OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

---

2 GEORGE V., 1911-12

VOL. CIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER TO THE TWENTY-FIFTH DAY OF JANUARY, INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1911-12

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

K. C., LL. D.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1911-12

CABINET FORMED OCTOBER 10, 1911

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Rt. Hon. Robert Laird Borden, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. George Eulas Foster, B.A., D.C.L., LL.D.
Without Portfolio	Hon. George Halsey Perley, B.A.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. Robert Rogers.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. Frederick Debartzch Monk, K.C., D.C.L.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. Francis Cochrane.
Minister of Finance	Hon. William Thomas White, B.A.
Postmaster General	Hon. Louis Philippe Pelletier, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. John Douglas Hazen, K.C., B.A., B.C.L.
Minister of Justice	Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Sam. Hughes.
Secretary of State	Hon. William James Roche, M.D.
Minister of Labour	Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers, K.C., B.A.
Minister of Inland Revenue and Minister of Mines	Hon. Wilfrid Bruno Nantel, K.C. LL.D.
Minister of Customs	Hon. John Dowsley Reid, M.D.
Without Portfolio	Hon. Albert Edward Kemp.
Without Portfolio	Hon. James Alexander Lougheed, K.C., Senator.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Martin Burrell.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... R. Boudreau.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. T. S. Sproule	Speaker.
Mr. P. E. Blondin, M.P.	Deputy Speaker.
Mr. T. B. Flint	Clerk of the House.
Mr. J. B. R. Laplante	Assistant to the Clerk.
Lieut.-Col. Henry Robert Smith	Serjeant-at-Arms.
Capt. H. W. Bowie	Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

Albert Horton	Editor.
Thos. P. Owens	Associate Editor.
Stephen Abbott E. Joseph Duggan J. O. Marceau Alphonse Desjardins A. C. Campbell George Simpson R. C. Dunbar	Reporters.
Chas W. Boyce	Assistant to Editor.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1911-1912

ACHIM, HONORÉ—Labelle.
AIKINS, JAMES ALBERT MANNING—Brandon.
ALGUIRE, DUNCAN ORESTES—Stormont.
AMES, HERBERT BROWN—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ARMSTRONG, J. A. MACDONALD—York (O.), N. Riding.
ARMSTRONG, JOSEPH E.—Lambton, E. Riding.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BAKER, GEORGE HAROLD—Brome.
BALL, R. J.—Grey, S. Riding.
BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton, East.
BARNARD, GEORGE HENRY—Victoria (B.C.)
BARRETTE, JOSEPH ARTHUR—Berthier.
BEATTIE, THOMAS—London.
BÉLAND, HON. HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELLEMARE, A.—Maskinongé.
BENNETT, RICHARD BEDFORD—Calgary.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E. Riding.
BEST, JOHN A.—Dufferin.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLONDIN, PIERRE EDOUARD—Champlain.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY——Shefford.
BORDEN, RT. HON. ROBERT LAIRD—Halifax.
BOULAY, HERMÉNÉGILDE—Rimouski.
BOURASSA, J. BOUTIN—Lévis.
BOWMAN, JAMES—Huron E. Riding.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BRABAZON, GERALD H.—Pontiac.
BRADBURY, GEORGE HENRY—Selkirk.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BROUILLARD, OVIDE—Drummond and Arthabaska.
BROWN, JAMES POLLOCK—Châteauguay.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM ASHBURY—Medicine Hat.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURNHAM, JOHN H.—Peterborough, W. Riding.
BURRELL, HON. MARTIN—Yale-Cariboo.

CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CARRICK, JOHN JAMES—Thunder Bay and Rainy Riv.
CARROLL, W. F.—Cape Breton, South.
CARVELL, FRANK BROADSTREET—Carleton, N.B.
CASH, EDWARD L.—Mackenzie.
CHABOT, JOHN LEO—Ottawa.
CHAMPAGNE, ALBERT—Battleford.
CHARLTON, WILLIAM ANDREW—Norfolk.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CHISHOLM, WILLIAM—Antigonish.
CLARE, GEORGE A.—Waterloo, S. Riding.
CLARK, HUGH—Bruce, N. Riding.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CLARKE, ALFRED HENRY—Essex, S. Riding.
CLARKE, W. A.—Wellington, N. Riding.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT SYLVESTER—Comox-Atlin.
COCHRANE, HON. FRANCIS—Nipissing.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM FOSTER—Brantford.
CODERRE, LOUIS—Hochelaga.
CROCKET, OSWALD SMITH—York, N.B.
CROMWELL, FREDERICK ROBERT—Compton.
CROTHERS, HON. THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W. Riding.
CRUISE, ROBERT—Dauphin.
CURRIE, JOHN ALLISTER—Simcoe, N. Riding.

DAVIDSON, AVARD L.—Annapolis.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, MARIE JOSEPH—St. John and Iberville.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, HON. CHARLES JOSEPH—Montreal, St. Anne.
DONNELLY, JAMES J.—Bruce, S. Riding.
DOUGLAS, JAMES M.—Strathcona.

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELLIOTT, GEORGE A.—Middlesex, N. Riding.
ELSON, PETER—Middlesex, E. Riding.
EMMERSON, HON. HENRY ROBERT—Westmorland.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Two Mountains.
FISHER, JOHN HENRY—Brant.
FORGET, SIR RODOLPHE—Charlevoix & Montmorency.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOSTER, ARTHUR DE WITT, Kings, N.S.
FOSTER, HON. GEORGE EULAS—Toronto, North.
FOWLER, GEORGE WILLIAM—Kings and Albert.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.

GAUTHIER, LOUIS JOSEPH. St. Hyacinthe.
GAUTHIER, LOUIS PHILIPPE—Gaspé.

GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLEY—Welland.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GOODEVE, ARTHUR SAMUEL—Kootenay.
GORDON, DAVID ALEXANDER—Kent, E. Riding.
GRAHAM, HON. GEORGE P.—Renfrew, S. Riding.
GUILBAULT, JOSEPH PIERRE OCTAVE—Joliette.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HAGGART, HON. JOHN GRAHAM—Lanark, S. Riding.
HARTT, THOMAS A.—Charlotte.
HAZEN, HON. JAMES DOUGLAS—St. John City and County.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.
HEPBURN, BERNARD RICKART—Prince Edward.
HUGHES, JAMES JOSEPH—Kings, (P.E.I.).
HUGHES, HON. SAMUEL—Victoria, (O.).

JAMESON, CLARENCE—Digby.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERICK—Missisquoi.
KEMP, HON. ALBERT EDWARD—Toronto, East.
KIDD, EDWARD—Carleton, (O.).
KNOWLES, WILLIAM ERSKINE—Moosejaw.
KYTE, GEORGE W.—Richmond, (N.S.).

LACHANCE, ARTHUR—Quebec Centre.
LAFORTUNE, DAVID A.—Montcalm.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LAMARCHE, PAUL EMILE—Nicolet.
LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie-Napierville.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAPOINTE, LOUIS A.—Montreal. St. James.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, P.C., G.C.M.G.—Quebec, East, Soulanges.
LAVALLÉE, JOSEPH OCTAVE—Bellechasse.
LAW, BOWMAN BROWN—Yarmouth.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Rouville.
LENNOX, HAUGHTON—Simcoe, S. Riding.
LESPERANCE, DAVID OVIDE—Montmagny.
LEWIS, EDWARD NORMAN—Huron, W. Riding.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland,(N.B.)
LOVELL, CHARLES HENRY—Stanstead.
*LOW, THOMAS A.—Renfrew, S.

MACDONALD, EDWARD MORTIMER—Pictou.
MACDONELL, ANGUS CLAUDE—Toronto, South.
MACLEAN, ALEXANDER K,—Halifax.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, (O.), S. Riding.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCCRANEY, GEORGE E.—Saskatoon.
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent, W. Riding.
MCCURDY, FLEMING BLANCHARD—Shelburne and Queens.
MCKAY, JAMES—Prince Albert.
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton, N.
MCLEAN, ANGUS A.—Queens, P.E.I.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Sunbury and Queens.
MCMILLAN, JOHN ANGUS—Glengarry.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.

*Resigned.

MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARSHALL, DAVID—Elgin, E. Riding.
MARTIN, MÉDERIC—Montreal, St. Mary's.
MARTIN, WILLIAM MELVILLE—Regina.
MEIGHEN, ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MERNER, JONATHAN JOSEPH—Huron, S. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Victoria, (N.B.)
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N. Riding.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MONDOU, A. A.—Yamaska.
MONK, HON. FREDERICK DEBARTZCH.—Jacques Cartier.
MORPHY, H. B.—Perth, N. Riding.
MUNSON, CHARLES ARTHUR—Northumberland, (O.). W. Riding.
MURPHY, HON. CHARLES—Russell.

NANTEL, WILFRID BRUNO—Terrebonne.
NEELY, DAVIS BRADLEY—Humboldt.
NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N. Riding.
NICHOLSON, DONALD—Queens, (P.E.I.).
NICKLE, WILLIAM FOLGER—Kingston.
NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E. Riding.

OLIVER, HON. FRANK—Edmonton.
OSLER, SIR EDMUND BOYD—Toronto, West.

PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS J.—Beauharnois.
PAQUET, EUGÈNE—L'Islet.
PARDEE, FREDERICK FORSYTH—Lambton,W. Riding.
PAUL, WILLIAM JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
PELLETIER, HON, LOUIS PHILIPPE—Quebec County.
PERLEY, HON. GEORGE HALSEY—Argenteuil.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec West.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.
PUGSLEY, HON. WILLIAM—St. John City.

RAINVILLE, JOSEPH HORMISDAS—Chambly and Verchéres.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, HON. JOHN D.—Grenville.
RHODES, EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
RICHARDS, JAMES W.—Prince, (P.E.I.).
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Huntingdon.
ROBIDOUX, FERDINAND JOSEPH—Kent, (N. B.).
ROCHE, HON. WILLIAM JAMES—Marquette.
ROGERS, HON. ROBERT—Winnipeg.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W. Riding.

SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK LAURENCE—Souris.
SEGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption.
SEVIGNY, ALBERT—Dorchester.
SEXSMITH, JOHN A.—Peterborough, E. Riding.
SHARPE, SAMUEL—Ontario, N. Riding.
SHARPE, WILLIAM HENRY—Lisgar.
SHEPHERD, FRANCIS HENRY—Nanaimo.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Guysborough.
SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SMYTH, WILLIAM ROSS—Algoma E. Riding.
SPROULE, HON. THOMAS SIMPSON—Grey, E. Riding.
STANFIELD, JOHN—Colchester.

STAPLES, WILLIAM D.—Macdonald.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver.
STEWART, DUGALD—Lunenburg.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, West.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

TAYLOR, JAMES DAVIS—New Westminster.
THOBURN, WILLIAM—Lanark, N. Riding.
THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon Territory.
THOMSON, LEVI—Qu'Appelle.
THORNTON, CHARLES JONAS—Durham.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TREMAIN, HADLEY B.—Hants.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN GILLANDERS—Assiniboia.

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—Maisonneuve.

WALKER, HENRY JOSEPH—Northumberland, (O.), E. Riding.
WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York (O.) Centre.
WARNOCK, DAVID—Macleod.
WEBSTER, JOHN—Brockville.
WEICHEL, WILLIAM GEORGE—Waterloo, N. Riding.
WHITE, GERALD VERNER—Renfrew, N. Riding.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria, (Alta.).
WHITE, HON. WILLIAM THOMAS—Leeds.
WILCOX, OLIVER J.—Essex, N. Riding.
WILSON, CHARLES AVILA—Laval.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WRIGHT, WILLIAM—Muskoka.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1911-1912

ALGOMA, EAST—William Ross Smyth.
ALGOMA, WEST—Arthur Cyril Boyce.
ANNAPOLIS—Avard L. Davidson.
ANTIGONISH—William Chisholm.
ARGENTEUIL—Hon. George Halsey Perley.
ASSINIBOIA—John Gillanders Turriff.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Albert Champagne.
BEAUCE—Hon. Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis J. Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—Joseph Octave Lavallée.
BERTHIER—J. A. Barrette.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BRANDON—J. A. M. Aikins.
BRANT—John Henry Fisher.
BRANTFORD—William F. Cockshutt.
BROCKVILLE—John Webster.
BROME—George H. Baker.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—Hugh Clark.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—James J. Donnelly.

CALGARY—R. B. Bennett.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON, SOUTH—W. F. Carroll.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
CARLETON (O.)—Edward Kidd.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—J. H. Rainville.
CHAMPLAIN—Pierre Edouard Blondin.
CHARLEVOIX—Sir Rodolphe Forget.
CHARLOTTE—Thomas A. Hartt.
CHATEAUGUAY—James P. Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—John Stanfield.
COMOX-ATLIN—H. S. Clements.
COMPTON—F. R. Cromwell.
CUMBERLAND—Edgar N. Rhodes.

DAUPHIN—Robert Cruise.
DIGBY—Clarence Jameson.
DORCHESTER—Albert Sevigny.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Ovide Brouillard.
DUFFERIN—John A. Best.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM—Charles Jonas Thornton.

EDMONTON—Hon. Frank Oliver.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—David Marshall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Oliver J. Wilcox.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Alfred H. Clarke.

FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPÉ—Louis Philippe Gauthier.
GLENGARRY—John Angus McMillan.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—Hon. John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Simpson Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, S. RIDING—R. J. Ball.
GUYSBOROUGH—J. H. Sinclair.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—Rt. Hon. Robert Laird Borden. A. K. Maclean.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON, EAST—Samuel Barker.
HAMILTON, WEST—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Hadley B. Tremain.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Louis Coderre.
HUMBOLDT—David Bradley Neely.
HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
HURON, E. RIDING—James Bowman.
HURON, S. RIDING—J. J. Merner.
HURON, W. RIDING—Edward Norman Lewis.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

JACQUES CARTIER—Hon. Frederick Debartzch Monk.
JOLIETTE—J. P. O. Guilbault.

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT (N.B.)—F. J. Robidoux.
KENT (O.), E. RIDING—David Alexander Gordon.
KENT (O.), W. RIDING—Archibald Blake McCoig.
KING'S AND ALBERT (N B.)—George W. Fowler.
KING'S (N.S.)—Arthur De Witt Foster.
KING'S (P.E.I.)—James J. Hughes.
KINGSTON—Wm. F. Nickle.
KOOTENAY—Arthur S. Goodeve.

LABELLE—Honoré Achim.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph E. Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
LANARK, N. RIDING—William Thoburn.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE-NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION—Paul Arthur Seguin.
LAVAL—Charles Avila Wilson.
LEEDS—Hon. Wm. T. White.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—Wm. J. Paul.
LÉVIS—J. B. Bourassa.
LINCOLN—Edward Arthur Lancaster.
LISGAR—William Henry Sharpe.
L'ISLET—Eugène Paquet.
LONDON—Thomas Beattie.
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Dougald Stewart.

MACDONALD—William D. Staples.
MACKENZIE—E. L. Cash.
MACLEOD—David Warnock.
MAISONNEUVE—Alphonse Verville.
MARQUETTE—Hon. William James Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—A. Bellemare.
MEDICINE HAT—Wm. A. Buchanan.
MEGANTIC—L. T. Pacaud.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Peter Elson.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—George A. Elliott.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Duncan Campbell Ross.
MISSISQUOI—Wm. F. Kay.
MONTCALM—David A. Lafortune.
MONTMAGNY—D. O. Lesperance.
MONTMORENCY—Sir Rodolphe Forget.
MONTREAL, ST. ANNE—Hon. Charles J. Doherty.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Herbert B. Ames.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—Louis A. Lapointe.
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Méderic Martin.
MOOSEJAW—William Erskine Knowles.
MUSKOKA—William Wright.

NANAIMO—Francis H. Shepherd.
NEW WESTMINSTER—James Davis Taylor.
NICOLET—Paul E. Lamarche.
NIPISSING—Hon. Francis Cochrane.
NORFOLK—Wm. A. Charlton.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—William Stewart Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Henry Joseph Walker.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—Charles A. Munson.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Samuel S. Sharpe.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Smith.
OTTAWA CITY { Alfred E. Fripp. / John Leo Chabot.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Donald Sutherland.

PARRY SOUND—James Arthurs.
PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—H. B. Morphy.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Michael Steele.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John A. Sexsmith.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—John H. Burnham.
PICTOU—Edward Mortimer Macdonald.
PONTIAC—Gerald H. Brabazon.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Arthur Meighen.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE ALBERT—James McKay.
PRINCE, (P.E.I.)—James W. Richards.
PRINCE EDWARD—Bernard R. Hepburn.
PROVENCHER—John Patrick Molloy.

QU'APPELLE—Levi Thomson.
QUEBEC, CENTRE—Arthur Lachance.
QUEBEC, EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC, WEST—William Power.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. L. P. Pelletier.
QUEENS, (P.E.I.)— { Angus A. McLean. / Donald Nicholson.

RED DEER—Michael Clark.
REGINA—William Melville Martin.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—Gerald Verner White.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Hon. George Perry Graham.
RESTIGOUCHE—James Reid.
RICHELIEU—P. J. A. Cardin.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—George W. Kyte
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin
RIMOUSKI—Herménégilde Boulay.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
RUSSELL—Hon. Charles Murphy.

ST. HYACINTHE—Louis J. Gauthier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City—Hon. Wm. Pugsley.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City and Co.—Hon. J. Douglas Hazen.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—M. Joseph Demers.
SALTCOATS—Thomas MacNutt.
SASKATOON—George Ewan McCraney.
SELKIRK—George H. Bradbury.
SHEFFORD—George Henry Boivin.
SHELBURNE AND QUEENS—Fleming B. McCurdy.
SHERBROOKE—Francis McCrea.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William Henry Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—John Allister Currie
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—Haughton Lennox.
SOULANGES—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
SOURIS—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
STANSTEAD—Charles Henry Lovell.
STORMONT—Duncan O. Alguire.
STRATHCONA—James M. Douglas.
SUNBURY AND QUEENS (N.B.)—Hugh H. McLean.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Hon. Wilfrid Bruno Nantel.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Hon. Jacques Bureau.
THUNDER BAY AND RAINY RIVER—John James Carrick.
TORONTO, CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.

TORONTO, EAST—Hon. Albert E. Kemp.
TORONTO, NORTH—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Angus Claude Macdonell.
TORONTO, WEST—Sir Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER CITY—Henry Herbert Stevens.
VAUDREUIL—Gustave Boyer
VICTORIA (ALTA.)—William Henry White.
VICTORIA CITY, (B.C.)—Geo. Henry Barnard.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Pius Michaud.
VICTORIA (O.)—Hon. Samuel Hughes.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—William George Weichel.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—George A. Clare.
WELLAND—William Manley German.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—W. A. Clarke.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Gordon C. Wilson.
WESTMORLAND—Hon. Henry Robert Emmerson.
WINNIPEG—Hon. Robert Rogers.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.

YALE-CARIBOO—Hon. Martin Burrell.
YAMASKA—A. A. Mondou.
YARMOUTH—Bowman Brown Law.
YORK (N.B.)—Oswald S. Crocket.
YORK (O.), C. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
YORK (O.), N. RIDING—J. A. Macdonald Armstrong.
YORK (O.), S. RIDING—William Findlay Maclean.
YUKON TERRITORY—Alfred Thompson.

SELECT Committee Appointed to Supervise the Publication of the Official Reports of the Debates of the House.

BEATTIE, THOMAS—London.
BELLEMARE, A.—Maskinonge.
BOULAY, HERMÉNÉGILDE—Rimouski.
BROUILLARD, OVIDE—Drummond and Arthabaska.
BURNHAM, JOHN H.—Peterboro, W. Riding.
COCKSHUTT, WM. F.—Brantford.
FOSTER, HON. GEO. E.—Toronto, North.
LAPOINTE, LOUIS A.—Montreal, St. James.
LOVELL, CHARLES HENRY—Stanstead.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MONK, HON. FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
PERLEY, HON. GEORGE H.—Argenteuil.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK L.—Souris.
TAYLOR, JAMES D.—New Westminster.

Chairman—JAMES D. TAYLOR, New Westminster.

ERRATA.

VOL. I.

Col. 1811, 2nd line from foot of column, delete words: 'For the last ten years.'

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.

. HOUSE OF COMMONS

WEDNESDAY, November 15, 1911.

To-day being the first day of the meeting of the first session of the Twelfth Parliament for the despatch of business, Thomas Barnard Flint, Esq., M.A., LL.B., D.C.L., Clerk of the House of Commons, Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Robert Smith, sergeant-at-arms, Jean Baptiste Rene Laplante, Esq., assistant clerk, and Arthur Henry O'Brien, M.A., law clerk, commissioners appointed by Dedimus Potestatem for administering the oath to members of the House of Commons, all attending according to their duty, James G. Foley, Esq., Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said Thomas Barnard Flint a roll containing a list of the names of such members as had been returned to serve in this parliament.

The aforesaid commissioners did administer the oath to the members who were present, which being done, and the members having subscribed to the roll containing the oath, they repaired to their seats.

The Clerk of the House said: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the secretary of His Royal Highness, the Governor General:

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Canada.

Ottawa, Nov. 16, 1911.

Sir,—I am commanded by His Royal Highness the Governor General to inform you that the Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber to open the session of the Dominion parliament, on Wednesday the 15th inst., at three o'clock.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
H. C. LOWTHER, Lieut.-Colonel,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Clerk of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by J. de St. Denis LeMoine, Esq., Acting Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is the desire of His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General that you attend him forthwith in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate, when the Speaker of the Senate said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have it in command to let you know that His Royal Highness the Governor General does not see fit to declare the cause of his summoning the present parliament of Canada until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law; but, to-morrow, at the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon, His Royal Highness will declare the causes of calling this parliament.

And the House being returned:

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). Dr. Flint, as the representative of the Crown has just reminded us, with the commencement of a new parliament, it becomes necessary for this House to elect a Speaker. It is not necessary to remind the House that the Speaker occupies a position of very great dignity and importance. In the earlier days of constitutional development he was not only the spokesman of the House of Commons, but he was the champion of their rights against aggression or invasion by the Crown when the rights of the representatives of the people in parliament had not been so firmly established, and were not so clearly understood as they are at present. But in these later days the chief function of the Speaker is to preside over the deliberations and debates of this House, and that the position calls for qualities of intellect, and of temperament, and for experience in the rules and procedure of the House is undoubted. The Speaker must represent fairly both sides of the House, and he must be impartial, firm, courteous, and, above all, patient. I submit to you the name of Thomas Simpson Sproule, member for East Grey, as one who possesses all these qualities in an eminent degree. Dr. Sproule has been a member of this House in every parliament since 1878. He has sat with almost every minister of the Crown who has been a member of any government since confederation. His devotion to his public duties has been pre-eminent, and those of us who have been his colleagues in the past know that he has

REVISED EDITION

made an especial study of the procedure and rules of the House, and has on all occasions manifested a very complete acquaintance with them. It is, therefore, with the greatest pleasure, and in the confident hope that the selection will command your approval that I move, seconded by Mr. Foster:

That Thomas Simpson Sproule, Esquire, member representing the electoral district of the East Riding of the county of Grey, do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Dr. Flint, it is the privilege of every administration, after a general election, especially when the administration has such a large majority at its back as the present administration has, to select from the members elected one who, in their opinion, is a fit and proper person to discharge the important duties of Speaker of this House. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has just moved that our old friend and colleague, Dr. Sproule, be elected Speaker as the candidate selected by the government. I have no exception to take to anything that has been said by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Borden) in his appreciation of the merits of Dr. Sproule. On the other hand, I cannot but say, and I must say it with frankness, that I am surprised at the selection which has been made by the government, not from any want of qualification on the part of the hon. member, not that I mean to say anything derogatory to him—far from it—but from the circumstances out of which the present administration has come into office. In England, in the mother and model of all parliaments, it is an established rule, unwritten, but with the force of written law, that whenever a man has been selected and elected as Speaker, he is Speaker for ever—elected after a new election, re-elected again until removed by death or disabled by disease. That system has certainly a good deal to be said in favour of it, and ought to commend itself to the judgment of the House in preference to our own. The system which has been followed in England has this advantage, that it trains the occupant of the Chair for the great position he has to maintain, and that he learns from the experience of every year, and of every parliament. We know ourselves from what has taken place in this House that however well qualified to act as Speaker a man may be by training, and by education, he has much to learn from actual experience in the Chair.

These things occurred to me when I had the honour to occupy the seat now occupied by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) and after the general election of 1908 I communicated with the Hon. Mr. Sutherland, who had been Speaker in the parliament of 1904, and asked him to again become the Speaker of this House. For reasons personal to himself, and for political reasons as well he would not accept, and I communicated my application, and the reasons for its refusal by Mr. Sutherland at the first opportunity. Then on my own motion, my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) was elected and filled the Chair with ever increasing dignity, impartiality and ability. After the election which has just taken place, and in which the principle fought for by the victorious party was the maintenance of British institutions, which were very much threatened, it appears, by the possible acceptance by the Canadian people of a harmless and innocent trade agreement, it would have seemed to me that the first thing to be done by my hon. friend was to put himself in accord as much as possible with British institutions, and that according to British precedent he would have moved into the Chair my hon. friend the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). British institutions, now that the victory has been won, are relegated to the backyard, there to be buried in dust and ignominy, to be resurrected and polished and re-furbished whenever a new election occurs. We have been familiar with such things in the past. Loyalty has always served a good purpose for the Conservative party in election times—and has then been forgotten.

Since, however, the principle of British institutions is to be departed from on this occasion, perhaps it is quite in the fitness of things that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) should be selected to be the Speaker of this House. I repeat that I have no exception to take to what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) as to the ability of the hon. member for East Grey. He and I are among the oldest members of the House; we have been sitting opposite one another for many years—if my memory serves me aright, for more than 30 years. I can bear testimony that he is able, painstaking, hardworking, conscientious according to his light, although his light is not my light. But, Sir, my hon. friend is of the human race, and therefore is not perfect. He would not, I think, find fault with me if I should say that in my estimation he has some weaknesses, but after an acquaintance with him of 30 years I must say in all kindness to him, that the only fault I find with him, the only weakness I find in him is that he is a Tory, a Tory of the Tories, the very quintessence of Toryism. I do not say that in anger, I say it in sorrow, and deep sorrow, but I know it is not his fault, it is his misfortune, he could not be anything else, even if he tried. But I am sure, at all events I hope, that when he takes the Chair in this House he will leave on the floor of it his Toryism, that his Toryism will not ascend the Chair, and

that in the Chair he will be the impartial servant of the House.

But, if I am surprised that my hon. friend the leader of the government has selected my hon. friend from East Grey to be the Speaker of this House, still more surprised am I, still more surprised must everybody be, that the selection has received the endorsation of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), Nationalist representatives in the government. If my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) were to read as assiduously as I read the Nationalist press he would know what a bad man he is, he would know that according to the Nationalist press, and according to Nationalist orators also, he is so bad that it is a crime for a member of the Liberal party, or any party, especially the Nationalist party to vote with him on any division. He would have learned that in 1905 there was a conspiracy between him and me, when autonomy was being granted to Alberta and Saskatchewan, to deprive the Catholic population of their schools, and the French settlers of their language. All this, and much more was written and spoken during the last campaign, and yet on this day, this very day, the first of the session, my hon. friend is the chosen candidate for the presidency of this House of the Nationalist party. In this they give us the measure of what we are to believe of their denunciations, and they show how easily they can swallow their principles if what they speak and write can be dignified with the name of principles.

Mr. BORDEN. Dr. Flint, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not received the proposals of the government with the best possible humour, but I suppose that under the circumstances we should not have expected that he would have been in much better humour than he has shown himself to-day. After all he has indulged in a more or less rambling speech with regard to the proposal made, and in the end he has admitted that the gentleman proposed by the government is a gentleman entirely worthy of the very high honour which it is proposed to confer upon him. I would like to say to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he has already begun to give evidence of the fact that he is ready to preach in opposition that which he did not practise in power. His speech was full of surprises, surprises that certain dissensions which he had hoped to see in the ranks of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House had not made themselves manifest. His appeal in that regard was unworthy of the right hon. gentleman, but the exhibition which he has given to-day is no new incident in his political record. I would like to tell him that so far as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are concerned, they are, without exception, so far as I am aware, willing to support the nomination of the gentleman whom I have named, and if the right hon. gentleman desires to test that, the opportunity is open to him now. I can only add that nominations of this kind have in the past been received in a somewhat different spirit from that which the right hon. gentleman has exhibited to-day; but I would like to say finally that under all the circumstances every allowance should be made to the right hon. gentleman for the ill temper which he has shown on this occasion.

The motion being put to the House,

The Clerk of the House declared the motion carried in the affirmative, nemine contradicente, and Thomas Simpson Sproule, Esquire, member for the electoral district of East Grey, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Mr. Sproule was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by Hon. R. L. Borden and Hon. George E. Foster.

Hon. THOMAS S. SPROULE (Speaker-elect). I beg to tender to this House my sincere and hearty thanks for the high honour it has conferred upon me by electing me as its Speaker. It will be my pleasure, as well as my duty, to endeavour to deserve that high honour by dealing with all questions which come before me in my official character with firmness and with impartiality. I am fully sensible of my unfitness for the position, but I rely confidently upon the co-operation of hon. members on both sides of this House to assist me in maintaining our rights and privileges and in preserving our rights and privileges, and in preserving the freedom and dignity of debate, according to ancient usage.

The sergeant-at-arms then placed the Mace on the Table of the House.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 3.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 16, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication from the secretary of His Royal Highness the Governor General as follows:

Ottawa, 15th November, 1911.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Royal Highness the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber formally to open the session of the Dominion Parliament on Thursday, the 16th inst., at three o'clock.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
H. C. LOWTHER, Lt.-Col.,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable the Speaker
of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by J. de St. Denis LsMoine, Esquire, Acting Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Royal Highness the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Hon. Thomas Simpson Sproule, Speaker elect, said:

May it please Your Royal Highness:

The House of Commons have elected me their Speaker though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me. If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their King and country, humbly claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your Royal Highness's person at all seasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from your Royal Highness the most favourable consideration.

The Hon. the Speaker of the Senate then said:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Royal Highness the Governor General to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the House of Commons to His Majesty's Person and government, and not doubting that their proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temper and prudence, he grants, and upon all occasions will recognize and allow their constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you, that the Commons shall have ready access to His Royal Highness upon all seasonable occasions, and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him his most favourable consideration.

Then His Royal Highness the Governor General was pleased to open parliament by a speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to state that the House, having attended on His Royal Highness the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, I informed His Royal Highness that the choice of Speaker had fallen on me, and, in your names, and on your behalf, I made the usual claim for your privileges which His Royal Highness was pleased to confirm to you.

THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Royal Highness the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Royal Highness was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament. To prevent mistakes I have obtained a copy, which is as follows:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is with much satisfaction that I meet, for the first time, the parliament of Canada, and avail myself of your advice and assistance in the fulfilment of the important charge which has been entrusted to me by His Majesty the King. I can assure you that I esteem it a privilege to be called upon to administer the affairs of this prosperous and growing Dominion, and to associate myself with you in the important duties which you are about to approach.

It affords me great pleasure to congratulate you upon the continued and increasing prosperity of the country. Our trade, both with British and with foreign countries, is rapidly expanding, and there is every prospect that its volume in the present year will be largely in excess of that attained at any time in the past.

Although there has been some damage to the crops in certain districts, the harvest has on the whole been abundant, and it is believed that the returns to the husbandman will exceed those secured in any previous year.

The results of the census taken during the present year will be laid before you, so far as they have been tabulated. While the increase in population has not fulfilled all the sanguine expectations that had been formed, yet it has been substantial and encouraging.

You will be pleased to learn that the revenues for the current fiscal year have, up to the present, largely exceeded those during any similar period in the past, with every prospect that this increase will be maintained.

The advantages that would result from a wider exchange of products between the various countries of the empire are undoubted, in view of the wonderful variety and extent of those productions, and negotiations have been opened for improved trade arrangements with the British West Indies and British Guiana, which should prove advantageous to those colonies as well as to this Dominion.

The importance of providing our country with better highways is manifest. A Bill will be introduced for the purpose of enabling the Dominion to co-operate with the provinces in the accomplishment of this desirable object.

It is essential to recognize that, in a country possessing so great an area of fertile land as that with which this Dominion is happily endowed, the great basic industry is agriculture. My advisers are convinced that the time has come when greater aid and encour-

agement should be given to those who are engaged in the cultivation of the land. To this end, a measure will be introduced under which it is hoped that there may be co-operation between the Dominion and the various provinces, for the purpose of assisting and encouraging our farmers to secure the best results in production, and at the same time preserve the fertility of the soil.

A measure will be introduced revising and consolidating the Acts relating to the inspection of grain and providing the means by which the government can secure, through a commission, the control and operation of the terminal elevators upon the Great Lakes.

A Bill will be introduced to establish a permanent tariff commission, whose duty it shall be to ascertain, by investigation and inquiry, such information as will furnish a more stable and satisfactory basis for tariff legislation than has heretofore been available.

Bills will also be laid before you with respect to the Department of External Affairs, the Archives and other subjects.

The selection of the best route for the Hudson Bay railway is engaging the attention of my advisers, and an announcement will be made to you of the result of their inquiry.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts of the last year will be laid before you.

The balance of the estimates for the current fiscal year, as well as the estimates for the coming year, will be submitted for your approval at an early date.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I commend the subjects, which I have mentioned, to your best consideration, and I trust that your deliberations, under the blessing of Divine Providence, may tend to the welfare and good government of this Dominion.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Duncan Orestes Alguire, Esquire, for the electoral division of Stormont, introduced by Hon. Mr. Foster and Hon. Mr. Reid.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the administration of Oaths of Office.—Hon. R. L. Borden (Prime Minister).

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, be taken into consideration on Monday next.

He said: It was our intention to have proceeded to-morrow, but I understand from hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that it would be regarded as somewhat more convenient if the debate were proceeded with on Monday.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the order for the consideration of the motion for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session have precedence over all other business except the introduction of Bills until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the select standing committees of this House under Rule 10, such select committee to be composed of the following members: Hon. Mr. Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Messrs. Reid (Grenville), Monk, Pugsley, Stanfield and Pardee, and that the portion of Rule 10 limiting the number of members of said committee be suspended in relation thereto.

He said: I would like to say in connection with this motion that I think hon. members on both sides of the House have realized in the past that several committees as constituted hitherto have been too large. The Railway Committee, for example, in the last parliament, consisted, if I remember the figures accurately, of 205 members out of a total membership in this House of 221. So, it was much easier to name a committee by saying that it should consist of all the members of the House except the sixteen gentlemen who happened not to be appointed as members of it. I would like to have the views of hon. gentlemen on both sides as to whether or not this can be corrected. It would seem to me that if we name about fifty or sixty members on the Railway Committee the other standing committees such as Privileges and Elections, and Banking, and Commerce could be restricted to from twenty-five to forty members, with the result that probably more responsibility would be felt by the members of the committees, the relative attendance would be larger, and on the whole better work would be accomplished. I take the opportunity of mentioning this now so that my right hon. friend may consider it, and if he wishes give us his views upon it. We can also have the ideas of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House as to whether this reform, as I think it is, cannot best be accomplished at the present time. Under the arrangement which I would feel inclined to propose, every member of the House would be on two committees and on no more, whereas hitherto it has been the practice to appoint certain members of the House upon three or four, or even five committees. I make the suggestion now in order that we may elicit the opinion of hon. members generally with regard to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The remarks of my hon. friend in presenting the motion are quite apposite under existing cir-

cumstances. The older members of the House have recognized that the committees would be more useful, and more practical were the membership restricted. If all the committees were of equal importance, the reform would be more easy to accomplish, but we know that some committees are recognized as being more desirable than others for membership on them. However, I presume there will be a general expression of opinion from all the members on the matter.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Joint report of the librarians of parliament.—Mr. Borden.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Mr. BORDEN presented to the House a message from His Royal Highness the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

ARTHUR.

His Royal Highness the Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute of Council appointing the Honourable Frederick Debartzch Monk, Minister of Public Works; the Honourable George Halsey Perley; the Honourable John Dowsley Reid, Minister of Customs, and the Honourable William James Roche, Secretary of State, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the eleventh chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled: 'An Act respecting the House of Commons.'

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 3.55 p.m. until Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, November 20, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed by the Clerk of the House that on the 18th September last he received from the Hon. Messrs Justice Malouin and McCorkill, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a report relating to the election for the electoral district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay declaring the said election null and void.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Public accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911.—Hon. Mr. White.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—Mr. Bickerdike.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANCASTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Marriage Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I have placed in your hands speaks for itself, and the best explanation I can give of it is to read it. It reads as follows:

The Marriage Act, chapter 105, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, is amended by adding thereto the following section:—

Every ceremony or form of marriage heretofore or hereafter performed by any person authorized to perform any ceremony of marriage by the laws of the place where it is performed, and duly performed according to such laws, shall everywhere within Canada be deemed to be a valid marriage, notwithstanding any differences in the religious faith of the persons so married and without regard to the religion of the person performing the ceremony.

2. The rights and duties of the respective persons married as aforesaid as married people, and of the children of such marriage, shall be absolute and complete, and no law or canonical decree or custom of or in any province in Canada shall have any force or effect to invalidate or qualify any such marriage or any of the rights of the said parties or their children in any manner whatsoever.

I would draw attention to the fact that a duty has been thrown upon parliament in this matter by a decision of one of the courts in one of the provinces of Canada. I do not think that this House, or the country cares a rap whether that judgment is well founded or not on provincial law, what the national interests require is that no such doubt shall be raised in any part of the civilized world in regard to the validity of any marriage ceremony regularly performed in Canada. The people of Canada have recently dealt with very important matters, but such a question as reciprocity pales into insignificance compared with the great national question involved in this decision, and I have no doubt that when the House has considered the matter it will pass either this Bill, or some similar measure embodying the same principle.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANCASTER moved for Bill (No. 4) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill is required because of the very unfair result of legislation passed by the late government shortly after they took

office in 1896, the result of which has been that in one or two of the provinces voters have a right to vote in more than one constituency, while in all the other provinces they are limited to one vote for one member of parliament only, a most unfair and unjust discrimination in favour of one or two provinces against the rest of the provinces. Like many other Acts of the late administration that Act requires to be rectified in the interests of the people of Canada in order that we may have proper legislation and proper means of electing our legislators without any unfair advantage to one province or one part of the country in its representation in this federal tribunal.

The Bill therefore reads as follows:

1. Section 10 of the Dominion Elections Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapter 6, is amended by inserting at the beginning of the said section the words 'Subject to subsection 2 of this section,' and by adding to the said section the following subsection:—

Section 2 of the section of the Bill I am now introducing, reads :

2. No person shall vote in more than one electoral district for the same year, and if by the laws of any province he is entitled to vote in more than one electoral district he shall for a Dominion election be entitled to vote only in the electoral district in which he is domiciled at the time of the election.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read for the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANCASTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) to amend the Railway Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LANCASTER. Briefly, this is the same legislation which was introduced by me two years ago and which was discussed in the House and upon which a party vote was taken. I have no doubt that the present government will adopt the Bill because at that time every man of the Conservative party in the House voted for this legislation which was defeated by a party vote at the instance of the government of the day, which thanks to Providence is now in opposition. Those who were not in the House when this legislation was formerly discussed are entitled to a little explanation. The object of the Bill is to remove a very unfair taxation upon municipalities in regard to the protection of level crossings. As the law is to-day the municipality has to pay a portion of the cost of protection, the railway company a portion, and the Dominion of Canada a portion, so that the municipality pays twice : once as taxpayer to the Dominion and also as a municipality. This Bill provides that unless a municipality, in order to get some extraordinary and special protection makes a special agreement, the Railway Commission shall not put upon the municipalities any cost of the protection when the railway persists in running on the King's Highway, or, what is commonly known as a level crossing. I am in hopes that the Bill will be passed by a vote of the majority of this House as at present constituted.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary) moved :

That a humble address be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne.

He said, Mr. Speaker, the constituency which I am privileged to represent in this House—a constituency which comprises within its boundaries the third largest city west of the Great Lakes—is deeply sensible of the high honour conferred upon it by the selection of its representative to move that an address be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General, thanking him for the gracious speech with which he has been pleased to open the first session of the twelfth Parliament of Canada. The very title 'His Royal Highness' by which the Governor General is designated, gives cause for satisfaction and congratulation to Canadians. For the first time in the history of our world-wide empire the parliament of an overseas Dominion has been opened by a Governor General who is a member of the reigning family—a Prince of the Blood Royal. We can assure His Royal Highness that if he esteems it a privilege to be called upon to administer the affairs of this prosperous and growing Dominion and to associate himself with us in the important duties which we are about to approach, we appreciate the honour that has been conferred upon our country by his appointment which implies a recognition of the growing importance of this Dominion as a part of the British Empire, and of the loyal devotion of the Canadian people to the Throne and person of His Majesty the King. But we welcome His Royal Highness not only because of His Royal birth and high station, not only because he is the brother of our late beloved Sovereign whose solicitude for the welfare of his subjects and devotion to the cause of peace have given him in history the name of Edward the Peacemaker; not only as the sole surviving son of that great Queen and mother whose

name and fame are the common heritage, not of the ciitzens of our own empire only, but of the people of all countries and all nations; not ony because he is the representative of our King and Emporer, but because of those matchless qualities of heart and mind that have ever endeared him to those with whom during a long and successful official life he has been associated. We are reminded that the beginning of his military career found him offering his services to His Sovereign for the protection of our own country from threatened invasion and that whether actively participating in great battles on the burning sands of Egypt, holding high military command in India, Ireland and Malta, or as an administrator or the special representative of his Sovereign on high diplomatic missions, he has ever brought to the discharge of those multitudinous and onerous duties, great abiltity and great tact and the manifestation of a spirit of patriotic devotion and self sacrifice that has commanded alike the affectionate regard, the respect and admiration of his fellow countrymen; while his illustrious consort has been the exemplification of all those virtues that are inseparably connected in our minds with the words 'home and mother.'

To many of us, it seems but fitting that a member of the Royal Family should open a new Parliament, with a new government with a clear mandate from the people on a great issue, indicating in no uncertain terms a settled conviction that the Canadian people would consider no trade proposals that menaced, even remotely, their fiscal and national independence, or threatened to lessen the strength of the ties that bind them to the British Empire, or rendered for a moment more difficult the realization of the hope that lives in all of us for the commercial and organic union of that empire.

Mr. Speaker, the risk was real and the danger imminent. I doubt not that when the proposals to which I have referred were first introduced, they were regarded merely as trade proposals; but when it was ascertained that in their ultimate results they involved the whole future of Canada, then it was that the national spirit of our people was aroused. I venture to think that the right hon. gentleman who so successfully leads the opposition in this House would not have introduced those proposals if he could have foreseen that there would have arisen around them an agitation, the results of which were so vital to the imperial and natioal future of the country. While I mention the name of the right hon. gentleman, may I be permitted to tender to him my sincere congratulations upon his having attained another anniversary of his natal day, with the expression of the hope that he may be long spared faithfully and illustriously to serve the state in the position which he at present occupies.

Mr. Speaker, in that portion of this great Dominion in which I am privileged to reside, a very substantial portion of our population has come from the great republic to the south, and one of the strongest reasons I had for opposing the reciprocity agreement was that it threw into the melting pot for solution a question that involved a problem in patriotism. When we remember that so large a portion of our population came from that great republic, where they inherited traditions that were at least not favourable to monarchial institutions; when they learned through the medium of the American press, that, however, much their former political parties differed with each other, they showed unanimity in favour of these proposals, and when they found American public men preaching a doctrine that indicated that the consequences of this agreement would be the absorption of western Canada at least by the great republic, and at all events rendering impossible for all time the commercial and organic union of those overseas dominions and the motherland which comprise the British Empire, it was little wonder that these people allied themselves with those who were in favour of the reciprocity pact. But it is a pleasure for me to say on behalf of these new settlers that as soon as they discovered that the Canadian people were not in favour of the agreement, they responded to the prevailing sentiment, and made it apparent that they proposed to devote their time and energies to the upbuilding of this great country just as they had done in the land from which they came; and, as they are settlers who are accustomed to pioneer conditions, they are enabled, now that this question is settled for ever, to assist us in laying the foundations of a great state, and in building up in western Canada a country which will at no distant day be the greatest part of this great confederation. That is, I think, a cause for congratulation and for rejoicing.

The speech itself indicates an earnest desire on the part of the government to at once realize the responsibilties to western Canada. We in the west have produced abundant crops. Our contribution to the wealth of the state this year will not be less than $200,000,000 by a population of a little more than a million, and it is but natural that we should look for some lavish public expenditures that will advance the interests of the agriculturists. With a buoyant and increasing revenue, and with expanding trade, we in the west do not require expenditures for lighthouses or breakwaters, or wharfs, unless perhaps some like those built in recent years by hon. gentlemen opposite where

there was no water; but we rejoice to find the new government implementing the promises they made while in opposition, by being prepared to assist and co-operate with the provincial authorities in giving us a system of highways which will enable the husbandman to convey the products of his farm to the elevators and railways. The very fertility of our soil makes it difficult for us to have good roads. I believe any member of this House who has travelled in western Canada will realize how many difficulties have to be overcome in the construction of highways in that country; but by the co-operation of the federal government with the provincial authorities we may hope to have constructed great trunk lines of communication whereby the farmers will be enabled readily to reach their markets, and also whereby the mails will be more readily conveyed to the remote sections of the country. This is a matter which I am sure will commend itself to the people of the west.

Closely allied with that is the encouragement which the new administration proposes to give to agriculture. It would of course be a mere commonplace to say that in a country like this, with a population of something over seven millions, and where over one-half of our people is engaged in agricultural pursuits, it is absolutely essential to give consideration to every measure that can be devised to advance those interests. It is encouraging to find this new administration, in its early life, making a deliberate attempt to grapple with the problem of how to secure the best results from the cultivation of the soil. It is also necessary in this country that we should appreciate the lessons of conservation. The very prodigality of nature in bestowing her bounties upon us not only in the west, but in all parts of Canada, is one of the reasons why we have been prodigal in their use. We are finding, despite our splendid natural resources, and despite the opportunities which exist on every hand for reaping rich rewards from industry, that we can soon exhaust those resources, and it is the duty of statesmen not ony to conserve the natural resources of the country, but the public health and public energy by measures which will best advance the interests of the people as a whole. I hope this administration will find some place in its programme for providing a department of public health. In the report of the conservation commission appointed by a former president of the United States it was stated that great as was the value of the material resources of those states, there was a still greater monetary value attached to the vital energy and living force of its people. We are a new country, and we have the opportunity to create such conditions as will conserve not only our material resources, but the health, energy and vitality of our people. It has been found that the largest number of industrial accidents happen toward the close of the day's work when the vital forces are low, and too many of our railway accidents have been directly attributable to the employees remaining too long on duty. Too often it has been found that child labour and the work which has been undertaken, especially by married women, in the older countries has involved a loss of vital force in the succeeding generation, and we Canadians—we in this young country—must, it seems to me, if we are true to our best traditions, realize that at best we hold this great land with its brilliant opportunities and its splendid resources as trustees for that posterity which will one day weigh us up in judgment for the manner in which we have discharged the trust reposed in us; and I hope and believe that this attempt and endeavour that is to be made by this new administration to conserve our resources and the heritage of our people will meet with a ready response from the people of the east and the west and will everywhere bring about those results which we are so very desirous to accomplish.

Then there is closely allied to the question of the development of our agricultural industry, the consolidation of the Grain Acts and the taking over under proper control by a commission of the terminals at the head of the Great Lakes. It has been a fruitful source of dissatisfaction and complaint on the part of the western agriculturists that proper provision has not been made at the head of the Great Lakes for the storage of our grain products. This complaint this new administration now proposes to remedy, but there are many questions which are worthy of the consideration of this House before we commit ourselves to a scheme that would involve the nationalizing of all of the grain terminals at the head of the Great Lakes. By 1915 the Panama canal will be completed, the Hudson Bay railway will have been completed, the National Transcontinental railway will practically have been completed, and new methods of transportation will be furnished to the people. It is, therefore, of vital importance in the minds and thoughts of those who produce grain in the west that no mistake be made so far as the terminals at Hudson bay are concerned, and we rejoice that the speedy completion of the railway will be one of the matters which will receive the most earnest consideration of this administration. It is a matter in which the people in the west are vitally interested, that terminals shall be constructed there under

the control of a commission, and that no private corporation will have an opportunity to unnecessarily control or dominate those terminals. That will obviate the necessity, of course, of our having to expropriate them, as we may some of the terminals at the head of the lakes. It is of equally great importance, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and I am expressing the opinion of men who have given the matter every consideration, that provision without further delay should be made for the construction of terminals at Vancouver and Prince Rupert. I do not know whether the hon. members of this House have given any consideration to the problem of transportation as it may be raised by the construction and completion of the Panama canal, but it has already been demonstrated by shippers who have sent grain from as far east, I believe, as Moosejaw, that it is possible to ship that grain west to Vancouver, and then by water carriage around the Horn and convey it to England in a little longer time, but at substantially the same freight rate at which it can be conveyed to the head of the lakes, and by water carriage shipped to Liverpool. And that during the winter months it is quite possible now to ship grain to Vancouver, and by water carriage from there, so as to reach all corners of the world quite as cheaply, if not at little better freight terms, than it is possible to have that same grain conveyed to the eastern seaboard by railway carriage, and from thence to the markets across the ocean. Now, if that be so it is quite apparent, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the construction of that canal will have a revolutionary effect upon the transportation problem of the west, and it is of the highest possible importance that this House should make provision for the early construction of terminals at Vancouver and Prince Rupert to meet the demands that will be absolutely made upon this country when the Panama canal is completed.

The construction of the Hudson Bay railway, as I have said, will bring the interior portions of Canada many days closer than at present to the markets of England and the continent, and it is of importance for the same reason that we should provide every facility by which the demands of the west can be met without delay. The Hudson Bay railway itself must follow the best possible route. I am pleased, and I am sure every western man will be equally so, that no question has been raised by the incoming government as to the necessity for the construction of that railway. It will provide an additional transportation route by means of which millions of bushels of grain that will be produced on the fertile prairies of the west will find access to the markets of the world, and even although that route be open only for a very short time in the year, it will afford that measure of relief which the absolute necessity of the case demands. It is of the highest possible importance, not only that the best route with the best grades be chosen, but that the terminals also shall be the best that can be provided. I am convinced that the determination of these questions by the government, after proper consideration, will commend itself to the people of every portion of this great dominion.

I doubt not that our friends opposite will congratulate us upon the splendid heritage in the way of buoyant and expanding revenues, and increasing trade that they have left to us. But in that connection I have also to remind them, Mr. Speaker, that they left us a legacy of great responsibilities and great obligations. No student of affairs in western Canada can for a single moment contemplate the construction of one of the means of transportation that I have just referred to—namely, the National Transcontinental railway—without being seized of the fact that there is a railway that has cost in its construction from 50 to 75 per cent more than the estimates of its engineers anticipated, and that that involves an added burden upon the men of the west in the shipping of their products to the sea in the form of increased freight rates. But, Sir, that is not all. The manufacturers of the east have quite as much interest in the question as the producers of the west, because if the cost of transporting the goods manufactured in the east bears an improper relation to the actual cost of those goods, as is very often the case, then it follows that there will be difficulties because the enhanced price will at once stimulate the differences between the east and the west. The east has an equal interest with the west in the question of the cost of the road to which I have referred; and, speaking for myself, I can only say that I hope the incoming administration will without delay see that a proper commission is appointed to investigate why it is that this road has cost from 50 to 75 per cent more than the engineers expected. This is very vital to the people of the west in so far as the question of transportation is concerned because the fixed charges of a railway, as we all know, are the principal factors which determine what the freight rates shall be; and if those fixed charges have become excessive by reason of the reckless expenditures of public moneys, it follows that in order to meet them the rates must be correspondingly increased. I had intended dealing with this subject at greater length, but I shall pass on merely hoping, as I have said, that at the earliest possible moment proper steps will be taken to ascertain just why it is so great a sum of money has been

expended over and above the sum estimated to accomplish the purpose aimed at.

Reference has been made to the fact that the returns of the census were somewhat disappointing. I am in receipt of a communication from the union of Alberta municipalities directing attention to the fact that these returns are incomplete and incorrect, that the statistical information in many instances is inaccurate and asking that a new census be taken, at least in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether that be possible, but this I do know that the city which I have the honour to represent has a population of at least 6,000 or 7,000 more than that shown by the census returns. But I am not altogether prepared to believe that is the cause of the inaccurate census returns. Indeed so extraordinary has been the growth of that great city and so rapid has been the increase of its population that during the last three or four months 6,000 or 7,000 may well have been added to the population as shown by the census.

But I think that we may congratulate ourselves as Canadians upon the fact that the census returns show a substantial increase in population. While the immigration returns show that vast numbers of people have come into Canada, people must have been leaving Canada as well in large numbers. But we have only to remember that fifty years ago the population of the United States was only half what it is at the present time to realize what the great possibilities of this Canada of ours may be. So, while, as I say, the census returns may be somewhat disappointing, still, I think we have every cause for rejoicing that they show such a substantial increase in population within the last ten years. And it is to be borne in mind that we have passed the difficult point. In the next ten years, we can ardently hope and confidently expect, the returns will not be disappointing. And we can very well be encouraged, because it was during the corresponding ten years in the history of the republic to the south that the greatest improvement was made in the census returns there.

Now, intimately associated in the minds of those who live west of the Great Lakes—and, I doubt not, also of those who live in the east—with the problems of transportation and prices and markets are the problems incident to and connected with the tariff. And it is a matter of great satisfaction, and, it seems to me, of congratulation, that we at last have an administration with the courage of its convictions, the courage to lift the tariff, if you will, out of politics by creating a tariff commission that will gather the information to enable us to deal with this most important matter on a scientific basis. I do not think there has been a time in the history of the Canadian people when it was more apparent that we should have a band of trained experts capable of gathering at first hand full and accurate information for the benefit of the Canadian farmer, manufacturer and workman than in the election that has just passed. How complete was the information of the people of the United States as compared with ours. That indicated the necessity of employing such a band of trained experts; and another advantage is that we may find employment for the great number of young men who are coming from our universities highly trained in the theory of political economy who would thus find employment and be able to apply their knowledge practically for the benefit of the people. We shall be able to have a band of trained experts whose labours will enable parliament to frame a tariff that will not be framed in the interests of a few gentlemen, to enable them to create great fortunes, nor yet for the purpose of vindictively attacking a political foe, but a tariff that will commend itself to the judgment alike of the agriculturist and manufacturer. I feel sure that I speak for the people whom I have the honour to represent, and for the people of the west generally, when I say that they are not the kind of men who do not believe in a tariff. The men of the west equally with those of the east, believe in a tariff. In these days of peace treaties, in these days when we are talking of the arbitration of differences that arise amongst the nations of the world, when we say that fleets and armies no longer have work to do, what is the great weapon with which nations must fight the battles of commerce?—and these battles are just as fierce, and, even though there be no bloodshed, just as deadly in some respects, as the battles of the past. The only weapon we have is the weapon we call the tariff. There is no sense in talking about the theories of free trade, the splendid doctrines of the past. It was a great constitutional writer in England who said, 'There is no human pain that is equal to the pain of a new idea.' And it seems to me that in these days the new idea that has seized the people everywhere is, that we must protect our country. People no longer talk of free trade, but of fair trade. We must protect our artisans, our manufacturers, and our farmers by affording them markets at home for the products of land and sea.

This is the duty, it seems to me devolving upon us, and I think it is a matter of congratulation for the House and the country that the government has the courage to create a tariff commission, one

that will be able, as I have said, to obtain such information as will form the basis for the scientific tariff that will secure stability in business. For, after all, the greatest thing you can have in a country is stability in business; and the thing that we call business has the right to know what treatment it has to expect from governments and from people. I can conceive of no method that can be devised that will enable this parliament to deal more justly and more fairly with the complex problems associated with the tariff and all that goes with it than a tariff commission. I venture to say that no Act of the late administration has met with greater support than the creation of the Railway Commission, a commission that is the buffer between the rights of the people and the aggressions of the railway. And in the same way it will be possible to create a tariff commission, not one with legislative functions but one whose duty it will be to gather the information that will enable us as legislators to devise a tariff on scientific principles, a tariff that will do violence to no industry, while protecting every legitimate interest that may exist within our broad Dominion.

One might ask what is meant by such a platitude as 'scientific tariff.' That is an old question, one that I have seen frequently asked and as frequently differently answered. I suppose it is only fair for each man to give his own interpretation of a scientific tariff. For my own part, I believe that is a scientific tariff which will insure to the Canadian people the ordered use regulated employment of our great resources of river and lake, sea and land that will insure the manufacture within Canada of all those articles that can be economically produced in Canada, giving employment to Canadian workmen at wages at least equal to those paid to workmen in competing countries, to the end that Canadian farmers may produce those things that will feed may produce the food products necessary to feed the Canadian workmen. That is my explanation of a scientific tariff at this time. And I say that there are no people in this great Dominion who have a more earnest desire to see a scientific business tariff for this country than the agriculturists of the west. For they are prepared to bear their part of the burden and responsibility of government ; and they realize that so long as we are in need of great public works for national development, so long as such demands are made upon us as are now made, we shall require large and buoyant resources, and that this can only be done in the manner now followed. If that be true, and I think that even hon. members opposite will agree that it is true, we reach the further conclusion that we should give to the motherland and to the overseas dominions a preference in our markets with respect to those articles that cannot be economically manufactured or produced in Canada. That constitutes my idea of a scientific Canadian tariff. The effect will be to remove prejudices too often created by public men between the east and the west. I remember when a senator belonging to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite told the people of the west of the vast fortunes being accumulated by manufacturers at their expense and pointed out in glowing terms that the one desire of those manufacturers was that they might use the dollars they had so acquired as a means of securing their entry into the effete aristocracy of Europe. The prejudices thus cultivated in the minds of the people of the west can only be removed, it seems to me, by removing the tariff, as far as possible, out of the realm of politics. And, as I have said, the way to do this is to furnish parliament with such accurate, such absolutely correct information will enable it to pass a tariff law based upon a proper conception of the obligations and requirements of every section of the country.

For, after all, Mr. Speaker, we in the west and those who live in the east are all imbued with a common patriotism,we are all striving for the common prosperity of our country; and I feel quite sure that as the years go by it will be found that those who create prejudices on fiscal questions and on tariffs in the minds of the agriculturists of the west at the expense of the manufacturers of the east, or seek to create antagonism between those who live in the west and those who live in the east, will receive a reprimand at the polls on the very first opportunity at which the people can express themselves.

Now, Sir, closely associated and allied with the question of a tariff commission is another question which I think must engage at no distant date the attention of this House and of this parliament. I refer to the control of corporations. I think it was Lord Acton who said that the great struggle of all the ages had been the conflict between custom and reason. In my judgment, in this complex civilization of ours, the great struggle of the future will be between human rights and property interests; and it is the duty and the function of government to provide that there shall be no undue regard for the latter that limits or lessens the other. I believe that so far as business, great or small, is concerned, it is elementary to say that if men meet together and conclude to enter into partnership, the limit of their responsibility is the limit of their joint and several fortunes. But when they constitute themselves into a joint stock company, or a corporation, the limit of their liability is the amount of their subscriptions. Every corporation is the creature of a statute, and

the statute expresses in some way the will of the people through their legislatures. If that be so, and if there be certain immunities and rights and privileges which flow to men who constitute themselves into corporations, it follows that the parliament or legislature that created them, that gave them birth and existence, has the power to impose upon them limitations commensurate with the demands and necessities of the people. I remember a minister of the Crown a few months ago, in western Canada, declaiming against the undue capitalization of certain companies organized during the past few years. But it must be remembered that they were organized under a law that had the sanction and approval of this parliament, and under the sanction of the government of which he was a member. It was the fault of the legislature, and not of these corporations, because we cannot take away from men the inherent right to merge, to unite their business interests; that is the inalienable and inherent right of all men, as we have learned during the past. But we have also learned that it is of the utmost importance, that it is absolutely essential for the development of the commercial life of this country, that men should know in advance just what they may do within the law and what they may do without the law. It is only a few years ago that the United Statse was passing through an era of development the like of which we are fast approaching, an era of trusts and combinations, and that situation gave rise to what is known as the Sherman Act. It was a punitive measure, it was not a piece of constructive statesmanship, it was not successful legislation, it did not indicate to the large business corporations what they might do or might not do with impunity. I submit that in this country we should at the earliest possible moment give our best attention to the consideration of some measure that will provide a tribunal that will limit the issue of securities by corporations, and will protect the public by enacting some measure by which they can know the real value of those securities.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Hear, hear. We are getting there.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). I am glad to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) say 'hear, hear,' and I trust that this subject will engage his attention in the years to come. There is no subject to which a public man may more usefully turn his attention than this very subject. But if my hon. friend's 'hear, hear,' means only a sneer at what has already been done—

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). No, no.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). Then we will accept the hon. gentleman's disclaimer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. C. P. R.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). It is perhaps rather early in the day to raise a question of this kind, but I am glad to see that some hon. gentlemen have the temerity to raise it. Their interrogation offers me an opportunity to say, now at the outset of my career in this House, that for many years I was associate solicitor and counsel for that great corporation, the Canadian Pacific railway, and I gave to it the best services in my power. But as soon as I was elected to this House I severed my connection with that corporation, and with all other railway companies or corporations; and I propose to devote my abilities, and whatever experience I have gained to advancing what I believe to be the best interests of the people of this Dominion. I will just say, Mr. Speaker, that it is of the utmost importance that this matter should engage the early serious attention of this House. I have seen railway securities issued, for instance, by new companies in western Canada whereby a large paid up capitalization was secured, by giving all the bonds and all the stock to some construction company formed for the construction of the railway often at a less cost than the amount realized from the sale of such bonds and that means that all the watered stock was scattered through the country, and that dividends on that stock will ultimately have to be paid by the people of the west. It is of transcendent importance that this House and this parliament should be seized of the fact that the people demand that some tribunal shall be created that will have control over the extent of the issue of securities by railway companies and by public utility companies, and that the capitalization of industrial concerns should bear some just proportion to the outlay, and to the physical value of the enterprise which it represents. My excuse for venturing to mention this subject is the fact that it has always been closely allied with the question of tariffs.

Now, Sir, there is one other matter in the speech from the Throne with which His Royal Highness the Governor General was pleased to open this House, that certainly should engage the consideration of every man, that referring to the promotion of trade within the British Empire. During the recent campaign I advocated that we should first endeavour to promote trade within the British Empire before we turned to promoting trade with other lands; and I believe that in seeking the extension of our trade in the British West Indies and in British Guiana we are fulfilling the pledges that we made in days gone by. It is important if we are to bring about

that commercial and organic union of the British Empire, of which I think we all have a strong and abiding hope, it must be done through commercial means. The genius of Pitt, the genius of Chamberlain, the genius of other great English statesmen has foreseen the extraordinary possibilities of uniting the overseas dominions with the mother country to commercial ties and commercial bonds. It is essential that we in Canada, as the greatest partner, should extend our trade so far as possible among the British dominions and with the motherland. I hail consequently that reference in the speech from the Throne with regard to increased efforts to promote our trade with the West Indies and British Guiana, as an indication of a desire on the part of the administration to expand our trade in those directions.

Now I have trespassed already too long on the attention of this House, and my apologies are due therefor. I will venture to say one thing more in conclusion. A new administration has come into power, with enormous responsibilities and matchless opportunities. The people of this great land, east and west, north and south, are looking for some results that will be commensurate with those responsibilities and opportunities. I feel certain that by acting in no narrow party spirit will that progress we all desire to see be attained. Let us unite our efforts to assist in the development of this great Dominion, let us all do our little best to bring about that organic and commercial union between the mother country and the overseas dominions which, I think, is inevitable and the accomplishment of which will mark this parliament as one of the greatest parliaments that ever sat in any of the King's dominions.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House for the attention with which my remarks have been received.

Mr. ALBERT SEVIGNY (Dorchester.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the Address in answer to the speech from the Throne. The honour done me surely is great, but what of the task it implies? Many are those in this House who would have been worthier than I of such an undertaking, but I understand that the hon. the prime minister (Mr. Borden) has not forgotten that the county of Dorchester stood by the party in 1896 and 1908, and has once more come back to the fold on the 21st of September last, when the Conservative party was gloriously returned to power.

The honour which is conferred upon me redounds on my constituents, and they will not forget it. In their name and in my own, I beg to thank the hon. the prime minister.

Mr. Speaker, a moment ago, on seeing that beautiful wreath of roses deposited on the desk of the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I recollected that to-day is his seventieth birthday. He will allow me, no doubt, to tender my congratulations and my respects. With such a distinguished leader at the head of hon. gentlemen opposite, whatever victories we win in the future will be glorious victories, because the battle will have been a hard one to fight.

Large numbers of our opponents are still wondering what has brought about the change in the country's political complexion which culminated in the sweeping victory of a few weeks ago. Have they forgotten that in this country of ours every citizen is guided and inspired by the one same ideal of national life and common citizenship?

The last campaign, in all parts of the Dominion, witnessed the awakening of the Canadian soul in the homes of the farmer, the settler, the workingman, the manufacturer, the trader, the business and professional man, the awakening of a feeling of common citizenship, each one being desirous to ensure the future happiness and progress of Canada.

The people who for the last fifteen years kept aloof from our party, have almost unanimously come back to us, realizing that when matters had come to a point when two ministers could proceed to London and here arrange secretly for the building of a navy, and two ministers proceed to Washington and there secretly give away our natural resources, they were practically being deprived of the right they conquered, and with which they are not willing to part, of governing themselves; they realized that they were being deprived of their birthright in connection with the natural resources of Canada as well as of the bright prospects which they are endeavouring day by day to improve.

Canada, which was 'at the parting of the ways,' as the president of the United States expressed it, has just shown that it had been slandered and that it had never thought of deviating from the path so wisely staked by the Conservative party through confederation and the national policy.

Let us hope that the mother country will be proud of the result and that she will grant us within in her own bounds that reciprocal treatment which we have refused to accept from other hands.

Sir, we were unwilling that our rich Canadian market should fall in the hands of the United States. Oftentimes Liberals have stated that their reciprocity proposals concerned natural products only; even so it was disastrous for our farming community. But how long would the farmer have

submitted to such restrictions, how long would the American dealer have submitted to them? Is it likely that the tariff wall would have stopped the importation of manufactured products from the United States? No, Mr. Speaker, the government would have been obliged to cut down the duties or do away with them, and then it would all have been over with our Canadian industries through which our cities have developed; the east would have ceased supplying the west, and the west would have ceased feeding our railways, our canals and our seaports. Our people would have flocked to the United States and increased its army of factory hands. Our forest wealth would have been depleted, we would have been the hewers of wood for the benefit of the United States pulp mills. Canadian wheat would have been monopolized by the United States milling industry which in return would have exacted heavy tolls on the flour sold back to us.

And what about those large numbers of foreigners who are settling down in the west? If they were to have their free trade connections with the people of the United States, is it at all likely we would succeed in impressing on their minds our aspirations, our ideals, our love for this country of memories and which has a great future before it? How would they have come to understand that sharing as they do in our national heritage, they would show their gratefulness for it by sharing in our aspirations. They would have acquired the Yankee turn of mind which distinguishes our 90 millions of neighbours, and such a result would have suited the United States, as paving the way to annexation. But a people owning such a fine, rich and great country as ours, enjoying such a measure of freedom, hopeful of being counted some day among the nations of the world, are surely entitled to ask of all Canadians, whether by birth or adoption, to give to Canada their hearts, their talents, their riches, have certainly the right to say to all: Canada for the Canadians.

Sir, that is what we said, and the voice of the sovereign people has approved of our views and stated that it was high time to overthrow the idols. Vox populi, vox Dei. Let us return thanks to God, Mr. Speaker. He has endowed the Canadian people with a proud soul, and He is watching over us in our youth, as He watched over us in our infancy.

For us that statement made by Sir Adolphe Chapleau thirty years ago, should remain as true as ever: That Canadian people in whom qualities of devotedness, of loyalty and of pride are intermingled, is worthy of being loved, educated, trained to vigor and greatness; nothing should be done to deceive them, or spoil them or defile them.

Sir, on entering this new life, I make it a point to thank and congratulate the hon. gentleman who has set for us such a fine example of courage and patriotism while in the midst of that strenuous battle against reciprocity. The circumstances are still fresh in the memory of all. To those who boomed reciprocity in the west he made this answer: I am absolutely opposed to it, and if you, gentlemen of the west, were prepared to make me prime minister to-morrow, if I would support it, I would refuse to do so.'

For many years, Sir, for fifteen years to say the least, our country has not heard such manly declarations from hon. gentlemen, who have preceded us in power. Utterances such as these was what was needed in the difficult position we occupied, and they won over to him the hearts of the people. Honour to him.

Sir, we are starting with a new governor and a new government. Our governor is a brother of the great king, Edward the Seventh, surnamed the Peacemaker, and we believe that he will bring along with him to Canada the qualities which endeared our late sovereign to his people.

The new government have at the outset offered and granted fair treatment to all. That is a precious token for the future, which causes the people to rejoice at having voted as they have done on the 21st of September, and causes pangs of remorse to those who have voted against us.

We are starting work under very favourable auspices. While under our eyes nations of the old world are waging war against each other or getting ready for deeds of violence and bloodshed in the near future, thrones are being overthrown, others are threatened by revolutionists; year by year thousands of people are leaving their country to seek elsewhere, on this side of the ocean, more favourable conditions, in the meantime Canada is expanding in peace, harmony and plenty, owing to the efforts of a strong and patriotic population, a God-fearing people, respectful of the crown and of our institutions.

Peace and harmony Canada wishes to ensure to all its children, and that policy will win the day, in spite of the appeals of certain organs whose inspirers on the day following their overthrow, and ever since, have striven to arouse ill-feeling and spite between the various races.

Abundance, we have it and we will have more of it in our immense prairies with their golden harvests, in our mines inexhaustibly rich in gold, in silver, in copper, in coal, in iron and asbestos; in our forests worked with care and preserved with prudence; in our industry protected with bene-

fit both for the employer and the employee; in the development of our land and by waterways, and principally in the Canadian people who love their country and work every day for its progress.

In this vast field of our operations we are all, I think, guided by the same desire of doing good. The field of our operation is beautiful; but we need good pilots such as those that we have, for the responsibilities are heavy and the reefs are treacherous.

We see in the speech from the Throne that the first thought of the new Government has been for the farmer. What do the left, who have cried everywhere that our party was opposed to the agricultural class, say about that?

Let us aid agriculture, Mr. Speaker, it is the most solid basis of our country, it is the domain from which the nation draws its best forces and its most durable wealth. It is the farmer who has just saved Canada from the reciprocity trap. In fact, take the verdict of Ontario and you will see how deep are the roots which bind the farmer to the Canadian land; take the verdict of Quebec, and out of the twenty-seven counties which were carried by the Conservative party in spite of the desperate appeal of our opponents, you find twenty-four rural constituencies, among which the most beautiful is certainly Dorchester, whatever my honourable colleagues may say.

It is the duty of governments to give a paternal attention to these sturdy workers who grow the harvests which nourish mankind.

It is by agriculutral products that our country has gained a world-wide reputation. The new government has recognized this in getting to work; we must congratulate them very cordially for it.

In these late years, steps of the greatest importance are made by men whom I think are very sincere, in order to draw us in the new policy called military imperialism. This policy has provoked discussion in Canada, principally since the old administration has voted the Navy Bill, and many of its most ardent champions have gone so far as taxing of disloyalty those who differed from them on this question. Notwithstanding the calumnies in a certain press it is not my intention to recriminate, after the words of peace and union which I have uttered a few minutes ago. Some have too hastily passed judgment upon my compatriots of Quebec. I say my Quebec compatriots because I know them better than the Canadians of the other provinces who were in unity with them upon this question. The flag that we love is unfurled to all the breezes of the world, and each Britsh colony, like each British subject, has received the mission and undertaken the duty of defending it. History shows that French Canadians have always faithfully fulfilled their duty.

In this country, both people, English and French, have one ideal and one common destiny. I am convinced that on this policy as upon all others, it is possible to come to an understanding if we have for each other mutual respect.

I think that the strifes of France, the old mother country of French Canadians, and those of England, the mother country of every one of us, were acute enough to justify us to repeat, as said Musset:

La mer y passerait sans laver la souillure,
Car l'abime est immense et la tache est au fond.

However, what a comforting spectacle they gave us a few weeks ago when we saw them uniting their flag, their pride and their honour and telling Germany to abandon its audacity.

This example of 'entente cordiale' comes from high enough, it seems to me, that it should be followed in our politics by those English and French living in Canada, who call themselves Canadians and who have the same flag.

Mr. Speaker, French Canadians, like the Canadians of other provinces, are opposed to this unfortunate law voted by the Liberal government, providing for the construction of a war navy which will be ruinous for Canada and useless to our country and to the empire.

If French Canadians are opposed to this law it is not through lack of loyalty. I affirm that French Canadians are just as loyal as any other Canadian. Those who doubt the loyalty of the French Canadians should know them better. They should come in our churches and hear the people singing every Sunday this prayer 'Domine salvum fac regem.' They should be in Quebec, the most French city of Canada, in circumstances such as marked the coronation of our sovereign a few months ago, and they would see for themselves all our people abandoning their work and filling the churches to sing the hymn of Thanksgiving, the Te Deum.

Mr. Speaker, let every one of us join in mutual respect for all, and let us remember that the presence of the two races on this continent was not brought about by human will, but by God's providence. In being united and working together we can make great things with this young giant whose name is Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the European governments did not realize until a few years ago the importance and the future of British North America. It was Sir John Young, who became Lord Lisgar, who said in Quebec, about the year 1865 that Canada was free to remain united to the metropolis or to part from her, that Great Britain was giving full liberty. It was, in other words, the famous 'arpents de neige' of Voltaire

celebrating their centenary. Lord Lisgar was judging too hastily as Voltaire had judged from too far away. They were forgetting Providence, who governs all empires and who had decided that Canada was to be the most important colony of the British empire.

European governments are no more indifferent about Canada. France regrets that she has lost it, as it has been said very often and, as Mr. Louis de Tinseau repeated it a few days ago, and England gratifies us with every honour, the most recent and the greatest being the sending us of H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught as Governor. We have now more than a representative of the Crown, we have, I dare to say, a part of the crowns of the great Queen Victoria, of our regretted sovereign Edward VII., and our beloved King George V. Canada has greeted with joy and many good wishes the arrival of His Royal Highness. We have not in this country the sumptuous palaces of the Imperial court, but we have seven millions of British subjects who say with the same sincerity and the same joy: God save the King! These seven millions have faith in the future and expect from their government principals, acts, work, revenues, wealth and honesty. The heirs of the Conservative party know that 'noblesse oblige.' They will work with our noble governor and with the people who acted so nobly on the 21st of September when the time came to remember the country.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (East Quebec). Mr. Speaker, the House has listened with more than ordinary interest to the two addresses in support of the motion now in your hands. We can congratulate ourselves upon the fact that we welcome to our ranks two members, young in years and of eminent ability, ability which might accomplish a great deal for this country if the hope could be entertained that these young men would direct their ability in the proper direction—a hope, however, which judging not from the manner but from the matter of their speeches, I fear I must not be too sanguine of. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) was preceded to this House by a high reputation for fluent oratory, and the speech with which he has favoured us has not only sustained but enhanced that reputation. I think I can with perfect appositeness compare his speech on the present occasion—judging from its easy and copious flow of sentences—with the crystal waters of the Bow river rushing down from the summit of the Rocky mountains towards that young and enterprising city which he has the honour to represent in this House.

Nor is my hon. friend the member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) new to political life. I am unaware that he has ever served in any legislative body as has the member for Calgary, but my hon. friend (Mr. Sevigny) is well known to us in the province of Quebec as amongst the most brilliant and ardent orators of the Nationalist party. Indeed, echoes have reached us of his fiery denunciation of the Naval Service Law, and not only of the Naval Service Law itself but of all naval expenditure in any kind or shape, whether Imperial or Canadian, by the Canadian people. But, Sir, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate my young and hon. friend (Mr. Sevigny) upon his speech of to-day. I particularly congratulate him upon the contrast that speech affords to the speeches with which he carried on his campaign, and I am sure that if his electors of Dorchester had been present to-day they would have inquired of themselves: Is that the candidate we elected on the 21st of September. My hon. friend (Mr. Sevigny), as did the hon. member for Calgary, was kind enough to offer me his congratulations upon the fact that this is my seventieth birthday. I tender to both gentlemen my sincere thanks, and I thank hon. members on both sides, and especially hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, for the kind manner in which they received these compliments. The hon. member for Calgary was profuse in his good wishes towards me, and he concluded by hoping that for a long time I shall occupy the position which I now do, meaning of course that for a long time to come I should remain leader of the Opposition discharging the difficult task of watching and criticising the acts of the government. I must say in all candour to my hon. friends, that judging from the manner in which the present government has commenced its career I feel that task will be too great for my advancing years.

My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) and my hon. friend (Mr. Sevigny) reached their happiest vein in their references to our new Governor-General, His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. Sir, it is a trite saying now that Canada has been exceedingly fortunate from the earliest days of Confederation to the present, in the character of those who have been entrusted with the duty and the honour of representing the royal authority in this dominion. Every new appointment has suggested the same observation, but the last appointment more than all the others. Already it is evident that His Royal Highness will bring to the discharge of his duties the same zeal, the same enthusiasm, the same care, that was ever displayed by his predecessors. In addition, he brings to the dignity of the office the glamour of his high rank in the British Empire. And, as to His Gracious consort, though scarcely a month in this Dominion she has already

won all Canadian hearts by the simplicity of her manner, the dignity of her bearing, the kindliness of her disposition. From her we have learned that dignity and simplicity of manner and kindliness of disposition, appreciable in every walk of life, have a double charm when found in the most exalted station.

As to the speech with which His Royal Highnesss has opened parliament there is not much to be said. The measures suggested in it are not of the character to invite any criticism at the present time. It promises we shall have measures for the improvement of highways, for the aid of agriculture, and for the establishment of a Tariff Commission, all of which may mean very much or very little, and until we have their details it is impossible to make any comment on them. But, there are words placed in the mouth of His Royal Highness by his present advisers which we on this side of the House have every reason to be proud of. It is stated in the speech:

> It affords me great pleasure to congratulate you upon the continued and increasing prosperity of the country. Our trade, both with British and with foreign countries, is rapidly expanding, and there is every prospect that its volume in the present year will be largely in excess of that attained at any time in the past.

Sir, when we took office fifteen years ago, such compliments could not be paid to the outgoing government as are now paid to us. Fifteen years ago the country was not in the condition in which we have left it to our successors; fifteen years ago agriculture was in a languishing condition, industry was perishing, the people were on the verge of despair. To-day, the treasury is not only full but it is overflowing; agriculture is in a flourishing condition, industry never was more active, the Canadian people are prosperous and happy. Fifteen years ago, Canada was nothing but an obscure colony; to-day, those hon. gentlemen who preceded me in this debate admit that our country has reached the dignity of a nation, and that upon her is fixed the admiring gaze of the world. If we scan the pages of history, I do not think there ever was an administration which went out of office under such circumstances as ours. As a rule, governments are beaten because the people are not satisfied with the prosperity of the country, but we have gone out of office because, having done so much for the country, our opponents told the people that it was better not to go further, and that they should take the administration from the hands which had guided the country with such success and place it in hands less enterprising. I believe, Sir, that a better epitaph could not be written for the late administration than these words put in the mouth of His Royal Highness by his present advisers, and these gentlemen will be happy indeed, if when the day comes that they must relinquish their trust, as much can be said for them as has been said for us.

There is another reference in the speech on which we have reason to congratulate ourselves. It is stated that the government have already opened negotiations with a view to having improved trade relations with the British West Indies and British Guiana. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) will remember that in former days he tried his hand, but with little success, to improve our trade with British Guiana and the West Indies. He knows also, and I regret it is a fact, that there is not much to be had in the way of trade with these countries, even under the most favourable conditions. I do not say that to discourage his efforts; on the contrary, we on this side of the House approve of any attempt which may be made by this administration to find markets for our products, whether it be in British or in foreign countries, because what we want is improvement of our trade. But, Sir, the present administration have rejected that agreement, in which there was a good deal to be had for the people, on the ground of sentiment, and I am afraid that in the present trade negotiations there is more sentiment than business reality.

This brings me to refer to the remarks of my hon. friend from Calgary upon the question of reciprocity, upon which we went to the country and were defeated. Sir, under our British system of government, the loss of power by one party and the accession to power of another party is a matter of little consequence in itself but what is of consequence is that we should know exactly what are the present conditions and what are the duties devolving on the present government? I want to speak of this without any recrimination in regard to the decision of the country. Of course in my judgment, the country made a mistake, but we on this side of the House are prepared to accept its decision loyally and to act accordingly. At the same time, we want to point out the obligation which rests on the present administration in consequence of the change which has taken place. What is the situation so far as this question is concerned? It simply amounts to this, that the late administration negotiated a commercial convention with our neighbours, the great American Republic, to remove all legal obstacles to the flow of trade between the two countries so far as natural products were concerned. Such conventions are not new in the history of the world. They are as old as tariffs. From the day nations adopted tariffs and collected their revenues by imposing duties on foreign imports, from that day conventions of such a character have

been a part of the commercial history of every nation. Need I remind the House once more that when Sir John Macdonald advised the Canadian people to adopt towards the United States a policy of high tariff, it was with a view to have a commercial convention such as was negotiated last year with the American Republic? The conditions which impelled us to negotiate were as old as Confederation itself; but those conditions received a new impetus from the rapid development of the western provinces; where a new community, buoyant with the enthusiasm of every new community, was seeking to expand its energies beyond the limits of our country. We are above all things an agricultural people. It is now established that at least 66 per cent of the population of Canada gets its living by agriculture, and the area devoted to agriculture is increasing every year. The consequence is that the country produces more than it can consume, and it is necessary to find markets abroad. This was the goal of the policy pursued by the late government from the day it first took office. We had that in mind when we adopted the British preference. We calculated that England, importing products from several countries, would naturally give the preference in buying from the country which accepted her manufactured goods in payment for what she bought rather than the country from which we would have to meet her exchange with gold, and the result of our policy, in increasing our trade with England, has shown that. Then we made the treaty with Japan and the treaty with France, and if you remember the dispositions of those treaties, you will know that our object was to obtain markets in those countries for our agricultural products. It was the same thought which impelled us to negotiate with the United States. In this we were impelled chiefly by the attitude of the new settlers in the western provinces; but the demand for the American market, which came chiefly from those provinces, did not meet with any favour from the party now in office. They did not object to the reciprocity agreement on any economic ground, but for such political reasons as have been exposed to us again to-day by my hon. friend from Calgary. The nearest approach to anything like economic ground which I saw placed before the Canadian people in the last election was in a speech by Mr. Sifton which caught my eye during the campaign. Mr. Sifton spoke as follows:

> We regard the United States as a great nation confronted by serious problems of unemployment, of exhausted resources, and monopolistic control of commerce. We wish our great neighbours well in the solution of these difficult questions, but do not desire to mingle their problems with ours. We object to this treaty because it binds the provinces of Canada in firm bonds of social and commercial union with the United States.

In this utterance of Mr. Sifton there is a true statement and a very false conclusion, which I was surprised to find in the mouth of one of so lucid and clear mind as Mr. Sifton is. He states strongly, but with no exaggeration a condition of things which all the friends of the Republic know to exist in the United States, and which all the best minds in the Republic are striving to get rid of. But what is the chief cause of these problems in the United States problems of unemployment, of exhausted resources, and monopolistic control of commerce? There are many causes; but can it be denied that the chief cause is a high and fast tariff, which, by unduly inducing industrial development, has caused the farm to be deserted and population to be concentrated in towns and cities, beyond the demand for employment, which by generating a desire to get rich quickly, has induced speculators to grab the natural resources of the country and exhaust them by premature exploitation, which, by preventing competition from abroad, has left the Republic defenseless to be preyed upon and controlled by monopolies.

Sir, if you refer to public opinion in the United States you will get confirmation of this. You will learn that all the best minds to-day in the republic from the professors in the universities to the man in the street, all are agreed that it is a problem which is meeting them and the difficulty is how to get rid of it. We know by experience that wherever such problems are caused by high tariffs, whatever there may be of desire to deal with them there is always a difficulty of creating new communications by touching the tariff. Now, Sir, if we compare our own condition to the condition of the United States do we see very much difference? True it is our resources have not been very much impaired, but are we free from the problems of monopolistic control of trade and commerce? He would be a bold man who would dare to say so. Is it not a fact that at the present time combines, trusts and mergers are flourishing on the soil of the Dominion almost as luxuriantly as on the soil of the republic. Mr. Sifton when he said that if we adopted this policy of a free interchange of commodities we would have involved ourselves in the problems of the United States made in my judgment, a singular mistake, a singular miscalculation. It seems to me quite clear that by opening the avenues of trade we would make it possible to deal with mergers, combines and trusts in the United States as well as in Canada. And indeed the rejection of the policy which we proposed is already bearing fruit. I believe it is a fact that at the present time the meat packers are making arrangements

whereby, freed from competition, they can calculate how much can be abated from the price to be paid to the producer, and how much can be added to the price which the consumer should pay. And this, Sir, although only two short months have elapsed since the 21st of September. Within this short space of time the Canadian people are already commencing to suffer for having listened on that day to the voice of passion and not to the voice of reason. Notwithstanding what has been said by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett), I maintain to this day, and I believe it will become more and more apparent as time goes on, that upon the 21st of September it was not the voice of reason that prevailed, but the voice of passion and prejudice.

My hon. friend stated that had this agreement for the interchange of natural commodities between the two countries been adopted, British connection itself would have been in danger. Sir, this assertion was borrowed from and I believe largely inspired by that class of imperialists who hope to build up the British Empire and solidify it, not by removing the shackles of trade, but by intervening and creating in all the constituent parts of the British Empire, between one nation and the other within the empire, new shackles. The defeat of reciprocity has been hailed with glee in Great Britain by this class of imperialists and their shouts of triumph have been reverberated week after week and at meeting after meeting Now they express their hope, their certainty, that before long British manufactured goods would by the action of the present Canadian ministry be admitted to compete freely in Canada with Canadian manufacturers. These men are about to be undeceived, they are undeceived this very day, and they will learn by the mouth of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) what is in store for them because he stated in so many words—I was careful to take down his words—that he hoped to see reciprocity within the empire for natural products, but never would he see the day when British manufactured products would be admitted to compete on a footing of equality with Canadian manufactured products. Sir, as I have already said the imperialists of Great Britain are already undeceived, and they will know to-morrow, if they do not know to-day, what false calculations they have been making. They will know that with the men who are now in office there is no more hope for British competition than there was for American competition. Moreover those who, as they thought, voted for British connection will learn by and by that if they are to reach the goal of their ambition they will have to come back to the Liberal party who first

introduced the British preference. And here I make bold to say that the last elections were carried under false pretenses. Sir, I know there are men on the other side of the House who imagined that in rejecting the agreement which we made with the United States they did a great service to England and to the empire. I respect their views, I will not quarrel with them, but let me say that in my humble judgment far from rendering a great service to England they have done an injury to England and to the British Empire. To-day, Sir, the world is in a state of transition, the old civilization is passing away, and a new civilization s coming. The period of conquests, of domination, and of land aggrandisement by force is passing away, but it has not so far passed away that at the present time we see Germany, France, Italy and Spain endeavouring to snatch slices of territory in North Africa. Yet we are so far advanced in the new civilization that after all there is no fear of a general conflict resulting from this painful state of things. But were we living in an earlier day and not in 1911 it is probable that there would have been in Europe a general conflagration on account of what is now taking place in North Africa. In this new condition of the future, a condition not of war but of peace, the friendship of the United States would have been the best asset that England could possess. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) has been at pains to explain that in the attitude of the present Canadian government there was no hostility to the United States and so did the Prime Minister. Sir, I do not believe that any Canadian in his views was influenced by any hostility to the American people; but, Sir, I may perhaps say that I regret the tone of certain newspapers, the tone of certain public men, which was such as to create enmity between the two peoples. Let me say this: Whilst the United States can find no complaint in the attitude taken by the Canadian people—in my judgment the Canadian people were wrong, but whether right or wrong I place my country above everything. While the United States could find no fault with us for the attitude we took—wrong in my judgment as it was—I still say that we have lost a great opportunity of improving and increasing the friendship between the United States and England.

I said a moment ago that my hon. friend had been at pains to explain his attitude on this subject to the American people. Let me quote for his information a statement from a very moderate paper, the New York Times. I quote from the issue of that paper of 23rd Sept.:—

Speaking about the various degrees of deadness, President Taft's plan of arbitration with

England seems deader to-day than the Wool Bill he recently vetoed. Canada did it.

This pithy sentence shows to us all that there may be in the rejection of this agreement far worse consequences than had been dreamed of by my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he endorses that statement ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows that I stated in the manifesto which I issued to the Canadian people that reciprocity would help the passage of the arbitration treaty. My opinion is here confirmed. And I stated a moment ago that the Canadian people, while, in my judgment, they took a wrong course, yet had done nothing at which the American people should take umbrage. But human nature is human nature, and while the relations of the two countries are satisfactory, my contention is that they would have been made more satisfactory and that a better sentiment would have been created had this agreement been passed.

I know very well that there are people, not only in this House, but in the country, who feared that reciprocity would provide but the incipience of annexation. I know also that there are in the United States people who hope that some day annexation will take place. I have simply to say to the people in Canada who fear annexation and to the people in the United States who hope for it that they alike fail to take into account the manhood of a proud people who would equally disdain to be cajoled or to be coerced into a course inconsistent with their dignity. And, whatever attitude hon. members on the other side of the House may assume, we on this side have sufficient confidence in our own honour to do the best we can for our country and not fear the consequences. Our patriotism is of such robustness that it is equally impervious to the allurements of favour or to the debasing suggestions of fear.

It is true that in the recent elections we lost ground. We lost ground in every part of Canada except in the prairie provinces. There the feeling was so strong that it could not be influenced by appeals to passion and prejudice, and we have come back from that section of country as strong as when the House was dissolved. In this there is a strange situation which cannot be overlooked by the men in office, the men upon whom rests the responsibility of governing this country. The men in the prairie provinces are growers of wheat and herders of cattle. The producers in this territory between the Great Lakes and the mountains have, on the other side of the international boundary, and almost at their very doors, a market which is to-day something like 10 cents a bushel higher than their own.

Mr. STAPLES. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman a question ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down.

Mr. STAPLES. What was the difference in price 4 days or 4 weeks prior to the 21st September ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Staples) knows, probably better than I do, that, taking it day in and day out during the 12 months of the year, the difference is from eight cents to twelve cents in favour of the American market. The Canadian cattle grower has now no other market than the British market. This market is open to him, but it is hampered by an embargo against which we have protested again and again, but protested in vain. These men were looking for the American market. They are denied it by the action of the present government. What is going to be done for them ? It would not be human nature for these men to rest idle and be satisfied. They are labouring—and it is but natural that it should be so—under a sense of wrong and injury. If you peruse the newspapers of the west you cannot but be impressed with the existence of this sense of wrong and injury. But there is more than that ; you find indications in those papers of an impression growing in the minds of the people there that in the attitude taken by this government, western interests were sacrificed to eastern interests. There is in this a danger far greater, far more to be apprehended than the vain, illusory idea of annexation. There is nothing more detrimental to our national life than that there should be cultivated between the east and the west the feeling to which I have invited the attention of my hon. friend. I do not ask to-day for an answer; it would not be reasonable to ask the government at this time to be prepared to offer a new policy. But at no distant day the government should be prepared to deal with that situation and give the western people some compensation for the benefit which they expected from the trade agreement, of which benefit they are deprived.

But there is another question which is in the air, a question which was spoken of even to-day by the seconder of this address : there is the naval question. And upon the naval question we have not heard a word in the speech from the Throne. On the 31st of March, 1909, this House by resolution unanimously passed and affirmed the following proposition :—

> The House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.
>
> The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the

speedy organization of a Canadian naval service.

In conformity with the terms of this resolution we introduced, the following session, after consulting with the Admiralty, a measure, which measure was not satisfactory to the opposition of the day. This was not because our policy was wrong but because it did not go far enough. And I cannot do better than quote the resolution moved upon the Bill by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) then leader of the opposition. He moved the following amendment :—

The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty and, in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war, are ill-advised and dangerous.

That no such proposals can safely be accepted unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

That the said proposals while necessitating heavy outlay for construction and maintenance will give no immediate or effective aid to the empire and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

In this amendment was laid down the policy of the present administration. They found fault with our proposal because there was in the Bill introduced by the government of that day too much autonomy and too little imperialism. Upon the present occasion one would have expected, seeing that the government are now meeting parliament for the first time and exposing their policy, to hear an announcement of the course they intended to follow upon such an important question as that. Yet the administration is silent, not a word have we heard about it. What is the reason? Before we proceed further, perhaps it would not be out of place, on the contrary it would be conducive to a better understanding of the present situation, if we asked ourselves what is the character of the administration we see before us. If I am to judge of the character of the present administration by that resolution I have just quoted, and by the speeches which were made during the election, by solemn declarations by party leaders, I would judge that the present administration is a True Blue Tory administration, tinctured and saturated with sound imperialism, as they understand imperialism. I could quote sentence after sentence, speech after speech to this effect, delivered during the contest by my hon. friends opposite. It will be sufficient for the present to recall the words my hon. friend the Prime Minister spoke at Toronto, when he said that the voice of Toronto should be the voice of Canada. Well, we know what the voice of Toronto is with regard to the navy. The voice of Toronto has always been that the navy Bill we introduced was not sufficiently imperialistic, and was too autonomous. That is the only criticism that was ever made. But, Sir, on the present occasion I have to say that the voice of Toronto has been endorsed; and no one will dispute that the victory gained by my hon. friends on the treasury benches on the 21st of September last was a triumph of imperialism. All over the country the triumph of the conservative party was greeted with pæans of triumph, with shouts of victory for the cause of imperialism. Indeed, on the very next day, the 22nd of September, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, himself the apostle of imperialism, cabled his congratulations and his blessings to my hon. friend, stating that he saw in the victory the dawn of the day he had long been looking for, and that he hoped soon to see the realization of his imperialistic dreams.

So, under the circumstances, therefore, there is perhaps no occasion to ask what is the character of this administration. Is there any doubt? If I were to listen to my own reasoning, my own judgment, if I were to attach importance to the deliverances of my hon. friends opposite, I would conclude that this is a true imperialistic administration. That is what my reason would tell me, but my eyes tell me a different story. When I look about me I cannot see what is in the hearts of hon. gentlemen; that they have refused to tell us; but I see before me a very composite galaxy. I see men sitting on the treasury benches opposite, one, two, three, perhaps four, upon whom the blessing of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain would produce the same contortions as the sprinkling of holy water upon the head of Satan. They cannot have come together without something extraordinary having taken place. This government, like another Joseph, wears a coat of many colours. The other Joseph was betrayed by his friends and sold into bondage. I have no hesitation in saying, with a full sense of the responsibility attaching to my words, that the hon. gentlemen now on the treasury

benches cannot have come together without some of their brethren having been betrayed, without some of the electors, either in Ontario or Quebec, having been sold, and badly sold.

But who is it that has gone back upon his record? Who has abandoned his principles? Is it my hon. friend the Prime Minister? Well, my hon. friend will permit me to tell him, and I do not think he will differ from me, that he has been many things in succession, and nothing long at a time. I believe, however, that he is still a true Tory and imperialist. Is it my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr Foster)? I believe that the fear of the electors of Toronto will keep him to his guns, if nothing else will do it. Is it my hon. friend the new Minister of Finance (Mr. White)? I once knew him in better company, but he has fallen from grace, and it is much to be feared that he has fallen down, down, down, to the lowest depths of the bottomless pit. Is it my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk)? Once upon a time my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, then the private member for Jacques Cartier, was the pride and hope of the Conservative party. He was promoted high in the ranks until he became the first lieutenant of the leader of his party. He sat by his side, cheek by jowl, every day. But unfortunately that accord did not last long For some reason better known to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, for some reason which he never explained, he left this seat and took a back seat, though still remaining in the ranks of the party. But last year my hon. friend seceded altogether from the ranks of his party, broke openly with his party, and refused any longer to take part in its deliberations. He shook the dust off his feet at the door of the caucus room, would not enter the caucus room. He joined the ranks of the Nationalists, who held Laurier in abomination and Borden in execration.

Those of us who were here last session saw him aloof from his former colleagues, isolated, sullen, tragic, the avenging angel of an outraged people whose sons were soon to be removed from the bosoms of their families and thrown upon the decks of men-of-war to be disembowelled on distant seas fighting for England. This was the language of his new associates, the Nationalists, who, upon the hustings, and in his presence upon more than one platform, denounced the Naval Service law, qualified it as a criminal law 'une loi criminelle' a wicked law, 'une loi maudite'. No wonder, therefore, that my hon. friend, holding such views, dissociated himself from the Conservative party whose only quarrel with the law was that it did not go far enough. My hon. friend was utterly opposed to the policy of the government, totally opposed to the policy of the opposition—until the 21st of September. For my hon friend opposite, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), to cross over from this side to that side was natural enough, but for my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to have jumped over from this side to that side of the table was an acrobatic performance which does honour to his limbs if to nothing else, and which showed that, after all, the weight of principle which my hon. friend carries will never interfere with his movements.

But now my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is in the administration of my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Borden). How did they come together? Sir, the government that we have before us was not the natural government to be expected when an opposition becomes the government of the day—it is a coalition government. Am I speaking too strongly when I say that? I repeat it is a coalition government, and I shall give the proof. Only last year, just two days less than a year ago, on November 22 last, my hon. friend, speaking of the numerous meetings of Mr. Bourassa, of Mr. Lavergne, or the seconder of the address (Mr. Sevigny) and many others which he attended himself and at which certain resolutions were passed condemnatory of the policy of the government, of that of the opposition also, made use of the following words ('Hansard,' page 127):

> Certainly the policy of Mr. Borden was condemned at these meetings. A resolution was passed at these meetings wherever they were held condemning the attitude of the government and condemning the attitude of the leader of the opposition. I stand by that resolution, I adhere to it.

I have the resolution; it is a long resolution from which I shall quote the concluding portion as follows:

> We blame the federal government and the parliamentary majority, who have imposed on Canada this new naval law, who have launched the country into the vortex of militarism previously denounced with such energy by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who have endangered the peace of Canada, and deflected towards the construction of murderous engines, and the preparation of bloody wars, the millions destined to the development of our agriculture and of our ways of transportation.

This is the part that related to me personally, let me now quote the part referring to my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Borden):

> We likewise censure the attitude of Mr. Borden and of the opposition behind him, for the adoption of a policy in no way less nefarious.

Now what has taken place to bring my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) into the ranks of the government?

Has anything been said by the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) to make him change his views? Has anything occurred except the verdict of the people on the 21st of September, that my hon. friend now approves of the Act which was so nefarious when the leader of the government was in opposition? How did they come together? What arrangement has been made between them? It is impossible for these two gentlemen to sit together if they still hold the opinions which they held until the 21st of September, and if they now hold different opinions it is their first duty to inform parliament of the new policy they intend to follow. What has taken place? Which is the master mind? Who has brought the other down? Who is it that has given way? Is it the imperial lion who has swallowed the National lamb, or is it the National lamb who has swallowed the imperial lion? Whatever took place between my two hon. friends has remained hermetically sealed in their bosoms. My hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) has spoken on two or three occasions in different subjects, but he has never mentioned the word 'navy'. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has also spoken since the elections. Before the elections he talked of hardly anything but the navy, but he has not opened his mouth on that subject since the elections. He spoke the other day to the people of Hull, and gave most salutary advice to the young people, telling them not to seek a living in the civil service, that they might do better elsewhere, mixing with the people. But, Sir, it is not fair to these young people for him not to tell them also to eschew the naval service where they might be exposed to be disembowelled on the decks of ships on distant seas, fighting for England. Opportunity has been given to these gentlemen to explain their policy, and certainly if they did not choose to do it before, here was the opportunity, when they placed in His Royal Highness's hands a statement of the measures which they were to bring forward for the happiness of the people of Canada. His Royal Highness told us that we should have a Tariff Commission—not a word about the navy. We were told that we should improve the highways—not a word about the navy. We were told that we should improve agriculture—not a word about the navy. But, Sir, there is one who is not quite so discreet, and who lifted a very little corner of the veil, that was my hon. and old friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). On the occasion of his election by acclamation, my hon. friend the Postmaster General made use of the following language:

When I was called to Mr. Borden's cabinet, I was not asked to withdraw a single line of the programme that I have submitted to my electors, and my efforts will tend to the complete carrying out of this programme. We shall have the referendum that we ask, and we shall stand by the decision of the majority of the Canadian people on that question. Moreover, we may be offered more than a referendum, and we shall be still more glad to accept it.

We would have been interested to know what is more than the referendum which may be offered to the Canadian people. Mr. Armand Lavergne was present on that occasion, and Mr. Lavergne stated that he was not bound by any secret and that he could assure them they would have a referendum. Mr. Armand Lavergne gave us a little more of the secrets of the party, for he told us he had had an interview with the Prime Minister when he was forming his government. He did not say whether he had come by invitation or unsolicited to offer his advice, but at all events he was consulted whether on his motion or on the motion of the Prime Minister does not much matter and he said to the Prime Minister: I am bringing you the regenerated province of Quebec; will you accept it? Well, Sir, when I look at the regenerators of the province of Quebec now sitting on the treasury benches I very much fear that many people will believe that the regenerated province of Quebec is in a worse position than when it was unregenerated. At all events, Mr. Lavergne pretended to speak of the secrets of the government. We are living under constitutional government, an elementary principle of which is that the men who form the administration must have a common policy. Are we to suppose that men who so differed as these gentlemen on the treasury benches did during the elections have now come together on a new policy? If that be so, then the leader of the government will not dispute that it is his bounden duty to acquaint parliament of the policy they have agreed upon and which they intend to pursue. On the other hand, are we to suppose that these men holding views so dissimiliar, have formed a cabinet, ignoring altogether such an important public question and still intending to sit there together; the Prime Minister and his friends from the other provinces, holding that the naval policy must be improved, and the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and his colleagues from Quebec, holding that it must be wiped out altogether. Constitutional government demands that we should have an explanation of the policy which has been adopted, and as we have not received any explanation we are bound to conclude that the men who now sit together in the administration have no policy upon this question. I believe there is a measure of truth in the statement of Mr. Armand Lavergne and of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) that there shall

be a referendum upon which the government, abdicating their responsibility and functions, will leave it to the Prime Minister to advocate an improvement of the naval policy from his point of view and larger expenditure for naval purposes, and will leave it to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier at the same time to advocate a different policy. This would mean that the Prime Minister would say to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and that the hon. member (Mr. Monk) could say to the Prime Minister I will wash my hands of this business and you can wash yours, and let the people vote as they please, and we will have no policy and no guidance to offer the people; this is a thing which we thought essential to the empire two years ago, but the requirements of office now tell us to cast it aside as an old garment. Sir, that is not responsible government in any way. I leave it to all those who are students of English Parliamentary History if such a spectacle as we have here to-day would for one instant commend itself on the floor of the British parliament. I leave it to the House to say whether we are to have a government without any policy at all, or whether we shall exact from them compliance with the constitutional rule. Standing there, as they are at this present moment, I think I am not criticising the course of the government in too strong language when I say that it is a scandalous and immoral violation of the fundamental rules of British parliamentary government. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Pugsley:

That the following words be added to the address:

We beg to represent to your Royal Highness that by resolution of this House, adopted the 31st of March, 1909, it was affirmed that:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilites of national defence.

And further:

This House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service.

That in pursuance of that resolution the late administration proceeded to adopt a well-defined policy of naval organization.

That with regard to that policy, as well as to the whole question of naval defence, there is in the present cabinet a flagrant conflict of opinion, and that some of its members have repeatedly, both before and during the last elections, denounced naval defence in any form whatsoever.

We respectfully submit to your Royal Highness that it is a fundamental principle of constitutional government that the advisers of the Crown shall be heartily in accord on all important questions of public policy, and that the inclusion, by the Prime Minister, in the present cabinet, of members holding diametrically opposite views on a question of the highest importance to the Dominion and to the empire, is contrary to the well understood principles of responsible government and should not receive the approval of the House.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I join with the mover and seconder of the address in extending to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) my hearty congratulations on his having attained his seventieth birthday, and to wish to him in the years to come during which he shall be spared—and I hope they will be many—every possible happiness.

I join with my right hon. friend in extending congratulations to the mover and to the seconder of the address. Their speeches have been characterized not only by eloquence, but by breadth of view and by an understanding and comprehension of the conditions of this country and of the problems confronting us for the future, which I am certain assure us that there presence in our deliberations will be a very great and welcome addition to the debating strength of this House.

I also desire, before dealing with other parts of the speech of my right hon. friend, to associate myself with what he has said so eloquently and so well respecting their Royal Highnesses the Governor-General and the Duchess of Connaught. My right hon. friend has expressed this so well, and it has also been expressed so well by the mover of the address, that little remains for me to say. But I would like to add just this, that it seems to me that the great distinguishing characteristic of the life of His Royal Highness the Governor-General and of the Duchess of Connaught is a high and earnest sense of duty and responsibility, and I am thoroughly confident that they have assumed their duties in this country with an earnestness and an enthusiasm which will assure to the people of Canada the deepest possible interest by them in everything that concerns the welfare of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come at once to some of the observations of my right hon. friend. So far as the opening portion of his speech is concerned, I have no fault to find with his observations. In fact, I am entirely inclined to agree with his frank statement in the first instance that he deemed it beyond his power to enter into any effective criticism of this government. I am sure that every hon. gentleman to-day listening to him was more firmly convinced of that after he concluded his speech than at the outset. He very properly remarked that it is not now time to comment on the measures which the government propose to introduce; but he found a great solace and comfort in the fact that an allusion, a very proper allusion, was

made in the speech from the Throne to the prosperity of this country, as well as an expression of belief that that prosperity would continue at all times in the future. My right hon. friend, possessed with an hallucination which has overcome him on many occasions in the past, considered this a compliment to himself. He takes the credit of this prosperity. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that after the 21st day of September last he would have awakened from that dream, and would have realized that the prosperity of Canada is not due to him or to any measure, whether administrative or legislative, that he has given to this country, but is due to the wonderful resources of this Dominion and to the splendid capacity of the people of Canada in developing those resources. It is only an illustration on his part of that singular self-appreciation which has characterized him on many occasions. We have in opposition over and over again recognized that this country was prosperous; we recognized it in the debate on this very question during the last session of parliament; we recognize it now; but we believe that that prosperity is due to the great resources of this country and to the industry and capacity of its people, and not to him or his government or to any measure that they ever passed.

The right hon. gentleman said that he would desire no better epitaph than that contained in this speech. May I be permitted to note in passing that the right hon. gentleman recognizes the verdict of the people on the 21st of September last as an epitaph. Let us deal for a moment with this question which the right hon. gentleman desires to thresh out again, after it has been pronounced on by the people—the question of the agreement which he proposed to parliament during the last session with respect to trade relations with the United States of America. So far as that agreement is concerned, my right hon. friend took a somewhat curious position in the concluding portion of his observations with regard to it. He did not feel inclined to say that it was not within the rights of the Canadian people to pronounce upon that question when it was submitted to them; but, by a certain curious insinuation which was to be found in his speech, he more than suggested that they could not properly have done so. I take issue with the right hon. gentleman in that regard. I say we had on the statute-book of this country for eighteen years, until the right hon. gentleman himself removed it, a standing offer of reciprocity to the United States of America. My right hon. friend removed that, and I say that no man in Canada, during the period in which that offer was on the statute-book of this country, ever denied the absolute and perfect right of the people of the United States to decline to entertain it; and it would be a curious condition of affairs in this country if, after parliament had been dissolved for the purpose of submitting that question to the electorate of Canada, that electorate ought to have been influenced by any consideration that they could not deal with that question in what they deemed to be the best interests of this Dominion as a portion of the British Empire.

My right hon. friend dissolved parliament in a great hurry, and dissolved parliament without taking the ordinary and constitutional step of asking parliament to vote the necessary supplies. I want to tell him, in connection with the motion he has proposed, that under all the constitutional authorities that can be cited, no graver violation of the duties of a government was ever witnessed in any country. If you examine the authorities, you will find that when a dissolution of parliament is in preparation or under consideration, the very first duty of a government is to make provision for the supplies in order that the public business may be carried on, and it is the duty of the opposition under such circumstances to grant those supplies for such reasonable period as may elapse before a new parliament can vote them. That plain duty of a government under constitutional usage was violated by the right hon. gentleman, the result of which brought the public service of this country for a time into very great difficulty and very great confusion.

Well, my right hon. friend went to the country with his boast. He told us in parliament—told us amidst the cheers of his supporters—and published in the press that he was going to the country and going to sweep it from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He made many boasts of the same character after parliament was dissolved. He told the people of this country to follow his white plume and he advised all his friends far and near to bet their money on the old cock. I would like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, in passing, that there are many men in Canada, if I am not mistaken, who followed that advice and who are sadder and wiser men to-day.

Now, let us come for a moment to the observations of the right hon. gentleman with regard to this question. He has told us that we opposed reciprocity on national and not on economic grounds. I take absolute issue with the right hon. gentleman. His statement in that regard indicates either one thing or the other—that his memory is not as good as it ought to be, or that he did not read very much of what was said by hon. gentlemen on this side in discussing this question in parliament, and on the hustings after the dissolution of parlia-

ment. I have under my hand here—if it is desired to raise economic considerations on a question which was thrashed out in very great detail—an address which I issued to the people of Canada during the course of that campaign, and in paragraph after paragraph of which—as the right hon. gentleman would know if he had ever done me the honour to read it, as I believe he could not have done—I dealt with the economic considerations connected with the adoption of this agreement. I said:

> It is a direct and serious menace to our internal lines of water communication and to our ocean shipping, as well as to our Canadian Atlantic ports that have been constructed and equipped at such enormous cost to the country.
>
> It opens to the United States our home market, which consumes 80 per cent of our animal and agricultural products. It also has the effect of opening that same market to twelve foreign countries and to all the British possessions for which we obtain no reciprocal or compensating advantage.
>
> It makes an absurd pretence of bringing relief to the farmer by exposing him to the competition of the world in everything that he sells and by continuing the existing burden of taxation on everything that he buys.

I can read to the right hon. gentleman many more extracts from this address which touch the economic feature of this question and the economic feature alone.

Now my right hon. friend says that the result of the elections of the 21st September was obtained by an appeal to prejudice. I take issue with him upon that and I say, Mr. Speaker, that he cast a distinct reflection upon the capacity and the judgment of the Canadian people when he ventured to say that their action on that occasion was the result of prejudice. I say that their verdict was the result of well reasoned consideration of the arguments placed before them on the one hand by himself and his colleagues, and on the other hand the arguments both from the economic and from the national standpoint which were placed before them by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

The right hon. gentleman declares that trusts are flourishing in Canada, and he draws an alarming picture in that regard. Might I venture to ask him what he and his administration have been doing during the past two or three years? Does he mean to suggest that these trusts have sprung up since the 21st of September last? I venture to remark that when the right hon. gentleman made that suggestion he cast no reflection on hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have not been responsible for legislation during the past fifteen years, but he cast very serious reflection upon his own administration, and his own policy in respect to the matters which are alluded to. But, Sir, how did he propose to remedy the state of affairs of which he complained? By submitting to the parliament of Canada a measure not to control and regulate Canadian trusts, but by opening up the Dominion of Canada, the markets and the resources of this country to the depredations of the enormous trusts of the United States. Well, if that be the method which commends itself to the right hon. gentleman I for one am not surprised that sometimes his reason and his eyes do not see alike.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was dealing with the observations of my right hon. friend with respect to what is known as the reciprocity pact which he submitted to parliament in the last session and which was passed upon by the country. I had been dealing with his assertion that the economic question had not entered into the discussion so far as we were concerned. I challenged that statement, and I still challenge it. The fact that it is absolutely unfounded can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of any hon. gentleman who desires to go over again the discussion which took place in the late campaign. But I will point out to the right hon. gentleman one thing—one thing which he has overlooked or forgotten—that on one side in that controversy there was not only one economic argument, there were two wholly inconsistent economic arguments; and that side was the one that he represented. For every one who recalls what took place will remember that, up to about two weeks before the 21st of September last, the argument of these gentlemen was that this proposal should be accepted by the country because it would bring higher prices to the farmer; but, about two weeks before polling day, they absolutely changed their position and placed before the people, not only in the east but in the towns of the west, the argument that the proposal ought to be accepted because it would give lower prices to the farmer and therefore lower prices to the consumer. So. if my right hon. friend is disposed still to contend that we did not stand upon any economic argument, I can pay him the compliment of saying that he and his friends stood during the campaign upon two absolutely inconsistent economic arguments.

My right hon. friend says that the people are suffering to-day from the results of the rejection of this pact. The conditions of Canada at the present time do not appeal to me in that way. But I was not very

sure whether he considers that the rejection of this agreement had resulted in higher prices or in lower prices. He did not make that very plain to me, and I do not know whether he desires to make it plain now. He asserted also that the rejection of this proposal had resulted in a divergence of sentiment between the east and the west, and that the people in the west felt themselves aggrieved and oppressed because this compact had not commended itself to the people of Canada as a whole. I would like to say to the right hon. gentleman this, that if any such sentiment does exist in western Canada to-day—and I am not satisfied that it does exist—it is due to the teaching of his own friends and supporters.

So far as his argument with respect to the relations between Canada and the United States is concerned, I say that I for one in this country have always endeavoured to adopt a course which would maintain and improve, if they could be improved, the friendly relations which now happily exist between the British Empire and the great republic to the south. I hope that those friendly relations always will be maintained; and I hope that the approaching celebration of the completion of a hundred years of peace between the two countries will be carried out in Canada as well as in the United States in a manner worthy of so great an occasion. But I venture to think, Mr. Speaker, that Canada will lose neither the friendship nor the respect of the United States by a policy which will firmly maintain the control of Canadian affairs by our own parliament and which will find its highest ideal and expression in the growth and development of this Dominion as an autonomous nation within the British Empire.

The right hon. gentleman went on to speak of the project of preferential trade within the empire. He thought that he found inconsistencies in the views of the members of the cabinet in this and in other respects. It seemed to me that the right hon. gentleman, so far as I could understand the purport of his remarks, expressed, within five minutes of each other, views that were absolutely inconsistent. For, in the first place he sneered at the British imperialists, speaking of their aspirations and ideals in a very slighting way; and then, a few sentences afterwards, he described himself as their only hope and said they would have to come to him in the end. I can only say that I think they will be in a very distressful and a pitiable condition when they come to that last resort. For the right hon. gentleman knows his own record in this matter. Every hon. member of this House knows that record. In 1896 the right hon. gentleman adopted the policy of Sir Charles Tupper in regard to inter-imperial preference. He said that if he were given power he could and would do every thing to bring about a system of mutual trade preferences within the empire that Sir Charles Tupper would do. And he went to the mother country in 1897 and told the people there that Canada did not desire a preference in the British markets. And for what reason? Because Canada did not wish to see the mother country cursed with that system of protection which he said had been the bane of this country for many years. And I need only point out, as bearing on the question of inconsistency—if that is to be dealt with—that the right hon. gentleman for the next fifteen years maintained in Canada the very system which he had so strongly denounced before the people of Great Britain. In this respect my right hon. friend seems to be almost an unconscious humourist. For, after all, when he is dealing with the question of reciprocity within the empire on the one hand, and the question of reciprocity with the great republic to the south on the other hand, does it not appeal to him that, even putting aside all national considerations and taking the question purely from the economic standpoint, it would be infinitely more to the advantage of the people of Canada to seek reciprocal trade relations within the empire, with those who are our customers, rather than with the producers of the great nation to the south who are our competitors in the markets of the world. I think that within the range of this empire, having regard to the great variety of its products, there is infinitely better scope for the bringing about of reciprocal trade arrangements than were to be found in the scheme which the right hon. gentleman presented to parliament.

The right hon. gentleman dealt with the constitution of the cabinet and expressed very grave disatisfaction with it. Indeed, in the closing part of his resolution he adopted a most extraordinary course—one which I have never known to be followed in the House before—of submitting to His Royal Highness the Governor General that the constitution of the cabinet ought not to receive the approval of this House. I have never heard that it was the duty of the King or the representative of the King to concern himself with what should or should not receive the approval of parliament in that regard. My right hon. friend has launched a constitutional idea that is new to this generation in asking His Royal Highness the Governor General to express any opinion as to what ministers should or should not be approved by parliament. I have always understood that under the modern system of constitutional government, liberty of opinion had been secured

to the representatives of the people in parliament in this respect. My right hon. friend in the course of his discussion showed himself to be what in days gone by he described as a scrap-book orator of the first water. But it is certainly refreshing to find that he has not only gone back fifteen or twenty years for the purpose of bringing matters to the attention of this House which are more or less irrelevant, but he has gone back about two hundred and fifty years for his ideas of constitutional government.

I would like to explain to my right hon. friend, in the first instance, lest there should be any misunderstanding on the subject, that this cabinet was not constituted with the idea of satisfying him. We knew that this would be an impossible task, and that no matter how this cabinet might have been constituted, my right hon. friend would have been found making much the same argument and much the same complaint that he has made today. He has commented upon my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). There is nothing that more quickly arouses my right hon. friend to a high tide of eloquence than the sight of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, than to see him sitting upon the treasury benches while my right hon. friend is sitting in opposition. He compares the blessing of Mr. Chamberlain upon my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to the pouring of holy water upon his Satanic majesty. I do not know whether my right honourable friend compares the blessing of Mr. Chamberlain to the holy water, or whether he desires to compare the Minister of Public Works to his Satanic majesty. If the latter was his intention, I can only say that my right hon. friend might have found a much more suitable illustration a little nearer home.

Then he clutched eagerly at the idea of dissension in this cabinet, and there is nothing that would fill his heart with greater joy than to believe that such dissension exists. But after all, it does seem to me that the speech of my right hon. friend and his illustrations have been prompted by something of a more personal nature. Every honourable gentleman in this House remembers, I am sure, that on one occasion, about twelve or thirteen years ago, one of his most distinguished colleagues declared that my right hon. friend and his colleagues were wont to fight like blazes. Well, I can assure him that there is no such unhappy condition in this cabinet. Then he thinks that the Minister of Public Works ought still to be sitting upon the opposition benches. Well, that may be a matter of opinion, Mr. Speaker, and my right hon. friend is entitled to hold his opinion. But if I may venture to speak for my hon. friend the Minster of Public Works, I would hazard the statement that he prefers the company on this side of the House to that on the other side, and therefore he is over here. Then my right hon. friend points out the weaknesses of various other gentlemen on this side of the House. I think he might well remember that weaknesses are not confined to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I have not heard that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works ever held up to the people of this country as the goal of his aspirations the complete severance of the ties which bind this Dominion to the rest of the empire. If, at the opening of this parliament, we are to indulge in reminiscences of that kind, it is only right perhaps that they should not be confined to one side of the House.

Now, my right hon. friend is very much concerned about the naval question, and he is deeply anxious to know what is to be the policy of the present administration with respect thereto. Now, let me point out to him one or two considerations. He imagines, if one may draw a reasonable conclusion from his utterances, that this government should have come down with a full fledged naval policy at the commencement of this session. That is, as I understand it, the gravamen of his complaint. In 1896, my right hon. friend came into power on the 11th day of July, and he met parliament on the 19th day of August in the same year. The present administration was formed on the 10th day of October 1911, and we met parliament on the 15th of November in the same year. We come before parliament sooner than did the right hon. gentleman on the former occasion. He came before parliament on that occasion without proposing a single measure, although he had before him the Ottawa platform of 1893, with no less than thirteen or fourteen articles suggesting reforms which, as he and his friends declared, were absolutely essential to the welfare of this country. Now, we have not followed his example in that respect. We have met parliament at an earlier date than he did, and we have presented a very substantial bill of fare indeed, one that will occupy the attention of this parliament for some time, even under the best conditions. Therefore I submit that the course which has been taken by this government, and the progress we have made in carrying out the policy which we placed before the people, can well be contrasted with the attitude and the position of my right hon. friend and his government when they met parliament in 1896.

Now he desires to know what we propose to do with regard to the naval policy. Well, I will tell him. In the first place, let me

read what we placed before the people of Canada when we were asking them to return us to power during the recent election campaign :

Since the last general election the government has entered upon a new line of policy in regard to naval affairs, which is of far-reaching importance. The policy adopted was not debated before the people during the election, and it bears all the earmarks of a hasty and ill-considered scheme. In my judgment our duty to the empire cannot be properly or effectively fulfilled by such a measure. I hold that the plan of the government contemplates the creation of a naval force that will be absolutely useless in time of war, and therefore of no practical benefit to Canada or to the empire. It will cost immense sums of money to build, equip and maintain. It will probably result in time of war in the useless sacrifice of many valuable lives, and it will not add one iota to the fighting strength of the empire. The more it is considered, the more does it become evident that the whole naval plan of the government is an unfortunate blunder.

I have no doubt that the ideas embodied in that paragraph of the address which I issued to the people of Canada have entered the inner consciousness of my right hon. friend; and if that be so, I do not understand the great curiosity which he exhibits with regard to this matter, because I think he is pretty effectively answered by the words I have quoted.

The proposals of the late government involved an expenditure of nearly $55,000,000 in the next ten years. It was argued in parliament, and there was never any satisfactory or reasonable answer to our contention, that, as a fighting force, it would be absolutely useless when completed. Further than that, it established the principle of disunited navies, and I think it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the right hon. gentleman himself, and will be demonstrated before the end of this session, that before such a navy would be completed it would be entirely obsolete. Does my hon. friend consider that under those circumstances an expenditure of that kind should be carried on? I say there is only one thing to be done, and that is to stop such a system of wasteful expenditure— and we propose to do it. Further, Mr. Speaker, the whole policy must be reconsidered, and we shall reconsider it. In so grave and important a determination affecting for all time to come the relations of this Dominion to the rest of the empire, it is infinitely better to be right than to be in a hurry. The question of permanent co-operation between this Dominion, and the rest of the empire ought to be threshed out and debated before the people, and they should be given an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. I say further that we shall take pains to ascertain in the meantime what are the conditions that confront the empire, and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, without exception, will be prepared to do their duty as representatives of the people of this Dominion, and as citizens of this great empire. I stand by the declaration which I made in this House on the 24th day of November last.

My right hon. friend has spoken of the resolutions that were passed, and has called attention to one which I myself moved declaring:

That no such proposals can safely be accepted unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

That the said proposals while necessitating heavy outlay for construction and maintenance will give no immediate or effective aid to the empire and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

That no permanent policy should be entered upon, involving large future expenditures of this character, until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

I have no fault to find with the right hon. gentleman for calling attention to the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) when this matter was under debate two sessions ago did not see eye to eye with me on the question of emergent conditions which at that time I thought confronted the empire. Those conditions appealed to me in that way at that time by reason of very grave declarations that had been made by the Prime Minister, the Foreign Secretary and the First Lord of the Admiralty of Great Britain. I am ready to admit, in fact we were afterwards taunted in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite with the fact, that these declarations were, to a very considerable extent, modified by subsequent statements made in the British House of Commons by the advisers of the Crown, by the Prime Minister himself, I think, and also by the First Lord of the Admiralty. It is true that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), and I did not see eye to eye, but the point that divided us at that time was not a question of policy, but a question of fact, because the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) had said over and over again that when any emergency confronted this empire he and those who think with him would be prepared to do their duty. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and I stood together on this common platform that it would be the height of unwisdom, and not in the interest of a united empire that any great scheme of permanent co-operation should be forced on the people of this country without affording them an opportunity to pronounce upon it.

My right hon. friend could not come to a conclusion without having a fling at the

utterances of gentlemen in the province of Quebec who have been opposed to his naval policy, and who, it is perfectly true, were as much opposed to some of my views in the matter as they were to the views of the right hon. gentleman. A very severe arraignment was made of these gentlemen at the commencement of the last session. My right hon. friend was foremost to denounce them, and an hon. gentleman who is now out of public life (a reference to whom I make now only because it is necessary for the purpose of my argument), who occupied the position of Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) denounced them also in unmeasured terms. They referred to their utterances, they quoted them, and the gravamen of the whole charge was summed up at the end in a certain cartoon which as it was alleged had been used in a journal in the province of Quebec that was the recognized organ of the Nationalists. The House was astounded two days afterwards to discover that this very cartoon had been copied by this wicked Nationalist paper from the organ of the right hon. gentleman himself, and if any hon. gentleman in this House desires to verify what I state he may refer to the columns of 'Le Canada,' of the 26th day of September, 1904, when a certain issue had been raised in some parts of this country in regard to the action of the government respecting Lord Dundonald. Under these circumstances I do not think it lies very well in the mouth of the right hon. gentleman to make this the subject of controversial debate. I would suggest to him the old proverb: 'Physician heal thyself,' before he undertakes to cast any aspersion upon any other hon. gentleman.

I think I have touched almost every point that the right hon. gentleman has taken up in the course of his speech. Let me only say in conclusion, that I am very glad indeed that he has screwed his courage up to the sticking point of proposing this motion. It is conceived much in the same spirit as the right hon. gentleman displayed on the first day of this session, and I shall only invite the House to treat it in the same summary manner as the country treated the proposals of the right hon. gentleman with respect to the reciprocal trade arrangement proposed in this parliament during the last session, to dismiss it from notice as inspired not by any desire to conserve or advance the public interest of this country, but as a motion put forward solely with a view to excite supposed dissensions which do not exist, and in that way to conduce to the advantage of the political fortunes of my right hon friend which unfortunately for him and his party have been reduced to a very low ebb indeed by the event which took place on the 21st day of September last.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Speaker, whatever opinion one may entertain of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who now has the honour of leading this House, one must surmise in the first place that his temper is not as genial as we might expect from a man who suddenly has been elevated to a very high place of power and prominence in this great country. It was noticeable on the day this House opened that something was wrong.

Some HON. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. After an experience of twelve sessions with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) in this House, I do not believe that I ever saw him so irritated, notwithstanding that he should have been genial, smiling and bland. It is all very well for him to-day to protest that there is no friction in his Cabinet and that all is peace and harmony, but his own discomposure inclines one to conclude that even at this early date everything is not so happy as he would have us think. There can be no doubt, as the Prime Minister has said, that the personnel of the Cabinet may not satisfy the leader of the opposition, but a more serious question is : does it satisfy all the supporters of the right hon. gentleman himself. I need only refer to prominent Conservative papers and to the speeches of Conservative public men to prove that all is not satisfaction, and that the Prime Minister has fallen very far short of satisfying even his own followers. It may be said it is none of my business, but I hold that every elector of this Dominion has a perfect right to express himself freely upon the personnel of the Cabinet or upon any individual member of it. I shall not be going beyond the limits of proper criticism, if I state a few reasons why I think there is not entire harmony around the Council Board. There is no doubt considerable disappointment on this side of the House, but there is a good deal on the other side too, and that which impresses the onlooker most profoundly is the glaring evidence that the Prime Minister has not been a free agent in the selection of his Ministers, and that he has been shackled in some way, the particulars of which may never come to light, but the evidence of which is very apparent. There is no doubt in the world that the personnel of the Cabinet surrounding the Prime Minister is not the result of his own choice. They have come to the council of the nation not by any process of natural selection ; they are the work of the political highwaymen who say: stand and deliver. And the Prime Minister instead of resisting as we might hope he would have, has held up his hands and delivered. Will any hon. gentleman on the opposite side ; will the Prime Minister himself say that the occupant of the high

position of the Minister of Finance was the result of natural selection on the part of the Prime Minister or on the part of the Conservative party. I read the speech of the Minister of Finance at his nomination a few days ago, and he told the people he had entered the Cabinet through the open door. I have no doubt he did, but how did he get the door opened? The door was locked, barred and fastened, but it was opened because certain influences with a battering-ram on their shoulders, came to the door and smashed the bars. Does anybody think he entered the Cabinet with the consent of the Minister of Trade and Commerce? Does anybody believe he entered with the consent of the Borden Club or the Albany Club or the First Ward, or Fourth Ward or Fifth Ward Conservatives of Toronto? Was he the free choice of the Prime Minister? I say no, and I know I am correct. He was the choice of whom? He was the choice of the trusts, of the mergers, of the corporations, and he sits in his place today with the record of never having given more than one Conservative vote in his life, and of having been until last spring a pronounced Liberal. He sits there, the representative of the trusts, the mergers and the corporations.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) will please withdraw that expression. I think it scarcely parliamentary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I hardly think my statement is unparliamentary.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is not bowing to the ruling.

Mr. FOSTER. Bow a little deeper.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) thinks I should withdraw the statement I will do so in deference to him because I feel more sorry for him than for any man in that Cabinet. For the past seven or eight years I have seen the Minister of Trade and Commerce the dominant Conservative figure in this House. I have seen him the real if not the titular leader of the Conservative party. On all great occasions he was the leader of debate, he formulated the Conservative policy, he dictated terms, and now I do not like to see him relegated to a more or less insignificant position in the councils of his party. And, when I speak now, I speak more in sorrow than in anger, because during the past summer I had the honour of knowing my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) more intimately than at any previous time and I found him a most genial and agreeable travelling companion. I found him above all things a thorough Imperialist. There is nothing anti-British in the make-up of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He is an Imperialist from beginning to end and it is with sorrow that I see him denied his rightful post, and another taken in his stead, contrary to the desire of the great majority of the Conservatives throughout the Dominion.

Perhaps there was a reason for it. I have no doubt there was a reason for it, and I believe the real reason is now the dominating influence in that cabinet of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk).

I am going to direct my remarks to the proposed amendment to the Address, and to what it suggests. I think that amendment is most opportune. I remember particularly that just a year ago, on the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, the hon. Minister of Public Works moved in this House an amendment upon the navy question. In the speech from the Throne on that occasion the navy was mentioned, with the progress that had been made in regard to it. But that did not satisfy the hon. Minister of Public Works, and he undertook to move an amendment. I think he said that his object in doing so was to allay the tormenting condition which existed in Canada over that naval proposal. His amendment was in the language following:

> The House regrets that the speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the government to consult the people on its naval policy and the general question of the contribution of Canada to imperial armaments.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister was evidently not satisfied with that amendment of his quondam colleague. He moved a second amendment and the only difference to a casual observer between the amendment of the Minister of Public Works, and the amendment of the Prime Minister, was that the Prime Minister, for I think purposes of his own, premised his amendment with a bold statement of the unalterable loyalty and devotion of the people of Canada to the British Crown and empire. I believe that the intention of the Prime Minister, when he moved that amendment, was to drive from him openly the support of the so called Nationalist party in this House. He did not want them particularly to vote for his amendment, and he knew of no better method of preventing them doing so than by prefacing it with a declaration of the unalterable loyalty and devotion of the people of Canada to the British Crown and empire. The result of the division proved my case in that respect. How did hon. members vote on that occasion? The amendment of the Prime Minister was put first. The Nationalists of the House now

in the House voted against it. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) voted for it. My hon. friend the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) voted for it. I mention that because, when the amendment of the present Minister of Public Works was put immediately afterwards, up stepped the Minister of Trade and Commerce from his seat and sneaked out of the door behind the Speaker's Chair, and out stepped the hon. member for Centre Toronto and hurried out the rear door. A moment after, when the amendment of the Minister of Public Works was put, two names are omitted from the voting list, either pro or con—one the present Minister of Trade and Commerce and the other the present member for Centre Toronto. There was one man, however, in this House on the Conservative side who had the courage of his convictions; I refer to the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes). He refused, and he was the only one who openly refused to vote for the Nationalist amendment; he voted against it. The balance of the Conservative party voted for it, except two who as, I have already said flew the coop. That was the condition when the speech from the Throne was read last year.

Now, another question has intervened in the meantime, a question which has engaged very largely the attention of the electors in all the provinces of Canada to the exclusion, I think, of most other questions. In the province of Ontario I do not think the navy question was discussed at all during the recent election; at all events, I did not hear it. The discussion was purely and simply on the trade proposals. The verdict on polling day was certainly a decisive one and was against the then government's proposal. But I believe in the province of Quebec there was not a fair, unprejudiced, unbiased discussion of the trade issues at all. The predominant discussion in that province was the discussion which the so-called Nationalist party thrust upon the people, and was nothing more or less than an absolute condemnation of the then Prime Minister of Canada, charging him with being too British, too imperial, and a condemnation of the navy policy of the government, in which promises of all kinds were made, that if the Liberal party were defeated we would have heard the last of naval defence throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Under conditions so marked in the province of Quebec, and with no other great issue before the people, the people having disposed at the election of the question of trade relations with the United States, was it not to be expected that in the speech from the Throne there would have been some pronouncment by the government as to its naval policy? The absence of any suggestion in that respect emphasized the situation. People all over the country thought, why does not the Prime Minister state what he and his government intend to do? But not a word, not a reference in the speech from the Throne to the great question of naval defence in the Dominion of Canada, and for the support of the British Empire.

Now, there is a history to this question, and I am going to be very brief as I discuss it. This question was brought before this House for the first time in a most admirable manner by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. It had not then become a political football; it was a question on which all parties agreed. They agreed to establish a Canadian navy first of all, with schools for the training of cadets and officers, and to build a fleet in our own country, under the supervision of course of the British Admiralty. That resolution stands to-day as the unanimous decision of the House of Commons in March, 1909, and it was approved time and again by the present leader of the government—in his speech at the Dominion day banquet in London in the same year, and in his speech at the banquet in Halifax after his return. We were all one on that question until when? The date of the bye-election of Drummond and Arthabaska.

All went well until that day and then my hon. friend the leader of the government and his colleagues seemed to have fallen from the high plane which they took in regard to naval defence in this country. Fell for what purpose, for what object? To grasp at any thing? Yes to grasp at the Nationalist vote in the province of Quebec. Not openly. No, they would not take part openly, their supporters in the province of Ontario would not permit it; but by fair means or by foul they meant to get control of that vote. I am sorry to say in looking over the result of the last elections in the province of Quebec, though the Nationalists may be but small in numbers they are well scattered throughout the country, and that element rallying to the support of Conservative candidates in riding after riding were strong enough in many of the ridings to change the complexion of that province to some extent. But we are thankful that the great bulk of that province still remains loyal and true. To what? To the naval defence of this country for the protection of Canada and the protection of the empire. My hon. friend the First Minister need not imagine that he can simply say in regard to the naval question: 'Give us time,' we have only had a month or two months. Give us time and we will decide upon what we are going to do.' He has to do more than that. This country is committed at the present moment to a naval policy. The navy has been

started. Some hon. members are inclined to laugh but we must make a start somewhere, and my statement was that the navy has been started. Training schools have been established, training ships have been procured, advertisements calling for the construction of cruisers and destroyers issued, and tenders from the leading naval constructors of Great Britain have been received. There is no turning back on this question, we must go forward with it; and the people of Canada, particularly in this House—expect this government—this ultra loyal government at election times to come forward with its policy, with its naval programme. The policy which has already been adopted they can change if they like but the principle must remain there; and I am absolutely certain in my own mind that my hon. friend the First Minister, while he may disregard my advice altogether—although I am certain I am giving him good advice—can cut the Gordian knot which confronts him very simply if he so desires. Why in a few words, by a short declaration now or in the near future he can take the House into his confidence, he can free himself from Nationalist support if he wants to and get on this side of the House backing for a proper naval scheme even though he should lose his whole Nationalist following. I want to know from my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster)—he is usually a candid man—I want to know from my hon. friend whether he is prepared to stand by the statement which he made in this House last year in connection with the navy? Will he stand by that? If he will I am satisfied. I want to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence whether he will stand by the statements he made in this House less than a year ago? If he will I am satisfied and the people of the country will be satisfied. And, Sir, if any one goes away from this House in the hope that this question is going to be settled by a plebiscite or by a referendum, I for one entertain the opinion that it will never be settled in such a way. I think my hon. friend the First Minister knows as well as any body that constitutional practice, parliamentary practice, demands of him that he as the head of the government shall take a position on this great question. If his position is challenged in his own party or throughout the country he will have an absolute right to go to His Royal Highness the Governor General and ask for a dissolution and submit that question to the country. He can do so in the usual way but he cannot crawl under the gate or out through the bars of the fence by any referendum or any plebiscite to the people on this question. We on this side of the House can make up our minds on that question, just as hon. members opposite made up their minds not to allow the reciprocity agreement to pass. And if we have to stay here and force that question to dissolution we will do it in order to make the government——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. In order that the government may take a stand, a constitutional stand, on what is at this moment the greatest question with which that government has to deal, although they have omitted all mention of it in the speech from the Throne, I do not believe there is any reason for delay in the matter. I believe that my hon. friend the First Minister has in his possession at this moment all the information he requires. I believe he has, I know he has, the results of the Imperial Conference which took place in 1902, the subsequent conference in 1907, the conference of 1909, and the scheme mapped out by the admiralty during the present year. He knows what the British Admiralty wants. Why this delay? Why not say, within a reasonable time at all events, what he is going to do? He is the man who is responsible and the man who must take a stand on the question; and he will avoid a great deal of trouble I think in his own party and a great deal of annoyance throughout the country if he will take that stand at the very earliest date possible and let the country know where he and his party are upon the question which is very prominently before the people. Why? Because he has permitted to enter his cabinet three hon. members of whom it is said that they are in their inclinations, in their bearing, in their political life Nationalist as apart from Liberal or Conservative; and one of these hon. gentlemen, the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) if he is reported correctly in the newspapers has said that not only was he invited to enter the cabinet but he was permitted to select all the ministers from the province of Quebec. In that selection he has included himself and two other hon. members of whose views and leanings in regard to Nationalism there can be but one opinion. All of them were not up to the election time followers of my hon. friend the Prime Minister at all.

An hon. MEMBER. They denounced him.

Mr. GUTHRIE. They are to-day led by Bourassa and Lavergne. Although my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works may smile at the remark, my statement is actually correct and we read in the papers that my old deskmate—my old deskmate in this House—Mr. Armand Lavergne has been hiring a special train to come to Ottawa at a late hour of the night to consult

the First Minister as to the personnel of the cabinet. Does not that add some truth to my statement that the actual leaders of the Nationalist party are not in this House? But I was surprised to see within the last few days in the papers that when the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes) had called his field officers, his staff officers and his commanders of battalions together, that there was present even on that occasion one captain, Armand Lavergne, the only junior officer evidently who was permitted to attend. There is no getting away from the fact; there it is. Now it might be, may be asked why should we object to the Nationalists taking part in an administration in this country? Well, we can be candid on that question. I object. I, as a loyal British subject, as a believer in the British Empire. I object because I do not think the Nationalist propaganda is a loyal propaganda; and I believe that the sooner we join hands, if it became necessary to join hands, Liberal and Conservative and stamp it out root and branch the better it would be for Canada and the better it would be for the British Empire.

I denounce the propaganda of the Nationalist leaders as sectional, as tending towards the segregration of the province of Quebec from her sister provinces in this confederation. I denounce it as a menace to confederation itself, as anti-imperial in every sense. And the Prime Minister and his colleagues know that what I say on this point is correct. Why not, then, terminate the alliance? It will only bring trouble, sooner or later—, and probably sooner than my hon. friend thinks. Everybody, I think, is disposed to give the Prime Minister a fair opportunity to show Canada what he and his ministers can do. They are returned by a very substantial majority. I believe they have within their ranks sufficient to resist any Nationalist appeal or any calamity which might be threatened as following such an appeal. I believe that we have on this side of the House what will make up for any support on any question raised by the Nationalists which may cost the present government the votes of some of those now sitting behind them. I for one would do so, and I think I could undertake to get a good many from the province of Ontario who would do likewise. The Prime Minister has only to consult his own friends of the Borden Club of Toronto, of the Albany Club of Toronto; he has only to recall what was said by his friend the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who came down to Ottawa when the cabinet difficulty was on. Read his description of what took place. 'Uneasy lies the head that wears the Crown,' says the poet. And I am afraid that during two or three weeks after the 21st of September, my hon. friend the leader of the government did not have many nights of quiet rest. His friend and staunch supporter the member for West Toronto came here, and, returning declared that he was disgusted with the action of his colleagues—two hundred of them down in Ottawa crying for portfolios, two hundred of them, and only sixteen positions to give. And a great many men of cabinet ability, men who have done good service and displayed great ability during past years in this House had to be excluded, but some of them might have been included had not the bludgeon been held over the head of the Prime Minister, had he been allowed to be a free agent, and had the process of natural selection been allowed to proceed. I believe he would have surrounded himself with a band of gentlemen who would have given more satisfaction and peace of mind to himself and greater advantage to the people of Canada.

The Prime Minister said—I do not know that I should refer to it, but I will do so in closing—that the last campaign, so far as he and his party were concerned, was an economic discussion not a national discussion.

Mr. BORDEN. I did not say that.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I so understood him.

Mr. BORDEN. I said that the discussion was carried on on both grounds, and not on one only.

Mr. GUTHRIE. And the hon. gentleman read something from what he called a 'manifesto.' I do not know to which manifesto he referred; he issued so many of them. At all events, that particular manifesto has not come to my notice. But I think that probably I attended as many meetings in the province of Ontario—and with good results—as any other member who sits in this House, and I can say that in those meetings I did not hear a discussion of the trade question by the representatives of the other side from the economic standpoint. I have heard very able lieutenants of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) refuse to discuss the question upon economic grounds at all, saying to the people that even if they did lose a few dollars it would be to their advantage to refuse this proposal, for it would lead eventually to annexation, it would mean that we should be swallowed up by the United States. And why should it lead to annexation? Can anybody tell me that? This reciprocity proposal is dead, but can anybody tell me now why it should have led to annexation? The answer is—it is the only answer that can be given—because President Taft, or Champ Clark, or Senator Beveridge, or some of the cheap yellow journals of the United States said it would

lead to annexation. And these bold gentlemen opposite, these loyal gentlemen, taking that as a threat, were ready to tell the people of Canada to lie down under it, that if President Taft said it was so it must be so —forgetting that what seven or eight millions of free Canadians had to say on that subject was the important thing, and not what President Taft had to say.

However, that issue is out of the way at present, and I think the motion of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the leader of the opposition to amend the Address is a most pertinent one on this occasion, particularly in view of the personnel of the present cabinet. We do not believe there is harmony; the country does not believe there is unanimity. If cabinet responsibility is still a good British doctrine let us have it in Canada as well as in Great Britain. Let the Prime Minister free himself from his troubles as I suggested. Why, Sir, as I have said, the Navy Bill is not a thing of the future, but a thing of the present. The objection raised to it by hon. gentlemen opposite was that it did not go far enough; it did not meet the views of the present Prime Minister because it did not give 'unity of command,' that is it did not give the command of our Canadian fleet to the British Admiralty. That clause of the Canadian Naval Service Act can be amended.

It was stated there was too much autonomy in it, and not enough imperialism. That all rests in one clause, which provides that the Canadian navy may go to the defence of the empire upon the order of the Governor in Council. If that does not suit the majority in this House, that clause of the Canadian Navy Bill may be amended also. But why not go on? If you want the Canadian navy to patrol foreign waters, state so in the Civil Service Act by a short amendment. If you want to know whether there is an emergency or not, and you should give a cash contribution, a cable will serve your purpose.

But I believe that there is something behind what we see in the newspapers, that the policy which the government will follow in regard to the Canadian navy service will be a policy of delay, delay, seeking to put the matter over until the Nationalist movement in the province of Quebec shall have quieted down; and I honestly thought to-night when my hon. friend the First Minister commenced his speech at twenty minutes to six, that he himself was actually playing against time until the adjournment so that he might consult with the Minister of Public Works. The case, however, is in the hands of hon. members opposite. I think we can rely on the gallant Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes) for his support on this question. He was out when I made my statement regarding him a few moments ago, and as it was, I think, complimentary, I see no reason why I should not re-state it in his presence. He is a man in whom we on this side of the House have a great deal of confidence as a gallant officer, as a man who is not afraid to pay tribute to his predecessor, as a man who was not afraid, when occasion required, to vote against what is known as the Monk amendment last year, and the only Conservative who did so, as a man who is not afraid to express his opinion and to stand by his opinion. Now, all I ask of the Minister of Militia and Defence is that he will stand by the opinion which he uttered in this House at page 293 of last year's 'Hansard' on the question of submitting to the people a question so important as that of the naval defence of Canada. We on this side rely on the good sense, the good judgment and the manliness of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, and we ask him to stand with us on that question and force the government to take a stand on the Canadian Naval Bill. If that stand is not satisfactory to the people of this country, then we shall have no hesitation in asking for a dissolution and seeking a new mandate from the people, but not by referendum, and not by a plebiscite.

Mr. GUTHRIE.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce). I have been intensely interested and not a little amused by my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) who has just taken his seat. He has developed in a good many ways. In one way it struck me, just towards the conclusion of his speech, that the party opposite had missed a great opportunity in not having chosen him some years ago as leader of the party and of the government. He has such a delightfully short and sharp way of bringing great issues to fulfilment. He would send a cable, and settle the whole matter of the naval difficulty. Now, there are short cuts which help and there are short cuts which hinder, and I am afraid that the short cut system which has been adumbrated by my hon. friend would not be the most successful in carrying out great policies in great countries. We have had an admirable melange of gossip. Gossip always takes. What circle will not come close together and put ear to ear and head to head to hear something gossipy, which probably has no foundation in fact, but it is none the less eagerly listened to. Now, a great part of what my hon. friend has stated is gossip pure and simple, a sort of an outside introspective view of the formation of cabinets, and how it is done. But the mild and gentle temperament of my hon. friend seemed to change into one of a sanguinary character. He built up an extraordinary picture of men carrying vast

timbers on their shoulders, marching up to a door which was locked, barred and bolted and with these heavy battering rams of old he described them as bursting open the door of the citadel, and camping on top of my hon. friend the leader of the present government. He did not say that blood was shed, but certainly that wounds were made. Now I thank my hon. friend for all the balm he has poured upon my wounds, but won't he give me once in a while the opportunity to tend them for myself, and I assure him that I will tend them all, and come out sound and sane at the end?

My hon. friend's sympathy is of later date than I would have been glad to have it. Perhaps, as we travelled together, and ate together, and were entertained together, although we did not sleep together, during the coronation, he has somewhat revised his views of me, and has come to look upon me as a human being, and seeing me so maltreated in the house of my friends, he offers me his sympathy. Thanks. But there have been disappointments of other kinds. I remember attending a meeting in the course of the campaign in one of the Greys, and at what I thought was quite a successful meeting in that county, I noticed a young chap handing out to all and sundry a large poster. I took one in my pocket and carried it to my room. I took it out and read it, and it made the announcement that three nights from that night I was to be cut into small pieces, metaphorically speaking, by the Hon. Hugh Guthrie, soon to be Minister of Justice in the Laurier cabinet. The title was there, the prospective office was there; and if I were to deal a little in gossip I wonder if I could not draw all your ears towards me as I told you, in racy tones and in flowing language, of the many months passed in a perturbed condition whilst the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was casting the horoscope, and wondering in what length of time he should take the seat vacated by the Hon. Mr. Aylesworth, and become Minister of Justice in the government that has been.

However, this is all persiflage. It tends to pass an hour more or less pleasantly, but it is not statesmanship on the part of men delegated by the people to come here and look after the interests of their country, not of interests that lie back in the past, that can never be recalled and much less amended, but the interests of a great and growing country that will, in the present year and in the future, require their best services as trustees. Let my hon. friend bend his acknowledged talents and his great powers to the future issues of this country, to questions that lie about us to be solved, and in which we are all to co-operate in solving. He may not make it quite so pleasant for us, but I think he will allow me to say that he will advance the interests of the country in a better way than he has been doing to-night. However, I know that all he has said was uttered in a good spirit, and I take it as such.

Now what is the ground, if there has been any ground in all this talk we have heard to-night from the other side? May I say one thing, that my courage has considerably gone up since my right hon. friend made his speech. I do not know how strong we may be on this side, 47, 49, 50 is a very good majority. We were fairly comfortable under that majority, but to think now that with a majority of 50 behind us, if we ever get into a tight place the gallant leader and the gallant crew behind him will come to our help. The Prime Minister can go on now with the development of his policies, with the assurance that in time of stress the government can appeal to our hon. friends on the opposite side for a small contingent of assistance.

Why should not Armand Lavergne belong to the King's militia in the Dominion of Canada? He denounced Mr. Armand Lavergne because he was not imperial enough to fight for Great Britain, and shortly afterwards he poked fun at him, and criticised him because he ventured to appear amongst the militia under the kindly care of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Sam. Hughes). I should think he might have hailed with delight the appearance, out of that hot bed of degenerate Nationalism which he described to-night of one bright and shining example, who comes up to the support of his country and wears the colours of the King's militia.

But are they all at peace with each other on the other side of the House? I listened to the speech of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—I always do listen to his speeches, mainly because it keeps me going, to find out what there is in them, and so I have to follow them with great care; but if I drew anything at all from the long and able speech of my right hon. friend I drew this from him as leader of the party, that the question of reciprocity with the United States of America was neither dead nor put aside. Why all the speech, why all the deploring of the action of the country on the 21st of September, why all the declaration that it was the result of passion and prejudice? Why the insinuation if not more that in the other sister countries of the empire, and the heart of the empire itself, we could not reap as great benefits in the way of interchange of trade as we could from trade with the United States of America as set out in the reciprocity agreement? Why his sympathy for the Northwest, because of the ill done to them on September 21st, unless beneath it all there

was the conviction in the right hon. gentleman's mind that the saving thing still for this country was to have reciprocity with the United States? And yet here comes my hon. friend from Guelph (Mr. Guthrie) and declares that the question is a dead question, and that the issue is out of the way. Are these two brave men who fought for their country, sitting down under one defeat, and allowing their country to go to ruin rather than repair the consequences of their failure to secure what they believed would be of greater value to Canada?

There was another bright and shining light which illuminated my countenance when I sat on the other side of the House and looked over to this side, that of my hon. friend, the late Minister of Labour. I believe that the late Minister of Labour lies as close to the heart of my right hon. friend and has done so for a period of years as ever did Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Armand Lavergne in the good old times. They took counsel together, and my friend Mr. Mackenzie King, no longer a member of this House but the leader of the Reform party in Ontario, has declared that the reciprocity question is not dead, and has made his propaganda upon that as a basis. Whom are we to believe? What is the purpose of all this? Are my hon. friend and his party going to save this country yet on the line of reciprocal trade arrangements and to save it by the only path which they declare lies open, or after all this talk are they going to let it die and do nothing? There is a question to be settled by my right hon. friend himself, with some of the members of his party.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is the greatest coiner of catch phrases whom I ever met in public life. They are often very happy, but many of them are only catch phrases. My right hon. friend in the opening of his speech said that this country fifteen years ago was very different from what it is at the present time, pluming himself on the great advance that had been made in fifteen years. Yes, Mr. Speaker, fifteen years ago this country was very different from what it is in 1911. Does my right hon. friend take credit to himself and his policy and his governmental methods for the difference between the Canada of fifteen years ago and the Canada of to-day? The Canada of 1896 was very different from the Canada of fifteen years before 1896, and I would again call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact that the growth and development that took place in the period of fifteen years from 1896 to 1911 was absolutely based upon and was the outcome of the patient preparatory work that had been done in the preceding period. Your critic who is not very observing or very much gifted with sound common sense, leans on the fence rail and watches the woodsman cutting down the trees. He watches him for a season and says: You have not got along very far, there is not much doing yet. Another year he leans over the fence rail. The man has cropped between the stumps after having burned the land off, but his crop is poor and skimp; the critic says: Not much doing here, the man is not much good. Four years afterwards he comes back and finds every stump out, but the land not yet cropped and he says: The man is no good, there is nothing doing around this farm. Then all at once, by pressure or persuasion or purchase, this man is succeeded by another man. Everything is ready for the plough, the man puts his plough into the soil ready for the planting, sows his seed and a few months afterwards reaps a bounteous harvest, and your critic then comes along and says, equally unreasoningly and equally unjustly: A great farmer this, see the crop he has got; the other man was no good, this man is good forever. There you have it exactly, the preparatory years in that great Northwest when all Canada, as the motive power and nourishing power of this great land was making experiments, was opening up its transport lines, was preparing its soil, was showing to the world the advantages of the country, that preparatory work of transport and exploration and development was the absolute essential to the fifteen years of harvest time that have been enjoyed from 1896 until to-day. Do not let us be carried away by these simple catch phrases.

In another respect the Canada of 1911 is a little different from the Canada of fifteen years before—it has been burdened by some mighty heavy unnecessary burdens, all the result of the system and the policy of my hon. friends opposite. The country has been denuded of some of its best property, which has been given to the individual by the policy and system of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In every branch of their administration evils became so glaring that the people thought it necessary at last to step in to prevent these evils. They were met by a government united in fastening down the lid and preventing all inquisition. Publicity was absolutely denied.

My right hon. friend has also declared that sentiment was the largest element in the defeat of reciprocity, and he feared that sentiment was the greatest impelling force in the endeavour to have reciprocal trade relations within the parts of the empire. Well, Sir, I believe it to be perfectly true that when sentiment is weak and selfishness is strong then is the opportunity for bad measures and bad government, and I am thankful that in every nation's history, the time comes ever and anon when sentiment thrusts out

selfishness, and bad men and bad measures have to disappear. From 1896 to the present day, the appeal of my right hon. friend to the country has largely been an appeal to the selfishness of the individual. Reciprocity with the United States was an appeal to the selfishness and cupidity of the elector. I am glad, Sir, that the people having listened to that appeal, felt, that underneath this proposed measure there lay the seeds of harm to this young country in its national ideas and national development. I am glad that the electors did forego the extra few cents a bushel on their grain, that they did forego the appeal to their selfishness, and that they looked to the better and stronger and higher interests of the country and gave their verdict in accordance with their judgment in that respect. And Sir, to my mind, nothing has ever sent through this country a more purifying flame than the canvass that resulted in the elections of the 21st of September, 1911. I hope that ever and anon in the history of this young nation there will come times when on large issues sentiment may be appealed to, a sentiment which is proper and honourable and just, and which may purge us from selfish and unworthy ideas.

Mr. DEVLIN. What about your own trips to Washington?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) shows that he has not lost one of those small interrogation points that always stuck out on him when he was supporting ing the government in this House. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) also said, and to this I call the attention of the House and country that the conditions in Canada with respect to reciprocity with the United States were the same now as they were at confederation. No more misleading statement was ever made in this House, but I believe now that my right hon. friend himself did believe it and of course it led to his complete undoing. You have all read the remarkable personal allusion made by Mr. Balfour in taking leave of his leadership of the Unionist party, where he describes a peculiar disease insidious and powerful which creeps upon a man although he does not know it, and though he seems to be in the plenitude of his powers yet has really become impervious to new ideas. That more than anything else, Mr. Balfour said, led him to the captious course of laying down the leadership before he braved the risk of entering such a period. Well, such a period seems to have taken hold of my right hon. friend and his two principal colleagues. They believed in their hearts—my right hon. friend has said so to-night—that the conditions in 1911 were exactly the same as the conditions before confederation. In that belief he proposed reciprocity, and though from every side came hints of the changes that these years had made, of the springing hopes of the new and aroused and growing national life of Canada and of the higher ideals of her people, none of these seemed to find access to the minds of my right hon. friend and his two colleagues; they wrapped themselves around with the conditions of 1867 and rushed to their fate and ruin. One of the right hon. gentleman's arguments was that reciprocity was necessary because Canada produces more than she needs for her own consumption and therefore requires markets. That is just the point. Canada needs markets but what she needs especially is home markets. That is the cardinal difference between the two parties on the issue which has just been decided. My right hon. friend looked at the published figures of foreign markets, and he forgot that home markets and the interchanges which make home markets are infinitely of more importance to us than our interchange with foreign countries. We believe that it is better to have an interchange of products raised in Ontario with an interchange of products raised in the prairies, both requiring in their production Canadian labour and both building up homes in Canada. Our whole policy was to make production greater in our own provinces and then to interchange these products the one province with the other and so build up a trade within the country. We said to the Liberal party: it is because we see that your policy threatens these provincial productions, threatens these provincial interchanges, threatens our means of interprovincial communication, which will be built up by these interchanges and thus sap the life of the country, that we prefer to stand by the policy which we have announced and which we believe is best for the country.

My right hon. friend, in referring to the monopolies, and the speculations, and the unemployment in the United States of America, asked, what caused them? He was ready with the cause, and his one and only cause was a hard and fast tariff. Then in the United States of America it is a hard and fast tariff which causes monopolies and unemployment; in Canada it is a half-and-half hard and fast tariff which causes monopolies and unemployment, if they exist here; in Great Britain it is no tariff at all which causes monopolies and unemployment, for there are both of them in Great Britain to-day. My right hon. friend is evidently not a philosopher, he catches at the straw of a hard and fast tariff in the United States as being the cause of monopolies and unemployment. Graded down, what about the tariff which he maintained in this country for 15 years—was that productive of non-

employment and monopolies? If there were mergers and monopolies in this country, why did not he and his administrative co-partners use their regulating and destructive power upon these mergers and monopolies? But it is not simply a hard and fast tariff that causes mergers and monopolies and unemployment. The United States tariff is altogether too high; and to compare that with the tariff of Canada is not a fair comparison—ours with 25 per cent on the average, theirs with 43 per cent on the average; or, taking sections, ours on wools and woollens with about 30 per cent, theirs with from 90 to 92 per cent. The exaggerations of tariff exaggerate the difficulties in the United States; but we in Canada stood a poor chance of having less monopoly and less effects of monopolies by opening our resources to the monopolists of the United States than we do by holding to our moderate tariff with our regulating and controlling powers upon it.

The voice of the 21st of September, my right hon. friend says, was the voice of passion and prejudice. Do not let my right hon. friend run away with that idea. There was no discussion of the economic question, said my right hon. friend. Very little or none of it, said my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. Are they sincere in that declaration? I can only say from my own experience that I travelled this country fairly extensively, and spoke very assiduously, as often as I could and as long as I could stand it, and I am here to state that I never made a speech in the campaign in which there was not from three-fourths to seven-eighths of it, my best attempt at economic argument. I cannot say that I made a first-class economic argument, though I tried my best to do it; but I made it, and made it because I thought it was one of the strongest points we had, and I believe that to this day. I did touch the National question and the question of our Imperial relations. I would have considered that I had not done the duty I owed to my hearers if I had not touched those two points, because they were inextricably tied up with the proposal with the United States of America.

But, said my right hon. friend, you have done a bad thing because you have spoiled the prospect of peace arbitration. Why does it limp to-day in the United States as between the United States and Great Britain and as between the United States and France? Not because of Canada's action, as my right hon. friend knows. It halts because a portion of the Senate of the United States refuses to give life and vitality and power to Mr. Taft's arbitration treaties. I have greater respect for the sensible people of the United States than to think that because an independent country to the north of them exercised its manly right to say what it thought about a trade proposal, therefore the United States is any the less inclined to friendly relations with the people of Canada. Not less friendly, but more friendly will be our relations unless such advocates as my right hon. friend impress upon the people of the United States that we did an unfriendly Act when in reality we were acting according to our lights for our best trade and national advantages.

Now, I want to see my right hon. friend live up to his professions. In the campaign that has just ended, and in many campaigns preceding, my right hon. friend has made this one claim for his long political life, that he has always acted as a peacemaker, that he saw in this country factions, races, creeds, sectional diversities, and that if he has done any thing in his thirty-five years of public service it has been to cement together all sections of the country and to do away with these acerbities and prejudices. It is a noble ambition for a statesman to work up to; it is a noble claim for a statesman, when his life of statesmanship is drawing toward its close. What I want to ask my right hon. friend to-night is not to mar that claim of his by persisting in doing what he has started out to do on two occasions already in this House—lighting the flames of dissension between different parts of this country, between the east and the west and between different sections of the country in the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario. What good statesmanlike end is served by the attempt of my right hon. friend to sow the feeling in the minds of the people of the west that their interests are utterly at odds with those of the people of the east? What good end is served by trying to pick out from the debris of that feeling little differences between Nationalists at one period of their life and another or by making it appear that there are differences between members of the cabinet? I have so much respect for the claim of my right hon. friend and the work of many years of his many years of statesmanship that I would like to see him drop that course and deal with greater questions.

Now the naval question has been referred to to-night and I do not intend to deal with it at any length. Let me tell my right hon. friend a thing which follows as a corollorary from a statement made by the Premier. In 1896 when my right hon. friend came into power there was one great question—great to him and all his followers for 18 years. What was it? It was the reform of the tariff. You remember it. Everybody remembers it. For 18 years he and other gentlemen with him had declared that protection was a curse and a bane, and

that their aim and life object politically was to take every vestige of it out of the tariff and out of the statute book of this country. They knew for 18 years just what an iniquity it was, and they knew for 18 years just what was necessary to get rid of it, viz., to revise the schedules. That is all there was to it. They preached that for 18 years, they were ready to take office on that issue at any time during that period. They came into office in 1896. They passed one whole session of parliament, they passed into a second session of parliament, and yet they didn't declare their policy on the tariff question until 1897. And yet to-day they want us in a moment of time, after a month or thereabouts, they want us to formulate a policy with reference to the naval defence of the empire. My right hon. friend knows that will not go down with the country because it is not a just request. Here are 16 or 17 men gathered as indiscreetly and indiscriminately as my hon. friend may choose to term it, and yet men who I believe have honest purpose in their hearts and an honest will to work. They come to the responsibilities of departments entirely new to them, to the administration of affairs of great complexity and of great difficulties, as some hon. gentlemen on that side of the House know, they envisage policies which are of the greatest importance and none more so than as to the relations and the manner of defence that shall exist between us and the other parts of the empire. And yet they request us after having been in office one month with all the disturbing influences which prevent thought and study almost entirely, to modulate and formulate our policies. We will modulate it and we will formulate it and we will present it to this country and we will defend it before this country, but we do not intend as my leader said, to hurry ourselves—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER—and run the risk of spoiling what might otherwise be strong and permanent. And, Sir, that position, laugh as my right hon. friend will, is a position which is perfectly fair and which the country will cordially endorse. That is my opinion. If my right hon. friend and his friends think otherwise let time which has solved many things and given wonderfully unexpected answers to a great many well-devised imaginings, let time solve this as it has solved so many other questions, and let this government, as other governments, be judged upon the record of its works and not upon idle gossip or vain imaginings.

Mr. CARVELL. I move the adjournment of the debate. I had no idea that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce would have concluded his remarks at this hour.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. BORDEN. It is rather early in the evening if this is to be a prolonged debate to consider adjournment. If my hon. friend is not prepared to go on—

Mr. CARVELL. I am not in a position to go on.

Mr. FOSTER. The ex-Minister of Public Works is always prepared to speak.

Mr. BORDEN. If my hon. friend is not prepared of course we must make allowance, but I should think he would perhaps be as well prepared as any of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded him. However under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I will not raise any further objection.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 10.03 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, November 21, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett (Calgary): For an Address to His Royal Highness, the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the Opening of the Session, and the proposed Amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, we had the pleasure last evening of listening to a very racy, if not very lucid, address by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). That address dealt practically altogether with the trade question and, therefore, I shall briefly deal with that subject. Coming back fresh from the country with a majority which he estimates at from 45 to 50, it is all very well for my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) to claim that the question of reciprocity has been threshed out and settled by the Canadian people once and for all, and to repeat the statement which he has so often made in this House that the prosperity enjoyed by this country during the last 15 years has not been due to any wise legislation or administration by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition (Sir. Wilfrid Laurier) and his col-

leagues, but has been due entirely to the policy or foundation laid by my hon. friends when they were in power prior to 1896. We have heard that from the Minister of Trade and Commerce during nearly every budget debate in which he has participated since 1896 when he had the honour of a seat in this House and I have no doubt that to some extent he believes in the truth of it. I shall not quarrel with him or any hon. member opposite as to the cause of the enormous development which has taken place in Canada in the last 18 years, but it is certain the development has been enormous, and if my hon. friends opposite during their term of office, whether it be lengthy or otherwise, can continue the ratio of progress which existed from 1896 down to the present time, they certainly will not have lived and governed in vain.

My hon. friend says that the whole discussion during the late elections was upon the economical side of the trade question submitted to the people by the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Not quite as broad as that.

Mr. CARVELL. I want to be correct, and I will say it was nearly all along those lines.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as I was concerned.

Mr. CARVELL. I have no doubt that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is too astute a politician to go through the country occupying the high position that he does, and talking nothing but the economical phase of the reciprocity proposition. But, Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce does not represent the whole Conservative party in all the back townships. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce may not have been present in some of the back townships and have listened to the impassioned appeals which his supporters and friends made on every question almost in the world except the question of reciprocity with the United States in natural products. I know I am voicing the experience of all the members on this side of the House who represent English-speaking constituencies when I say that practically the last thing that was used to influence votes in our constituencies was reciprocity or what the result of reciprocity would be. I state here that practically the only thing which was used for the purpose of affecting votes was the race and religion of the hon. gentleman who led the government of this country down to September 21. I realize that there are hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who will deny that; I realize that newspapers will take up the statement I make and deny it, but nevertheless I repeat it and declare that in the English-speaking portions of the maritime provinces and in the province of Ontario, practically the only thing which we had to fight was the money which reciprocity furnished—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL. —the money which reciprocity furnished and the contemptible cry of race, creed and religion which was waged against the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition. So far as New Brunswick is concerned, I have personal knowledge of this because I met it on the platform, I met it in public and I met it one hundred times in private to every once I met it in public, and I say that so far as the English-speaking portions of New Brunswick were concerned, practically the whole campaign was waged on this contemptible cry. We see from the newspaper reports, we hear from our friends in Ontario, we hear from almost every source—not only that we have the proud boast of 'The Orange Sentinel' three days after the election that it was their work which won the election for the Conservative party and placed them in power. I have here a clipping just placed in my hands by a friend containing a statement made by a Methodist clergyman at a meeting held in Leeds, during the campaign of the present Minister of Finance (Mr. White). On November 6, a Methodist clergyman, the Rev. Frank Cochrane, minister at Phillipsville stated:

> He recognized the truth of Dr. Dunn's charge against the Conservative campaigners in Leeds, 'I yield to no man in my Protestantism,' he declared, 'but I blush for the appeals made in this riding on grounds of religious prejudice against a great Canadian who has spent his life in public service, seeking to unite in true and patriotic Canadianism all creeds and classes.'

This is only one evidence of the cry and the campaign urged all over this country by my friends opposite. Now they say: we have won because the people do not want reciprocity with the United States. I am not in a position to speak for any other portion of the Dominion of Canada excepting the maritime provinces, but I am here to state that reciprocity and subjects closely allied to it are not dead so far as the maritime provinces are concerned. I do not care whether you say reciprocity with the United States in natural products or not, but my opinion, and I know I am voicing the sentiment of every gentleman here from the maritime provinces, on either side of the House, is that the admission of the natural products of the maritime provinces into the United States would have been the greatest boon which has been offered to our people in a lifetime or which can be offered to them within the next generation. The Minister

of Trade and Commerce says that what Canada needs is home markets, trade with ourselves; we do not want foreign markets.

Mr. FOSTER. I never said that.

Mr. CARVELL. Does he not go that far? Then I stand corrected, and I will say that we want foreign markets when we can get them, in the British West India Islands, in British Guiana, and in a few other countries where Nature supplies bananas and dates for the food of the people, but we do not want to sell our products to the great country of ninety million people which is growing faster than any other country in the world and which is able to pay a good price for them. We do not want trade with them, but we do want trade with a few coloured people in the West India Islands. Well, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is welcome to his opinions, and there is no member of this House in a better position to judge of the opinions and wishes of the Conservative party. But, Sir, he is not judging truly the aims and desires of the people of the maritime provinces. I regret to say that the people of the maritime provinces are not prospering in a commercial sense as much as they should. I do not know why it is. The census returns on this point must I think be unpleasant reading even to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. They are unpleasant reading to any man who wishes well of any portion of Canada or of Canada as a whole. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says we should sell to the home markets. We can sell from the maritime provinces to the home markets nothing that I know of which our people can produce except a few potatoes which we are able to sell to Montreal and Toronto. We cannot sell a thousand feet of our lumber outside of the maritime provinces unless we go to foreign markets. We cannot sell our horses, our sheep, our cheese, our butter, our fish, or anything else that we produce unless we go to some foreign market.

Mr. CURRIE. What has the hon. gentleman been doing with St. John harbour ?

Mr. CARVELL. I want to tell my hon. friend that we have been developing the St. John harbour in a manner which his friends never dreamed of doing, and I only hope, now that his friends are in power, that they will have the true patriotism to carry out the schemes that our friends started for the development of that harbour, and make it the great national seaport which it ought to be.

Mr. CURRIE. What for ?

Mr. CARVELL. I commend St. John harbour to my hon. friend. I hope he will go to his friends on the treasury benches and urge them to do justice to St. John harbour. I cannot tell why it is, but it is a cold fact that at least three-fourths of all the exports of the maritime provinces during the last few years have gone to the American market, even in the face of enormous duties. It may be possible for our hon. friends opposite to devise some scheme for finding other markets for these exports ; but no man can tell me that under these conditions the people of the maritime provinces do not want freer access to the American markets. I think I can go so far as to say that we have another intimation from the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he says that we must trade at home. That means, of course, higher protection. Perhaps I am drawing an improper inference from the statement he made, but if I am, my hon. friend can deny it. I think that is the only logical conclusion to be drawn from his statement—that it means greater protection. Let me tell you that from the standpoint of the maritime provinces we shall hear of this later on.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend intends to pin his argument on that, perhaps I should make a little denial. It is not necessary in my mind to place a larger protection on imports to make home markets grow, when you are contrasting that with a policy which proposed to throw down protection, as in the reciprocity agreement.

Mr. CARVEL. I am glad my hon. friend has given us this intimation that we will not have greater protection in Canada than we have had in the past.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither did I say that. I think I had better not make any explanation to my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL. I think my hon. friend is wise in not being drawn out too far on that line. We shall know better when we see the personnel of the Tariff Commission which my hon. friend proposes to create, whether we are to have higher protection or the same or less protection than we have at the present time.

Something has been said by other speakers as to the personnel of the present government. I have no quarrel with my hon. friend the Prime Minister in regard to the personnel of his government. That is his affair, and not ours. No doubt my hon. friend has had his own troubles, and is getting the punishments and rewards that must come to every government. If there are heart-burnings in his ranks, that affects him, not us. But I do have a quarrel with my hon. friend as to the position of his government in so far as it affects the well-being and the advantage of Canada. I am going to discuss for a short time the proposed amendment of the right

hon. leader of the Opposition. I submit that the inclusion in the government of the three gentlemen who represent the Nationalist party in Quebec will be a distinct disadvantage to the well-being of Canada as a whole. This leads me to a résumé of the naval affairs of this country during the last two or three years. I have taken a great deal of pleasure during the last two or three days in reading the speeches made by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and my hon. friend the Prime Minister on the 29th of March, 1909, when the famous resolution was introduced into this House and carried, in favour of Canada starting on some sort of naval policy. I commend particularly the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the careful perusal of every member in the House, no matter whether he be a Liberal, a Conservative, or a Nationalist, and I wish it were placed before every elector of Canada and that they might read it in their calmer moments. If they did so, I think they would come to the conclusion that no finer sentiments and no more logical conclusions have ever been uttered or reached than those of the hon. member on that memorable occasion. It is wonderful, however, to consider the results of what have followed from the statements he made and the pictures he painted at that time.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) discussed in the first place the proposition I am making of a monetary contribution in support of a navy and in his own inimitable, logical manner pointed out first the advantages, and I think he marshalled every fact which could come to the support of that proposal, or the proposal to send a money contribution to the mother country. Having done so, he then took the other side of the picture, and he pointed out in the most masterly manner possible the disadvantages which he thought would flow from it, and concluded that the proper thing for Canada to do in the first place was that we must have some method or means of naval defence, and in the next place concluded that it must be by constructing our own navy, by becoming our own contractors and defenders, and in that way contribute not only to our own self support, but also to the support of the empire when necessity should demand. At the risk of being a little tedious I want to recall to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and the members of this House the noble sentiments, and the logical sentiments, to my mind, put forth by him as contained in 'Hansard' at page 3496 on the 29th March, 1909. After discussing our isolated condition, after discussing the unpatriotic course of relying upon the Monroe doctrine for our defence after showing what we could do, he sums up in these words:

Whatever may be necessary has to be collected and assembled and developed with such expedition and in such abundance as circumstances will allow. Under that system our first vessels would be British built, British equipped, British manned, British officered from stoker to captain. There is no other way in which we could proceed——

And I may say here, Sir, that under the policy carried out by the Liberal government we went to England and purchased two vessels, brought them here with certain British officers and certain British sailors. We formed a nucleus of a navy by means of training ships by which we could eventually become master of the situation ourselves.

We are absolutely bare of the skill, the experience, the training and the machinery necessary to put one single war vessel on a proper footing; but—and it is but the beginning of a circle—the first Canadian owned vessel, built and equipped in Britain, and sent out to defend our coasts would become the nucleus and the training ground of Canadian stokers, Canadian sailors, and Canadian officers, and by and by perhaps, of a Canadian Admiral on the Canadian coast. How much time would be taken in completing that circle none of us can say, but if we begin the tracing of it and follow it fairly and faithfully, the time must come when we get a complete service and have an imperial adjunct to the British navy for the defence of Canada and the defence of the empire in which Canada gives some of her body, her bones, her blood, and her mental power, her national pride.

And then my hon. friend went on further, and pictured the development of first of all repair plants, next shipbuilding plants, and finaly of plants by which we could have commercial ships built as well as naval vessels. This is exactly the course which the late government followed. They did bring British vessels here, they started in to educate our own sons, to develop a Canadian navy, eventually to develop shipbuilding and repairing plants, and I submit that it is the only way of going to work, not only the only way, but it is the way which will eventually inspire all Canadians with the responsibility of their position, and make Canada an integral part of this empire. It will do that better than any other course that could be pursued. That was considered good politics by the members of that House, and the resolution moved by my hon. friend, as slightly amended, was unanimously passed by this House. My hon. friend the premier went to England and, as has been stated in this debate, he advocated and defended that principle at a public banquet in England. He came back to Halifax, and he advocated and defended the principle again, but in his absence certain of his jingo friends in Toronto had got in power, and finally he and his friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) were compelled to

go back on the manly policy which they had advocated, to go back on the logical policy which they advocated, and to do something else—anything at all as long as it was opposed to the principles and the policy of the then government. Then came the memorable resolution of my hon. friend the premier in which he advocated a contribution of $25,000,000, and this went on very well, and the Conservative party seemed to be pretty well agreed upon that, until the Drummond and Arthabaska election took place in the autumn of 1910. And since the Drummond and Arthabaska election was carried by the Nationalists we commence to see the fusion—I might almost say the agreement, and, as has been stated by the right hon. the leader of the opposition the unholy alliance—which was entered into, which evidently must have been entered into before then, between the then leader of the opposition and present premier, and the leader of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. Perhaps my hon. friends will deny now, as they did a year ago, that such an alliance existed,

We say on this side of the House that at that time that alliance did exist between the Nationalist party and the then leader of the opposition. My hon. friend the premier denounced this statement in almost angry terms and we had it denounced from every platform in the country as well as in parliament. We were compelled to take the word of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), we were compelled to treat it as though no coalition existed. But, Sir, from the day that the Drummond and Arthabaska election was carried by the Nationalists down to the present time, I ask the hon. members of this House, and I ask the people of this country, can they point to a solitary circumstance that has not shown in the plainest manner possible that that alliance did exist, that it existed down to the very day of the elections on the 21st September, and that it was consummated by admitting into the government the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), and the two gentlemen whom he says he chose as his colleagues acting under the authority of the Prime Minister. Now we have here three gentlemen who represent the party which is avowedly opposed—I do not know that I can put my hands on the actual words of the Minister of Public Works in which he will say that he is opposed, absolutely opposed, to contributing anything to the naval defence of the empire; but, Sir, take the statements which have been made by that hon. gentleman all through the province of Quebec during the last year and a half. Take his admission made here in this House about a year ago when he confessed that he had preached in every meeting in the province of Quebec which he and his friends had held during the preceding summer that the logical conclusion of a naval policy such as we had, meant conscription and, therefore, they opposed it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) admitted that it meant conscription. He said that it could not be anything else, and he and his friends preached that doctrine everywhere. And then take the impassioned appeal made to the people of the province of Quebec by his leader, and by the actual master of the present administration, Mr. Henri Bourassa, and his lieutenant Mr. Armand Lavergne, and the rest of the Nationalists in that province. Take the impassioned appeals which they made to the mothers of the province of Quebec, not to have their sons taken away to be disembowelled by German shells. Then take the impassioned appeals and the impassioned remarks—my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Blondin) denies that he is the author of them—but take the impassioned appeals of one Nationalist who said that it was necessary to shoot holes in the British flag in order to breathe the air of freedom. These were the arguments used by hon. gentlemen on the other side, these were the arguments used in the Drummond and Arthabaska election, these were the arguments used last summer, these were the arguments used on every platform in the province of Quebec during the late campaign, and it was on these arguments that hon. gentlemen on the other side were elected. And now my hon. friend the leader of the government, and his friends around him are sitting on the treasury benches by virtue of the assistance which they received from the men who obtained their election in the manner in which I have described. So, Sir, I say that we have the right to come here and protest against the inclusion of these men in the cabinet. Not that they are not gentlemen unfit to sit in any cabinet, I have nothing to say against them in their personal capacity, I am only criticising them on account of what they represent, and the views which have brought them into the government, views by which this country will be governed I am afraid as long as this government remains in power. My hon. friend the leader of the government says: 'We will frame our naval policy in good time, and as we have a mind to.'

And the question comes to us now: What is that policy to-day? The hon. gentleman and his friends said in 1909: We believe in the manly policy of self-defence by Canada, the creation of a Canadian navy, the training of our own men, and the placing of ourselves in a position to protect our own shores and our own commerce, and, in time

of war to give assistance to the mother country. But they abandoned that policy, they did not want to pursue the manly course, but they said: We ought to contribute $25,000,000 because there was an emergency. But last night the leader of the government was compelled to state before this House and country that at that time he was wrong, that no emergency existed, that he did not know what he was talking about but was only trying to get away from the position he had taken eight or nine months before, and, therefore, we must not blame the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) for differing with him, that the Minister of Public Works was nearer right than he. Such is the position to which the leader of the government of Canada is reduced. I suppose that, a year from now, he will say he was wrong in issuing his manifesto in September, 1911. In that manifesto he said:

> I hold that the plan of the government contemplates the creation of a naval force that will be absolutely useless in time of war, and therefore of no practical benefit to Canada or to the empire. It will cost immense sums of money to build, equip and maintain. It will probably result in time of war in the useless sacrifice of many valuable lives, and it will not add one iota to the fighting strength of the empire. The more it is considered, the more does it become evident that the whole naval plan of the government is an unfortunate blunder.

I hope that my hon. friend, within the next year will come forward and say he was wrong then. It may be asking too much, but it is just possible that he may come to his senses and recall all these statements, and do what I have already said to be the manly thing, that is, to start in to build our navy for ourselves. But can he do this with the present Minister of Public Works in his government? Can he do this so long as he is under the control of the Nationalist party of Quebec? I submit that it is impossible for him to do it. His own common sense must have shown him by this time that it was not reasonable to ask for a contribution towards the imperial navy, because he admits that there was no emergency. He tells us that he has nailed his colours to the mast, that he cannot take the Liberal policy and build a navy because it would be a useless waste of money, and might lead to the useless sacrifice of lives. What then is he going to do? If he listens to the Nationalists of Quebec he will do just what we have always told him he would do—nothing. That is what he is driven to. And that is why I object to the inclusion of these gentlemen in his government; that is why the Liberal party object, and why, I believe, the loyal people of Canada will object, to the inclusion of these men in the Prime Minister's government—because the end will be that nothing will be done.

I had the pleasure of discussing this matter with people of all shades of politics in the old country last summer. While I admit that I was not able to discuss it with every politician, yet I met many of them both Unionist and Liberal; and I must say I did not meet a single Unionist who did not tell me that the policy that Canada ought to adopt was the very policy that we had decided upon. It is true, many of them said we should have gone further. That is my own opinion. Had I had my own way in its entirety, our policy would have gone further, and would have included a Dreadnought or a complete fleet unit. But the difference is only a matter of degree. My idea was, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) said that we should start by obtaining training ships, and so place ourselves in a position to train our young men. This would enable us to develop our own officers. Then we could build our own vessels. We might as the Minister of Trade and Commerce said build only torpedo boats at first, but later we could build cruisers and finally Dreadnoughts. I repeat that I would like to have seen the full programme carried out. But the difference, as I have said, was only one of degree. We were on the right track, according to the consensus of opinion not only in this country, but in the motherland.

But what will be the position of Canada in the eyes of the world if we follow out the decision that the Minister of Public Works will force this government to make, which the Prime Minister's alliance with the Nationalists of Quebec will force him to follow, and do nothing? Canada has been recognized for years as the premier self-governing dominion of the British Empire. One has only to travel in Great Britain, meet the politicians there on either side of politics and other people as well, to know that everywhere in the old land Canada is looked up to as the greatest of the overseas dominions of the empire. But in what position will Canada be in the eyes of the world, when, at the behest of the Nationalist party of Quebec Canada says: We will not contribute money, we will not build vessels, we will not take any part, but will place ourselves in the degrading position, which the Minister of Trade and Commerce described in the magnificent speech to which I have referred, of relying upon the bounty of the hard worked and over burdened taxpayer of Great Britain to defend us in the troubles that may arise in the future. It is a gloomy picture, but who can say that it is not a true one in view of the state of affairs in Canada to-day? Therefore, I say, I am disappointed in the lines upon which the government has been formed. And in that I think I express the sen-

timent of the great majority of the people of Canada.

The hon. gentleman (Hon. R. L. Borden) intimates that we will have a plebiscite. But think of handing over a great matter of policy such as this to a plebiscite which may mean nothing, and which certainly will not bring out one-half, even if it brings out one-quarter of the vote of Canada. My hon. friend knows that the scheme is unworkable. He knows he will not satisfy the people of this country in this way. He knows that he will place Canada in a position of humiliation in which she never need be placed. It is a scheme which, I believe he will regard, on full consideration, as ill advised, and, therefore, not to be carried out.

For my part, I am a firm believer in the policy adopted by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the opposition, and by the Liberal party, the policy of building our own navy. I believe we have reached the time in our history when it is our duty to adopt whatever means may be necessary to protect ourselves and to render to the mother country in time of danger whatever assistance it may be possible for us to render. We know that it is possible to do something in the way of training soldiers on short notice, for we have had experience of that in the past. But we know also that such a course is impossible in the case of naval defence. We know that naval defence involves the employment of trained, technical officers and seamen. A horde of untrained men on board a man-of-war would be worse than useless. Therefore, if we are going to do anything, we must commence somewhere, and I do not think we can commence a day too soon.

There is another side to the question—the moral effect which the building of a navy by ourselves will have upon the rest of the world. This is worth more to us than all the millions of dollars we should contribute even if we were to adopt the policy of contributing $25,000,000 now and $25,000,000 two or three years hence. The sending out of a few thousand men to South Africa to take part in the war there brought about results that will outlast the life of any man in this building. By that course we placed Canada in a position which no money contribution could have secured for us. We not only increased our national spirit, but we compelled the admiration of the people of the empire generally. Even considering it on the low basis of money value alone, we have got back in the last ten years a hundredfold what it cost us.

By pursuing that course with respect to the navy, we will place ourselves in a much better position than we occupy at the present time. In my opinion, the amendment of the leader of the opposition is well advised, and I hope the leader of the government and his friends will take this matter to heart, and will accept the amendment, and that we may then go on our way in the development of the policy inaugurated by the late government, taking the manly course of making a start, building a navy, so that if the need ever arises, we may be in a position to do our share in the defence of Canada and the defence of the empire.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, it was to me a matter of great surprise to hear the right hon. gentleman the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) speaking on the motion made by the leader of the government for the appointment of a Speaker. Clouds and darkness were around about him sufficient to obscure what I had expected to see, namely, the sunny ways of conciliation. Instead of adopting the policy of conciliation, the right hon. gentleman, and those supporting him seem to have adopted a very different policy, a policy of sowing seeds of discord, a policy of perpetuating strife, a policy of preventing the cementing of the bonds of unity and friendship between all classes of our population, without which no nation can ever attain peace or permanence or prosperity. It was also a matter of surprise to me that the right hon. gentleman should have referred in the way he did to the prairie provinces, expressing sorrow for the way in which they had been treated by the electorate recently and sympathy with them in their present misery. No doubt he included the province of Manitoba in his reference to the prairie provinces. Now the province of Manitoba was brought into the confederation in the year 1870 by a Conservative government, the people of that province well understand the principles of the Conservative party, and the principles of the Liberal party; and, because they well understand the distinction between the two parties, they saw fit to send a very large majority of members to support the present government. When the right hon. gentleman offers his sympathy to the people of Manitoba, I trust he will not forget the way in which that province was unjustly treated by the late government, refused fair consideration in respect to her boundaries, denied her prayer to be placed on an equality with the other provinces which are the creation of the right hon. gentleman and his administration. So when he sympathizes with Manitoba and expresses his sorrow for their present condition, I scarcely think the people of that province will consider him sincere, or even thank him for his sympathy. The people of that province expressed their resentment for the way

they have been treated by their votes on the 21st of September last. Speaking of the prairie provinces, the right hon. gentleman said that they were growers of wheat, and herders of cattle. It is true that the people in many parts of the prairie provinces are growers of wheat and herders of cattle. But they also aspire, along with the people of eastern Canada, to have their own industries, and their own home markets for the sale of the products of their farms. In the province of Manitoba there are many farmers, farmers who have prospered without the suggested benefits of reciprocity. And let me say to the right hon. gentleman that those three prairie provinces are so prosperous that they are attracting not only thousands but tens of thousands of agriculturists from the United States, who desire to have a share in the prosperity of Canadians.

It has been said that the election was not carried by economic reasons against reciprocity. Now let me say that the people of Manitoba thoroughly understood the situation regarding reciprocity. The right hon. gentleman said that the people were looking to the American market, because there was probably a difference of 8 to 12 cents a bushel in the price of wheat in favour of the United States market. But the people of Manitoba kept in mind the message of the President of the United States, when transmitting to the Senate in response to resolutions the report of the Tariff Board relative to prices of the various commodities named in the proposed reciprocity treaty. That report was carefully prepared by experts, and showed the conditions of farm production in the United States and Canada, the market prices in the two countries, and as to wheat, shows that of the Minneapolis prices one-half were more and one-half were less than six cents above the Winnipeg prices. Let me say further that in the report that was issued by the Minneapolis Board of Trade the statement was made after investigation that the difference in the price of wheat between Minneapolis and Winnipeg was about 5 cents, and that the prices in Winnipeg and Chicago were practically the same. The President of the United States is a gentleman whom we all respect, and greatly admire, because he is interested as President in doing all he possibly can for his country. When members of the present administration were invited to go to Washington and talk the matter over with the President, he then had a far better understanding of the situation than they had. One reason stated by the President why the price in Minneapolis was a little higher than the price in Winnipeg, was the local conditions, because the Mineapolis mills had a capacity to grind about thirty-three per cent more grain than they could get from the country immediately surrounding them. The farmers of Manitoba knew perfectly well that just as soon as that deficiency was supplied in the Minneapolis market down would go the price of grain in the Minneapolis market, and it would remain the same in the city of Winnipeg and in Fort William.

They understood, further, another thing in respect to an expression that was used by the right hon. gentleman opposite.

> The men in the prairie provinces are growers of wheat and herders of cattle. . . Men were looking for the American market. . . The Canadian cattle grower has now no other market than the British market.

That the Canadian cattle grower in the eastern provinces has a splendid home market, which means increased prices for the farmer's commodities and an increased price for his land. There are farmers, at all events in Ontario, concerning whom I know something, who are exceedingly prosperous, and we hope and prefer to think that there will be home markets established in the western part of Canada which will make conditions in western Canada the same as in eastern Canada. The farmers in western Canada hope to have that home market in which they can sell their produce without having to send it to the United States. The President of the United States also made a statement which appeared in an address that was made by him in Chicago, Ill., in June last:

> The world price of these four cereals is fixed abroad, where the surplus from the producing countries is disposed of, and is little affected by the place from which the supply is derived.

He also states that:

> A very material benefit to all the farmers of the country, especially stock and cattle raisers and the dairy farmers, will be the by-products of bran and shorts from the flour mills likely to follow the free export of wheat from Canada to those mills.

He also states in the same speech that the United States exports to Canada fifteen times as much meat as Canada exports to the United States.

The farmers in western Canada, particularly in Manitoba, desire that the by-products of the wheat, the bran and shorts, should remain in Manitoba so that they can be used by the farmers, that the mills where they grind the wheat should be in western Canada so that the benefits to be derived therefrom may be enjoyed by the people of that country. They also desire that their cattle should be fed at home in order that the statement made by the President of the United States

might not continue to be correct that the United States sends fifteen times as much meat into Canada as Canada sends into the United States.

In respect to animals and the market for animals, in the report which I have just mentioned, a statement of the number of horses and other animals in the United States and in Canada is given. For instance,—and the farmers of western Canada knew that the United States killed the position because it was a statement that was made by experts for the President of the United States,—there were in the United States 21,000,000 horses and in Canada only 2,133,000, and that the price in Minnesota for these horses was $111 and in North Dakota $114. From the same report they learned that the price of horses in Saskatchewan was $156 and I believe it to be a fact that you can scarcely buy a fair horse in Manitoba for less than $170. The horse dealers and horse raisers of the United States knew perfectly well from that report that they would find in Canada a splendid market for their horses. Manitoba and the other provinces in western Canada send a large number of horses to British Columbia and get good prices for them. Providing the fence between the United States and Canada were taken down, let me ask you where would the people of British Columbia buy these horses—in Manitoba or in Saskatchewan? By no means; they would go to the United States and they could get them at a much less cost. It is the same with respect to dairy cows. The price of dairy cows that reports show in Minnesota and North Dakota was $33 per head, and in Manitoba and Saskatchewan were $40 and $41 per head. The prices of other cattle in Minnesota and North Dakota, immediately adjoining Manitoba and Saskatchewan, were $14 and $20 per head and in Manitoba and Saskatchewan $23 and $31 per head. The price of sheep per head in those immediately adjoining states was $4 and in Manitoba and Saskatchewan $7, and of swine in those states which I have mentioned $11.50 per head and in Manitoba and Saskatchewan $13 per head. The farmers of Manitoba, having that evidence and report before them, knew perfectly well that if reciprocity were to be put into operation, instead of the United States being a market for their general farm products, Canada would be the market for the farm products of the millions of people in the United States. So, having considered all these questions, they said: 'The market at home is good enough for us.' They heard and they knew the sentiment expressed in rather poetical expression found in the 'Globe,' a paper perhaps that hon. gentlemen opposite know something about, in 1905. I did not hear them repeat it on the stump this year:

Land of the sweeping eagle, land of commercial swing,
Ye know that we (Canada) toiled through the snow and the night because we believed in the spring,
And when we needed ye most ye spoke of a vast wilderness
Of stunted trees and frozen lakes and people in distress.

But the sun of our West has arisen
And now by its light we see
A country fit for great empire,
A land of one mind and free,
And do ye think that we who have
Toiled through the snow and the night
Have prepared that repast for thee?

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not a fact that in the hon. gentleman's own constituency, among the rural voters, there was a majority against him on the question of reciprocity?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. AIKINS. Well, the hon. gentleman has asked a question and I think he should have an answer to that question. In the city of Brandon I think the majority was about 700, and in the rural part of the constituency, including some of the villages and towns in which there were I believe polls for persons from the rural constituency, the balance of the majority of 866 was made up.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). May I ask the hon. gentleman another question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Brandon has the floor.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Is it not a fact that outside of Souris——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, the hon. member for Brandon has the floor, and without his permission it is contrary to the rules of debate to interrupt him.

Mr. AIKINS. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman asking me a question.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Is it not a fact that outside of Brandon, Souris and Virden——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Is it not a fact that in the farmers' vote in the constituency of Brandon there was a majority against my hon. friend?

Mr. AIKINS. Let me, in reply to my hon. friend, say that in the town of Souris and in the town of Virden there were I believe polls in which rural constituents voted the same as those from the town, and I

would like if my hon. friend would go to the trouble of analysing the vote, he can only do it and discover how the ballots were cast. I do not know.

There is one further reason why the people of Manitoba did not wish to have reciprocity carried, because they understood from the message of the President of the United States to Congress that one of the leading motives of the United States was that the timber and other natural resources of that country were being exhausted, and as he put it on one occasion:

> The report of the chief of the Bureau of Corporations shows that the control of lumber in the United States is in comparatively few hands, and that they are so friendly to each other that the possibility of a monopoly is neither remote nor improbable, unless we bring to the markets of the United States the relatively inexhaustible supply to be found in Canada.

The people of western Canada realized, that if opportunity were given to those in the United States who had practically taken possession of all the timber resources in the United States and created monopolies, it would not be very long before they would have the control and the monopoly of our great timber and other natural resources. Discussion has taken place as to how far the late administration has dissipated our resources of timber and other natural products, but the people of the west believe and wish that whatever remains of the natural resources, whether in timber or coal or other mineral, should be preserved by the government for the benefit not only of those now residing in western Canada but of those who will eventually occupy happy and prosperous homes there. They realized that if they had to come into competition with the people of the United States in the purchase of their own natural resources they would have to pay higher prices for lumber and other materials and therefore concluded that it was better to reject reciprocity altogether. Conditions in Alberta and Saskatchewan are somewhat different. The result of the election was somewhat different. I daresay hon. gentlemen opposite are quiet because they know the reason why. It must not be forgotten that the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are the children of the late administration. They were created by the late administration. Their premiers were practically appointed by that administration. They know perfectly well that in 1901 for instance the population of Alberta was only 73,022, while in 1911 the population is 373,854, an increase in population in Alberta of 300,832. The population in Saskatchewan in 1901 was 91,279; in 1911 the population, if the census has been correctly taken, is 476,369, a new population entering that province in 10 years of 365,000. We cannot forget then that the premiers of the local governments of those two provinces were practically nominees of the late Liberal administration and, therefore, they could do nothing less in gratitude for what was done for them than do their utmost to return the late government to power. It must not be forgotten that these 600,000 people who went within ten years into those two prairie provinces were to a very large extent received and piloted by numerous immigration agents appointed by the late government and advised in respect of their location. It must not be forgotten that there were also numerous land agents who gave homestead entries to many thousands of these people; these would naturally take a kindly interest in those who had piloted them to their future homes or granted the homesteads, because they have prospered in Alberta and Saskatchewan—not by virtue of what the late government did for the west but by virtue of what God Almighty and Nature have done. Since these people came into such pleasant conditions piloted by immigration agents, located by land agents, is it to be wondered at that very many of them should be influenced by these immigration agents and land agents and take their advice in respect to the government which was in power when they came into this country? But I venture to say that if a vote were to be taken to-day the result in those provinces would be found very different from that of the 21st of September last. If you want an illustration of that go to the province of my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) where in the recent by-election there was an indication of what would happen, because all these elections went in favour of the Conservative party.

Another condition prevailing in these two provinces which does not prevail in the older provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia must not be forgotton, that is that there were not only thousands but tens of thousands of splendid settlers from the United States who entered Canada during the last ten years. I say splendid settlers, and the more we can get of them the better, because I believe if they are properly treated, as they will be under the Conservative government, they will in a very short time become the most loyal Canadians that we have; but in the meantime they have just come from the United States, a country which teaches all its children to love their country, and in that respect we in Canada might well imitate them, in order to create a national, patriotic sentiment among our children and among our people. One of the first things that is put

into the hand of the little American child as soon as it is able to distinguish any colour is a miniature of the stars and stripes —they call it Old Glory—and the child grows up recognizing that it should be loyal to that flag and to the Constitution which it represents. That is a matter concerning which we ought to laud the United States. These American citizens come into our country loving their own, and very properly so, we have no objection whatever to that; but when they do come from their own country, although they may love it, although they may sing:

The star spangled banner, long may it wave,
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave——

—they should understand that there is north of the 49th parallel a land just as free and homes of men just as brave who take off their hat and acknowledge allegiance to and have hope and confidence in and gratitude to an older flag, of serener glory.

The flag that braved a thousand years,
The battle and the breeze.

I am not at all surprised and I do not complain that the people recently coming from the United States should have an inclination and affection toward their old homes, even a passionate attachment to their native land; but it must not be forgotten that in the election which recently took place the Liberal party had the benefit of that sentiment which was not a Canadian but an American sentiment. As I have said, I do not believe it will be very long before the people coming from the United States, and we wish more of them, when they understand the way in which property and person are protected here, the way in which our law, civil and criminal, is administered, will prefer living under the Canadian constitution to living under the constitution of the great republic. Therefore, I have no fear in respect of them, no fear that they will induce us to become annexed to or to become citizens of the United States. The right hon. gentleman has said in his address.

You find indications of an impression growing in the minds of the people there that in the attitude taken by this government, western interests were sacrificed to eastern interests. There is in this a danger far greater, far more to be apprehended than the vain, illusory idea of annexation.

I entirely agree with the right hon. gentleman that there is a manifest danger—I do not say a probable one—of a severance of sentiment between the east and the west of Canada; and from the way in which the west of Canada was treated by the late Liberal government, I am not at all surprised that he refers to a divergence of sentiment, for what did the late government ever do for western Canada? Perhaps it was the construction of the St. Andrew's Locks, a work which was commenced some 15 years ago, and after having to wait longer than a celebrated old Israelite had to wait for two wives, we have eventually got those locks open. What else did they do? I shall not speak of the Transcontinental railway; that will come up at another time. But it seems to me when it is considered, it will be found that the cost of the construction of that railway has been such that instead of the Railway Commission being able to reduce freight rates, they will probably have to maintain them, I will not say increase them, in order that such railway may earn sufficient revenue to pay the fixed charges on the cost of construction. And what else have they done for western Canada? Yet the right hon. gentleman fears that there may be a severance of sentiment between the east and the west. One of the best ways for him to create that severance of sentiment in the minds of the people of the west is to tell them that they have not been properly treated by the people of the east. I am very sorry that suggestion was made by the right hon. gentleman. The fact is that the people of the west are looking to the Conservative party to adopt, in respect to the west, that National Policy that has made the east prosperous—a policy which was born in the Liberal-Conservative party, and which in 1896, for various inducements, was handed over, shall I say, to a wet nurse, the Liberal party. Somehow or other, the Liberal party, prior to the last election did not think enough of the child, and wanted to introduce something else, reciprocity in natural products, which is more or less in conflict with the principle of that National Policy. When that was understood, the people said, let the National Policy be the policy of Canada, and let the child be transferred to those who are able to look after it. I ask, what would be the difference between the practical results of the other policy and the practical results of the National Policy? What does the National Policy mean? It means the building up of national industries in Canada and the creation of home markets. Those industries and home markets have made eastern Canada one of the most prosperous parts of the world, and the same policy applied to western Canada will make it equally prosperous. I will not say it is not equally prosperous now. The farmers are progressive; but we must not forget that there have been expended in the west large sums of money on public works, and that the incoming settlers have also spent large sums of money. But the construction of public

works will not always go on and immigration will not always continue in the same ratio, and then or even now comes the question, where will the farmers find their home market? In eastern Canada? They would have to carry their products for long distances at expensive rates. May we not hope that under the fostering care of the present administration national industries will be built up in western Canada, providing the western farmer with markets where he can sell his products readily and at the best prices? That will tend to consolidate the east and the west of Canada. What would have been the result of the other policy, assuming that we had reciprocity in natural products? The result would have been that our farmers would —as the right hon. gentleman suggests— have had to find a market in the United States; that millions of bushels of wheat grown by our western farmers would have been carried southwards on American railways to American mills and manufactured there into American flour. What ultimate good would that do to our western farmers? As was stated by President Taft, there would be more meat coming from the United States to Canada than from Canada to the United States, a diversion of traffic to the south. What would then become of all the traffic now carried over our railways? Instead of moving east and west, it would go south to enhance the wealth of the people of the United States. Is that the proper policy for Canada? The National Policy, as administered by the Conservative party, tends to the consolidation of Canada; reciprocity, as proposed by the late administration, would tend to separation, a consummation not devoutly to be wished.

The right hon. gentleman also said this:

> At no distant day the government should be prepared to deal with that situation and give the western people some compensation for the benefit which they expected from the trade agreement, of which benefit they are deprived.

Mr. Speaker, the people of western Canada never had that suggested benefit, so that they cannot be deprived of it. The people of western Canada prospered under the old policy, and the policy which made them prosperous will continue to make them prosperous. What compensation is the present administration going to give to western Canada? One thing promised in the speech from the Throne is the Hudson Bay railway, which for years was promised by the late administration and is not yet constructed. It is perhaps in process of being born in the minds of some of the late government, but the present administration promise to build it. It is the shortest route that can be found between Great Britain and central Canada and between western Canada and the markets of the old country. The route is soon to be ascertained. Its benefit is soon to be given. What else is to be given? Some aid, as I understand it, towards the creation of a chilled meat system which the farmers greatly desire. What else? One thing I would suggest to the members of the administration and the people of Canada and that is that there should be a freer interchange of news between eastern Canada and western Canada.

(Mr. Aikins' hand in motion, happened to touch a passing member.)

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. Oh.

Mr. AIKINS. I beg your pardon. Well, you laugh but the hon. member did not get it in the neck as some hon. members opposite may. There is one thing that I would suggest, the people of western Canada, the great majority of the people of western Canada, have come from places outside of Canada. I do not suppose that in the present population of 1,700,000 in western Canada there are perhaps more than 250,000 of eastern born Canadians. Those from across the seas have passed through Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and other cities, and hurried to their destination; and they know no more about the cities I have named than they do perhaps of some places in the United States, in Belgium or in France. They may know no more about these towns than they do about Berlin, Washington, or Vienna. What do they know of eastern Canada? They know more practically of the United States because the western papers print more news from that country than they do of news from eastern Canada. That is because the rate for news messages from the south to the north is less than for similar messages from the east to the west. And so, although, as I said only yesterday, the people of the country pray to the newspapers which are mighty—they are mighty and properly so for they create very largely the sentiment of the people—pray to the newspapers: Give us this day our daily bread. And instead of getting their wholesome good loaf of Candian news they get an American bun on their daily breakfast table to assimilate. Gentlemen, that thing it seems to me should not continue if the people of eastern Canada are wise. If the present wires are not able to carry at lower rates news from east to west, and west to east, then the government should do something to facilitate the carrying of news more cheaply. They might subsidize a line or construct perhaps a separate wire maintained and controlled by the government. We should have one common sentiment. The right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, as I understand it, has said that the election was carried not by reason, but by pas-

sion and prejudice. The right hon. gentleman may mean by passion and prejudice, strong feeling or sentiment. Passion is a matter of feeling, prejudice is a matter of feeling, sentiment is a matter of feeling. If it is said that prejudice and passion with that meaning had something to do with carrying the election, then, Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with the right hon. gentleman. I believe that there was a truth expressed by the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division of Montreal when he said that one man who had a great deal to do with the events that happened on the 21st September was the man that wrote 'Rule Britannia.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AIKINS There was a demonstration given to the people of Canada that there was prevailing in this country, and growing, a British-Canadian national sentiment which, in addition to the good reasons that were assigned, was a strength to carry the Liberal-Conservative party properly into power. You talk about sentiment as a thing to be put aside and not considered. Mr. Speaker, I consider that sentiment with a proper object, sentiment with kindliness in it and with wisdom, is one of the most potent forces for good that exists in the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AIKINS. It may be as diffusive as the sunlight but it is as strong as steel and powerful as a thunderbolt; and I would be very glad to see that sentiment grow and expand in Canada until it becomes that force which bound the people of other countries patriotically together. You ask for illustrations of that. You do not require very many illustrations. What was it that caused the people of France led by Joan of Arc to rise up and expel from their borders the invader? What was it that made the French people resist the invasion of their country and the attacks in other wars what inspired them. They sang the Marseillaise: 'March on, march on, all hearts resolved on victory or death.' National sentiment. What was it, when there was a contest on the sea between the British navy and the navy of another country, when that signal was thrown up: 'England expects every man to do his duty,' that made the men respond and win the battle of Trafalgar? Simply national sentiment. What was it in the old city of Quebec when General Schuyler and the ill-fated Montgomery besieged that place, caused the people in those early days to fight for the maintenance of British authority in Quebec as against the United States? What was it, when Benjamin Franklin, Charles Carroll and Samuel Chase came over with their newspaper to Montreal, then in possession of the Americans, arrested their persuasiveness and made their success no greater than that of Schuyler and Montgomery? Simply sentiment. What was it that caused the United Empire Loyalists to leave the United States and their homes and come into Canada, that they might have the benefits and security of the British laws? Nothing but national sentiment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AIKINS. What was it in the stress of the 21st September last caused the people of Canada to avoid the rocks and shoals of reciprocity and brought them into safer water and a better harbour? A Canadian national sentiment and good sense. What can the government do by way of compensation to western Canada? Let the government, in so far as lies in their power, join with the other governments in teaching the new population that has come into our country something about Canada and Canadian history. Let them teach about Jacques Cartier and Champlain, about La Salle and La Verandrye, let them teach about Wolfe and Montcalm, let them teach about the United Empire Loyalists, about Laura Secord and about General Brock, about Lord Selkirk, about Vancouver and Simpson and Douglas in order that the children may have before them great ideals which they may imitate.

And in addition to that I would like to see the government of our country provide as far as possible for the military education of our children in all our schools. The best kind of a soldiery for Canada is a citizen soldiery, and the best time to train them and give the idea of protecting their own country and their own homes is to start when they are in the public schools and when they are young. And I think that the hon. Minister of Militia agrees with me in this respect. Create a national sentiment, and then, gentlemen, when we have created a national sentiment—when we are creating a national sentiment—let it not be said or suggested, as it is suggested in the proposed amendment and as has been suggested in certain addresses given in this debate, that there should instead of concord, be discord. While Canada is in a formative state let us do everything we can to bind the people together. I notice the attacks that have been made upon the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), and I am amazed at them. I meet him and look him in the face and say to him: You may be born of French blood, I of the blood of the British isles; you may speak a language different from mine and in your religion may be different in some respects from my religion; but at heart we are one because we have faith in Him, who, in His last utterances, expressed a desire

for concord and for unity. I look at my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and ask him if he is a Canadian as I am a Canadian and he will answer, yes; I ask him if he would devote the best hours of his life to Canada as I am prepared to do and receive a similar reply. So that at the bottom of our hearts we are one—one, at least, in this great thing, that we are Canadians who admire and love and are prepared to live for our own country. Then I can say to him as was said by one celebrated of old:

If thy heart is to my heart as my heart is to thy heart, then give me thy hand.

Locked together in the bonds of love for our own land, locked as should be locked the hands of all people in Canada whether they come from the east or from the west or from the south, to whatever race they belong, whatever language speaking, whatever religion professing, let us all be one as Canadians, one people welded together and guiding our nation. Our country's too broad for the schisms that shake petty lands. Let us join all our forces to make sure and firm federation, shoulder to shoulder, phalanxed heart to heart, and hand to hand.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I trust that my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) will not feel that I am discourteous to him if I fail to follow him along the lines of the address which he has just given to this House. The hon. gentleman came to this House with a reputation both at the bar and in general life which led yourself, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, and every hon. gentleman here to look forward to the hon. gentleman's first address as one worthy of his record and his career. One would naturally have expected him to address himself to the consideration of the very important constitutional question which has been raised seriously in this House by the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). But the hon. gentleman did not choose to prove true to his reputation. Instead of the address which we might have expected, he has given us the campaign speech with which he regaled the electors of Brandon in the late campaign, with sundry additions of pious ejaculation about the unity between the races in this country. Had he been here in previous parliaments and consorted with some of the hon. gentlemen who were at that time at the left of the Speaker's chair, he would have found far greater necessity for his eloquence than any which he can suggest today. My hon. friend, I say, has failed in his duty by failing to discuss the very important question which is more particularly and pertinently before us for consideration at this time. Instead of his poetic effusion and eloquent references to splendid generalities, if the hon. gentleman had attempted to show this parliament and this country why it was that his leader proceeded to form what was either a coalition government or a government the like of which has had few precedents in British history, he would have been true to his reputation, and would have better exhibited the ability which he is supposed to possess.

The right hon. leader of the opposition has proposed a resolution which brings to the attention of the country the one imminent situation which every hon. gentleman who sits at your right, Mr. Speaker, knows to exist. That resolution says:

That it is a fundamental principle of constitutional government that the advisers of the Crown shall be heartily in accord on all important questions of public policy, and that the inclusion, by the Prime Minister, in the present cabinet, of members holding diametrically opposite views on a question of the highest importance to the Dominion and to the empire, is contrary to the well understood principles of responsible government and should not receive the approval of the House.

That the cabinet which the Prime Minister has announced, and which now has its place on your right has been made up of varied and conflicting forces of the community is a fact that is well recognized. In that cabinet many hon. gentlemen who sit to the right of the Speaker in that portion of the House which we may describe as 'below the gangway' are not included. Concerning these hon. gentlemen it was the confident belief of every member of the House, whether on the right or on the left of the Speaker that they would be included in the government should the present leader of the House (Hon. Mr. Borden) be returned to power. If assiduous attention to their duties—whether or not really in the public interest, at least along lines that they believed in the public interest—and conspicuous ability, were to be reasons entitling men to recognition on the coming into power of their party, then the hon. gentleman who leads the government has completely disregarded these essential elements in the composition of the cabinet. I need not name the individual gentlemen whose rights in this regard have been so completely overlooked; they are within the knowledge of every one in this House and the country. Perhaps it will be said that this is a family affair. It may be so; it probably is so; I leave that to my hon. friends who have been overlooked, and so grossly disregarded, who have been supplanted in some cases by outsiders, men who did not give adherence to the Conservative party until the last moment, and who declared that they should be considered because they came in at the front door, when gentlemen who had stood in the dark shades of opposition for fifteen years were ignored. The Prime Minister of the day has taken from all classes and parties of people to form a cabinet. There is no pre-

cedent for such a course since the famous 'broadbottom cabinet' organized by Lord Pelham in 1742, and which was so called because in it were included men of all parties. The cabinet of to-day is either a 'broadbottom' cabinet, as Pelham's was, or it is a coalition cabinet. It certainly is not a Conservative cabinet. The men who were in the last House know that it is not a Conservative cabinet. And those who now appear in the House for the first time like my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) who had been indulging in all this flag-flapping and flambuoyant patriotism, little know of the worth and the capacity and ability of the men who sat on the left of the Speaker in the last parliament, and who have been disregarded by their leader in the formation of his administration.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) speaks with feeling on that point.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am sure that I did not refer to my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) in what I said. But there are hon. gentlemen who sit not far away from him to whom I might have referred.

Now, no less a statesman than Lord Derby, speaking in 1866 defined a coalition government to be:

> A government of men of different parties in which each, to a greater or lesser extent, sacrifices his individual opinions for the purpose of obtaining political strength.

Have we such a proposition here? Is the government made up of men of different parties who have, to a greater or lesser extent made sacrifice of their individual opinion for the purpose of obtaining political strength? I say that definition absolutely and completely covers the combination that sits at your right, Mr. Speaker. But, in case there may be any doubt, let us look at the situation for a moment or two. Let us consider first what the situation was in the last parliament. Let us consider where the Conservative party stood when they went to the country on the 21st of September, and where they stood in regard to the recognition of the rank and file of that organization when they came to parliament last week. A coalition, according to all constitutional authorities, is only to be formed in times of stress, and for the purpose of attaining conditions under which conflicting views may be adjusted in order to avoid a position which might result if any one of the elements concerned attempted to go on alone.

My hon. friend, the leader of the government, who I regret is not in his place, to the knowledge of every one in this country, and to the knowledge of the men who sit around him, knew that it was a matter of doubt for quite a while whether he would be able to form a cabinet without Nationalist support. The people of this country were quite aware that it was a matter of speculation and debate whether he would have pluck enough, strength enough, and confidence enough in his own party, to go on and form a government that he could ask the people of Canada to support, exclusively from the ranks of the Conservative party. And everybody knows that the leader of the government capitulated, and made a coalition with the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, and that here we have a coalition government, in which my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon Mr Pelletier) comes in, following his leader, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Monk), and either they or the Prime Minister made some sacrifices of principle, gave up some of their opinions upon public questions, in order that they might work together and form a government under a common leadership. Which party was it that gave up its principles? Was it my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who I am sorry to see is not here? He and I used to have discussions, in the last parliament, and I wish he were here now in order that I might ask him a few questions. These two gentlemen now sit side by side, cheek by jowl, seeing eye to eye, whereas they did not sit cheek by jowl, they did not work in harmony during the last parliament. There were three parties in this country during the past two years, and down until the 21st of September, until the moment that the Prime Minister capitulated and agreed to take the Minister of Public Works and his following into the government. We want to know, this country has a right to know, this House has a right to know, what were the terms of that capitulation, what was the agreement arrived at between those two combinations which resulted in this coalition. It is all very well to tell us they are going to sit down and think this matter over as to what they will do about the navy in the dim and distant future. Sir, according to every constitutional principle, according to every authority in the long line of British precedents in the mother country or in Canada, where a combination has been formed such as now exists in this government, it is the duty of the Prime Minister to divulge the terms upon which the coalition was arranged. But my hon. friend the Prime Minister says rather disingenuously, I think that he has no fault to find with the right hon gentleman for calling attention to the fact, which is perfectly true, and said:

> My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, when this matter was under debate a few sessions ago, did not see eye to eye with me on the question of the emergent conditions which at that time I thought confronted the empire.

He has no fault to find. And the hon. gentleman who was lecturing us about raising race issues in this country, should note his leader tells us on this side of the House that he has no fault to find with us in raising the question. But he would like his followers who were not here in the last parliament to think that the difference between him and his Minister of Public Works was only a little difference upon a question of fact that occurred two years ago. Well, Sir, every man who sat in this House in the last parliament knows that, unless these gentlemen were playing a game, unless they were dissimulating and deceiving the people of this country, the most active hostility existed between them, not on mere questions of fact, but on substantial questions of policy, down to the very last hours of the last parliament. There were, as I say, three parties in this House previous to the 21st of September. There was the great Liberal party, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman whom we are all proud to follow, and whom, let me say, the people of Canada will once more call to rule the destinies of this nation as soon as they have discovered the grounds on which this coalition has been formed. Then there was the Conservative party, led by the present Prime Minister, and the Nationalist party led by the present Minister of Public Works. The Conservative party and the Nationalist party have formed a coalition, and the Prime Minister will not tell us up to date what were the terms of the agreement upon which they coalesced. I hope the Minister of Public Works will tell us himself. Let me say now in his presence, what I said before he came in, that according to every constitutional principle, where conflicting political elements combine to form a coalition such as now exists in this government, it is the bounden duty of the parties to the coalition to announce to the House and the country the basis upon which the agreement was arrived at. Now let us examine the question as to whether there was only a difference of opinion as regards a mere question of fact. The whole difference first arose as to the duty and responsibility of this young nation of the empire in relation to the rest of the empire. It arose acutely in regard to the question of the naval policy which should be followed by this nation in the empire, in conjunction with our sister nations. It also existed upon other lines. The Minister of Public Works, and those who were associated with him in the province of Quebec declared that we should not interfere with military assistance in the wars of Great Britain. The position taken by the Minister of Public Works was a direct sequence, a direct result, of the position taken by his coadjutor in the leadership of the Nationalist party, Mr. Bourassa, when he declared in 1900 that the right hon. gentleman who then led the government had no right to send soldiers to the aid of Great Britain in the South African war.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. MACDONALD. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that because the Minister of Public Works has gone over to the other side of the House, he need not think that he can address hon. gentlemen on this side in that curt manner. He might as well make up his mind now at the very inception of this parliament that he has got to be polite with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. MONK. I have a right to say what I think.

Mr. MACDONALD. Of course, and perhaps he will tell us why he agrees with Mr. Bourassa that Canada should not send soldiers to South Africa.

Mr. MONK. I will tell all about it when the time comes.

Mr MACDONALD. Now we are getting it. I am delighted to see my hon. friend rising to the fly. He is going to tell us shortly all about this arrangement he made with the Prime Minister; he is going to tell us why he and his confreres in the province of Quebec took the course they did, a course which the people of Ontario watched with alarm, and which the people of my own province, good Conservatives, also watched with alarm. He is going to tell us of the strange things that occurred in order to enable this once great Conservative party to patch up an alliance with the Nationalist organization in order that they might work together We will all be delighted to hear what the terms were. Let my hon. friend be frank about it. Don't let us have any side-stepping, don't keep back anything.

Now that he has given us the assurance that he will say something about it, let us hear why it was that he went back on all the splendid position, from the standpoint of those behind him, which he took on this question of our relations with the mother country, and calmly eats out of the hand of the men whom he joined in passing resolutions to denounce only a year ago, in the province of Quebec.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) initiated the discussion of this question in the year 1909 upon a proposition that Canada should share in the responsibilities of the empire

by contributing to the naval defence of the country. The matter formed the subject of consideration by hon. gentlemen on both sides and, unanimously, hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House joined in a resolution which we passed, the terms of which are familiar to every hon. member who was in the last parliament, or will be to hon. gentlemen who take the trouble to look it up, in which we pledged ourselves to a definite and positive position in regard to our relations with the mother country. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, I think, was not here. He afterwards said that he was not here at the time that was done, because I find that a little altercation took place between him and the Minister of Trade and Commerce the following year after this, when the late government, following up and implementing the unanimous resolution of this House, brought down to parliament their proposals in regard to a naval service. I find that my hon. friend, speaking on that occasion, says:

I think I was given to understand that the motion would not be pressed. If I were certain of that I would assert it here. But it remained in abeyance until nearly——

Then my hon. friend stopped, or was interrupted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce who went on to say:

To make the question clear to my hon. friend, so far as I am concerned, no such promise was made by me.

There was the first sign of a little hostility given to the House, and given to the country between the Minister of Public Works and the father of this resolution which produced this whole naval question, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce very curtly told his then colleague sitting behind him that if he thought he had ever given any undertaking that he was not going to go on with this proposition, he was greatly mistaken.

Then, my hon. friend proceeded to discuss the question when we had the second reading of the Bill. My hon. friend moved a resolution in February, 1910 in which, after protesting his loyalty to the British Crown, he declared that this was a change in the relations of Canada with the empire, and ought in consequence to be submitted to the people by plebiscite. Then, further, the difference of opinion between my hon. friend and his then leader, and his now leader, was accentuated, because the Minister of Public Works, speaking at page 2992 of 'Hansard', said:

My hon. friend has spoken of differences of opinion in the ranks of the party on this side of the House. They may exist, but they are acknowledged.

So that he was very frank in February, 1910, in stating to the House and the country that differences did exist between him and his present leader. Not two years ago, upon a question as to whether or not there was a contribution to be made to the mother country, the minister said that there was a difference of opinion between him and his leader. He did not minimize it in any degree, did not pretend to say, as we were jauntily told last night, that there was a little difference of opinion as to a question of fact.

Well, what further? My hon. friend moved a resolution at that time, and he followed it with a speech in which he went on to discuss the responsibility that was being placed upon Canada by the imperialists of this country. I think that if there is any hon. gentleman who is entitled to be called an imperialist it is the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who sits behind him, and who is an imperialist almost of the Colonel Denison type. I am using that language advisedly because the Minister of Public Works in his speech in February, 1910, spoke of men of the Colonel Denison type who had brought such terrible things on Canada. This is what he said:

And who are the originators of that charge? Who, I ask this House, have been so earnest in promoting this gradual advance until at last we are face to face with this scheme, which is totally different from the two others and from the third more ancient, which began in 1862? To my mind it is largely the work, in the first place, of the Imperial Federation Society,——

Are there any members of the Imperial Federation Society in this government, or at the council board of my hon. friend? If there are he had better keep an eye on them unless they have buried the hatchet, unless they have settled all their points of difference; and if they have he ought to let the House, and the country know how they have settled them.

—which failed because it had no representative character and had proposed boldly in the beginning a scheme for which we were totally unprepared, political union, which is virtually comprised in this present project, and when that society failed and the new one, the British Empire League——

Is there any member of the British Empire League on the right of the House, or in the government?

—was organized, they took it up and the members of that anti-Canadian society——

Note the words:

—I will call it such, have been ever since moving heaven and earth to bring about this very policy to which many of us at present object. Look at the active members of the league. You will find they are not representative men; they are very respectable men.

but if you read their speeches you will find that they have gone to England and stated that this scheme is popular and accepted with joy throughout the country. What authority have they for that statement? Col. Denison or Mr. Small, at one of their meetings, after congratulating the meeting that it was not open to the press, stated that it was known that war decimates sailors, the British have great difficulty in finding complements of men for their navy, and they could easily recoup themselves here, there were 75,000 men at their disposal as a naval reserve, and the people were anxious to place them at the disposal of the British Empire.

That is the way that my hon. friend spoke in the debate. I know that my hon. friend is a plucky man, and I know that he can offer a defence for his position if he will do so. He cannot have any objection, whatever, to those of us who, at this moment fail to discern what his position is, reminding the House and the country of where he stood a little over a year ago. This is what he also said in that debate, and I want hon. gentlemen, and particularly the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who were not in this House to listen to it. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, busy as he was with the government of New Brunswick could not possibly have known what the Minister of Public Works said, because if he did I am quite sure that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have hesitated before he would have accepted a seat in this government or until he had had an explanation upon the subject.

It has been claimed——

—says the hon. Minister of Public Works—

—that what is asked from us to-day, this to my judgment unjustifiable sacrifice of our liberty, we owe to the mother country. I heard it said to-day that if British supremacy upon the sea was to fail we would disappear at once.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had presented to our minds the terrible picture of the Armageddon that was going to come, telling us that England's navy was going to be destroyed, and holding up before us the fate that was in store for Canada. The Minister of Public Works proceeded to say that this was all nonsense. This is what he said:

Is our indebtedness so very great? Do we owe all this to the mother country, and have we done nothing for ourselves in respect to external affairs or in respect to our own political development? Have we been sponges or jelly fish occupying a merely passive role in that regard, and has everything that could be done been done by the mother country?

Then my hon. friend proceeded to discuss the whole history of British diplomacy from 1876 down to the Alaska boundary dispute, the Ashburton treaty, the Washington treaty, the whole course of British diplomacy. He declared that England was willing to hand us over to the United States in 1782 and, therefore, we owed nothing to the mother country. Then he said:

There are many other facts which might be cited to prove the claim that any man who says that we owe a debt of gratitude to the mother country in respect to these many transactions under which our territory has been greatly fragmentized is speaking of what he knows nothing about.

Where is my hon. friend from Brandon? Did he ever indulge in any eloquent words to strengthen the tie which binds us to the mother land or in proof of the devotion which we ought to exhibit to the mother country? If he has, and I am sure he has, I invite him to come down and wrestle with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) who says that any man who ever said that we owed a debt of gratitude to the motherland did not know what he was talking about. Then my hon. friend went on:

What of this pretension that if British supremacy is not maintained upon the sea we cease to exist? I think that is carrying assertion a little too far. Whatever we have in this country is our own work. We built it up ourselves. And my friend will admit that in the early days we had to wrest concessions from the mother country.

That is where my hon. friend stood in February, and I want to trace his history right down because the Prime Minister told us that there was never any difference of opinion between them except a slight one two years ago. Where was my hon. friend in November, 1910? If my hon. friend speaks to-morrow he will be just celebrating the anniversary of sundry little differences that were going on in this House between him and his present leader. My hon. friend, on November 22, 1910, a year ago to-morrow, referred to a statement made by the hon. member for Bellechasse in the House at that time, that Mr. Armand Lavergne had said at a meeting at which Mr. Monk was present that Mr. Borden was no more and no less than the vicar of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. His leader to-day (Mr. Borden) was characterized by his bosom friend and companion, Armand Lavergne, as being the vicar of our distinguished leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. What did the hon. Minister of Public Works say when challenged with that statement? Did he deny it? Did he question the fact that Mr. Borden was the vicar of Mr. Laurier? Not at all—this is what he said:

I was not called upon to rise and call him to order. Certainly the policy of Mr. Borden was condemned at these meetings. A resolu-

tion was passed at these meetings wherever they were held condemning the attitude of the government and condemning the attitude of the opposition.

This third party leader was condemning the attitude of the second party leader.

I stand by that resolution; I adhere to it.

What did my hon. friend do then? He went on to relate the fable of the wolf and the dog who met in the forest and had a fantastical conversation in which the great stand taken by the wolf was that he was proud that he did not wear a collar like the dog. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works told this story to indicate to the House and the country that he did not wear the collar of the leader of the opposition at that time. Yet to-day the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) tells us there was a little difference about a question of fact two years ago! Just a year ago to-morrow then, my hon. friend spoke in this House and made some quotations in the course of the debate showing Mr. Bourassa's attitude at St. Eustache. At that town on July 17, Mr. Bourassa had appealed to his compatriots and had pictured the case of a little lad who, instead of staying at home and being a good Canadian and a good Catholic, would be disembowelled by a Chinese or Japanese cannon ball when he would be taken off to fight the battles of England. He said:

When we will have gone in that disastrous policy of which Laurier and Borden are the prophets and one day conscription will be enforced.

What did the Minister of Public Works say:

Mr. Monk was asked if he approved of Mr. Bourassa's statement, and replied:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think we did at every meeting state that conscription must necessarily follow. I remember the passage referred to by my hon. friend. It was a very eloquent portrait of what would be the result of conscription.

Is this man who stood at St. Eustache in July, 1910, and listened to Mr. Bourassa picturing the sad fate of the poor little habitant boy who, when he grew up and would have to fight the battles of England, was going to be disembowelled as the result of a policy for which Mr. Borden was going to be responsible? Was such a spectacle ever afforded in any British country?—men occupying positions so diverse and contrary as those of the present leader of the government (Mr. Borden) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) until the very election day forming a combination under such terms as those under which these people have got together? I would like to know whether the good Conservatives in my province, where those of us who belong to the Protestant faith have been proud in every election to stand in defence of the policy of the Liberal party and have declared that we would follow, so long as he was alive, the great man, a Frenchman, who led it—I would like to know what the feelings of the Conservatives in my own county would be if each one of them who was affected by the appeals to prejudice against that great statesman knew that in the cabinet of their leader there was a Minister of Public Works who shared in that wild and absolutely unwarranted appeal to the passions and feelings of the French-Canadians of this country, one year ago.

One year ago to-morrow, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works moved an amendment to the address. He did not, as on previous occasions, begin with an assertion of loyalty to the British Crown, he excluded that altogether, and made simply a bald declaration in regard to this question. Having passed the summer campaigning in the province of Quebec, indulging in harangues and appeals to prejudice, he cuts out the assertion of loyalty and says this Naval Service Bill changes the relations of Canada and the empire and ought in consequence to be submitted to the people by a plebiscite. That is where my hon. friend stood last year on this question in this House. He sat there all last summer and the men who sat behind him went up and down Quebec declaring themselves against Laurier and Borden equally, saying that they were Nationalists and would follow their leaders, Messrs. Monk and Bourassa. And Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, after all that record, calmly comes in after September 21 and nestles away into a Conservative cabinet and his leader does not deign to tell us on what basis they got together.

There is my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel)—he was certainly one of the unexpected things. When the stork brought the basket, and left it at his front door, I think he was almost surprised himself. I do not think any hon. gentleman who sat in the last parliament ever expected that the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) was going to fledge out into a minister when we got back, even though the Conservatives were in power, and even though my hon. friend was a good old-fashioned stodgy Tory. Nothing of the kind. He was a Tory in the old days, but he was a Nationalist now, a doughty member of this third party. That was less than two years ago. The Prime Minister has not explained the deal he has made with the Minister of Inland Revenue; he will have to tell us about that before we get through. My hon. friend the Min-

ister of Inland Revenue spoke on November 23rd, just a year ago the day after to-morrow, and it would be a good thing if he would celebrate the anniversary of that day by getting up and telling us the day after to-morrow just what understanding he had. Did the Minister of Public Works make the deal for the whole three, or only for himself? I rely upon my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue to frankly tell us just what has been done, because when speaking last year he told the House that he was a very frank man. I have his statement here, from page 184 of 'Hansard.' He said:

I shall be frank and shall say that, in the last contest, the proposition which had been made by the leader of the opposition was condemned as well as the government's policy.

So we have a second member of the Nationalist party frankly telling the House and the country just a year ago that he was not a follower of the leader of the Conservative party. Now, here are the two cabinet representatives of the Nationalist party who were in the last parliament both asserting their absolute independence of their leader, the present premier, and running a party of their own on this question of the naval service, and the relations between Canada and the mother country. We shall probably have some honeyed words; we shall probably be told that there were some things that the Minister of Public Works was ready to do. But this Nationalist party has a bible. It is written by Mr. Asselin, one of their candidates in Montreal in the last campaign. He has written a book called: 'A Quebec View of Canadian Nationalism,' in which we find the gospel of the party set forth, and a statement of what Canada should do as a colony, either by men or money or co-operation, in the way of contributing to the defence of the empire. For instance, he says:

You want Canada to contribute to just wars only? But who will judge of the justness of the war? There is hardly more sense in the cash contribution proposal, unless the contribution is based on the principle of obligation and the quota determined accordingly. And here again, once the principle is admitted, you must go at it manfully, and take up the burden in no niggardly spirit. The Quebec Nationalist, for fear of the consequences, will not admit the principle.

I wonder if that is a doctrine in the faith of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. I hope he will tell us, when he comes to enlighten us in regard to this deal with the premier, whether he agrees with Mr. Asselin or not. That gentleman goes on to tell us:

So, whichever way you look at it, you are confronted with this conclusion, that as long as a colony is a colony, she is entitled to the armed protection of the mother country; that the colony which would build a navy to assist the mother country whenever the latter's 'honour' or the 'integrity of her territory' is at stake—and these are the terms of the resolution of March 29 last—would be three times worse off than the mother country herself; and that Canada, considering the risks implied in her connection with Great Britain, would still be doing more than the ordinary duties of nationhood by simply providing for the defence of her own territory.

So that the Nationalist theory, as expounded by Mr. Asselin, and as enunciated by the Minister of Public Works, was that Canada should not do anything for the empire, but should confine herself to the defence of her own territory on the northern half of the American continent. Surely my hon. friend the premier will not seriously contend that that position, taken by the Nationalist party down to September the 21st, was not diametrically opposite to the policy he professed and tried to initiate. There was no question of the fact of the wide divergence between him and the Minister of Public Works, and between the Minister of Public Works and several other gentlemen, now ministers of the Crown, who sat behind him in the last parliament. Take the premier's own position with regard to the naval service. He could not say, like the Minister of Public Works, that he was not here when the resolution of the 29th of March, 1909, was passed. He was here, and joined in the wording of that resolution. He was absolutely and completely responsible for every line of it. Not only that, but he asked, with regard to the clause providing for the creation of a Canadian navy, that the word 'speedy' be put in, so anxious was he for the speedy creation of a Canadian navy. Then my hon. friend went on and loyally supported the compact. In England he sounded its praises; in his own province, in Halifax, he told of the glorious Canadian navy that was to be. As a result of this question having been settled on broad lines, having been lifted above the sphere of mere party politics, every one in Canada thought my hon. friend would have stuck to that broad position, one which would always have done him credit. But my hon. friend changed his tactics. In the following year his position was somewhat different, though on the first reading of the Bill on January 12, 1910, that is, a year later than this little difference that occurred between him and the Minister of Public Works on the question of fact, my hon. friend was still loyal to the proposition for a Canadian navy. This is what he said:

I say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, so far as my words have any weight with him: go on with your naval service; proceed cautiously and surely.

That is where my hon. friend the premier was on January 12, 1910. Then my hon.

friend the Minister of Public Works apparently began to complain that the resolution of the previous year had been passed without his having been consulted about it. The result was that the premier moved an amendment on the second reading of the Naval Service Bill, in which he declared that we were not going far enough, that the Bill did not adequately provide for all that was needed for the defence of the mother country, that we should provide for a naval unit. My hon. friend went on and proposed that we should have, not a plebiscite, but a general election, on this question, and further proposed that we should at once send to the mother country enough money to buy two Dreadnoughts, the cost of which would be in the vicinity of $25,000,000.

Now that was in January 1910, that is a little later than the two years of which he speaks and he knows, we all know, that the honourable gentleman who sits on his left (Mr.Monk) did not agree with him in regard to this question of the contribution of $25,000,000 of dollars for Dreadnoughts, and would not support it, that there was a straight line of cleavage between them which continued—I do not know whether the Minister of Public Works mesmerized the Prime Minister or the Prime Minister mesmerized the Minister of Public Works —but the line of cleavage which appeared in January 1910, continued without question. Then we came along to last autumn. Now I hope that before this debate is concluded my hon. friend the Premier will be good enough to tell us frankly and freely what kind of arrangement he did make with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) in order to allay their fears and put them to sleep. I have attempted to show Mr. Speaker, to the House, that constitutionally it is the bounden duty of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to do so. My hon. friend has always been a stickler for constitutional practice and I trust he will not fail us on this occasion. Because it was on a question of fact that the difference arose and I have his utterances on the subject made on November 24, 1910. This is what he said and the man about whom he was talking at the time has just now gone out:—

> I have had the good or bad fortune to be denounced beyond measure by Nationalist speakers on every platform where they have spoken in the province of Quebec.

Denounced by those people with whom he had a little difference of opinion on a question of fact. But he went on to say this:—

> I shared the honour of being denounced with about 80 Conservative members of parliament.

So that my hon. friend was proud of those gentlemen denouncing him, proud of the Minister of Public Works passing resolutions that he was no good, proud of the Minister of Public Works standing on platforms where Nationalist speakers called him a vicar of Laurier. That is where he stood a year ago. My hon. friend from Carleton ventured to doubt the truth of the denial which was made by my hon. friend the Premier, but I am not going to be so unkind to my hon. friend as that. I am going to accept his own statement in regard to the matter. I am bound to believe it and I think according to the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, we should do so. My hon friend (Mr. Borden) went on to say:—

> We are not in alliance with the Nationalists and we have been denounced by them even more strongly than we have been denounced by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Of course when a man wins and success is fluttering around he can be very jaunty. My hon. friend the Premier was very jaunty yesterday afternoon. He was proud of being denounced by the Nationalists a year ago; he was not in alliance with them and would not have anything to do with them at the time. Why, he says, my French Minister of Public Works and I two years ago —he did not say anything about last year—had a little difference about a question of fact. But that will not do, Mr. Speaker. I can fancy if you were on the other side of the House and the conditions were reversed how you would insist upon explanations being given that were satisfactory to the country; and I am quite sure that behind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) there are representatives of the people who for the moment perhaps may be satisfied with the conditions which success creates despite a strange combination of that kind, but who will find in their hearts a feeling that will demand an explanation and back home in their constituencies and along the concession line they will want to know how it is that these men who, one year ago, were at dagger points and were not in alliance, according to the words of their Premier, have got together since September 21, and what kind of arrangement they made in regard to this matter. Now while my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works a year ago was moving a bald resolution, without any protestations of loyalty in it, that there should be a plebiscite, my hon. friend the present Premier was moving resolutions and propounding policies which involved large plans of co-operation within the empire in regard to Imperial defence. The two positions were absolutely contradictory, impossible to reconcile in any way what-

ever, impossible to justify before the House or the country. Yet we have these two men getting together in the face of the people of Canada and declaring that, while they stood before the whole country absolutely opposed to each other on this vital question: we are going to get together and for the sake of the sweets of office some time in the dim and distant future we will state what we ought to do. Of course my friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will have his fears, and his doubts, and his worries in case Armageddon should come before that policy of theirs is incubated. Let us look at this eloquent statement of the Conservative position made by hon. Mr. Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, a position which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works absolutely denies and says is not right and is not in the interests of the Canadian people:—

For five centuries the patient, toiling British taxpayer has paid the bill and paid it with a cheerful countenance, and so far without grumbling. Can you find in the history of the world any more sublime figure and instrumentality of great and powerful good worked in so unselfish a way and borne so cheerfully and unstintingly by the few millions of people that live in the islands in the North sea. . . . To some, and I confess to myself, it is time, for very shame's sake, that we did something and did something adequate. Oh, but say some objectors, Great Britain is bound to protect the empire, her prestige demands it, her interests demand it. Well, all I have to say of that argument at the present time is that it is not the argument of the brave.

That is the opinion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. But there are some others here. There are some gentlemen in the cabinet who had something more to say in regard to where they stood in respect to the Minister of Public Works. It was not only the Premier and the Minister of Trade and Commerce who had the quarrel with that hon. gentleman, My hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) speaking on February 15, 1910 said:—

I am not here to defend the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I frankly say I do not agree with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. Secretary of State will tell us where he and the Minister of Public Works got together. And then the doughty Minister of Militia, who I heard had a hard time getting his place in the cabinet, but the boys on this side after all are very pleased that he should get it; there are lots of fellows who thought he should not have that position. But the Minister of Militia and Defence did not hesitate to condemn the views of his colleague the Minister of Public Works. On February 17, 1910 the Minister of Militia said:—

The policy of the opposition is an imperial navy under the one flag united and strong under which Canada will have ample protection.

What has the Minister of Public Works got to say to this statement of a minister of the Conservative party? Did he ever stand for that? Has he ever by word or voice in this country, in this House or anywhere else, declared that Colonel Hughes' statement of the position of the Conservative party was the right one? Then there is my hon. friend the Minister of Labour—and I can run over almost any one of them except my hon. friend the Minister of Customs who I do not think butted in on this occasion—who said on November 30, 1910:—

Mr. Speaker, the difference in a few words between the two parties is this, that the Liberal party wants a few ships, as they say, to protect our own coast, while the Conservative party declares for: one King, one flag, one navy.

There is another gentleman that has to reckon with the Minister of Public Works, or that hon. gentleman has to reckon with him: Take my friend the Minister of Agriculture, that strange selection which supplanted a man whom we in the Liberal party all thought was the farmer representative of the Conservative party par excellence, Mr. Andrew Broder.

Any hon. gentleman who will read the patriotic effusion of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) will find that, instead of there being a little difference on the question of fact, such as the Premier said existed between him and the Minister of Public Works, their divergence was wide as the poles. The hon. gentleman quoted Tennyson's poem about "One flag, one fleet, one throne." That is not the ideal of the Minister of Public Works—or if it is, he has a new birth, he has been absolutely converted since September 21. Now, this is where these gentlemen stand—this curious combination that now governs this country, this "broadbottom" government or coalition. There was my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) declaring to every audience that he spoke to in Ontario and throughout Canada that he was a loyal follower of our great leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) down to the time of reciprocity. No fault with the navy had the hon. gentleman; he was for the navy established by the Liberal party, he was not for the navy of the Nationalist party nor was he for the navy proposed by the present Prime Minister. But the members

of this strange conglomeration that has been got together, these men of divergent views, decline to tell us on what basis they came to an agreement. The hon. gentleman was a supporter of the Liberal party except on reciprocity. On every other point he was in favour of the policy favoured by all the supporters of the late government. I wonder what kind of an arrangement, the Minister of Public Works has with his desk mate (Mr. White). The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) used to talk about men who, being on the toboggan slide, found the descent very easy. The Minister of Finance (Mr. White) when he cut clear of reciprocity made a complete and sudden descent He now accepts the Nationalist party with all the other features of a policy which formerly he found objectionable. I wonder whether the Conservative tiger has swallowed the Nationalist lamb, or whether the Nationalist tiger has swallowed the Conservative lamb. That is a conundrum that the small boys on the back concession line in Ontario will be asking.

But seriously speaking, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD. If hon. members on the other side can take anything but a serious view of the anomalous position that the two men who practically sit alone at this moment on the government benches occupy before the people, I can only say, I wonder at their levity. One of these gentlemen, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) went up and down the province of Quebec addressing meetings at which resolutions were passed with his consent denouncing the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) beside whom he sits to-day. A proud position the gentlemen are in who support that combination without knowing how it came about and who only laugh at the situation. Is this a party to be trusted with the responsibility of the destinies of Canada? The Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works were wide as the poles apart in their opinions upon the vital question of the relations of this nation to the empire, yet they sit now cheek by jowl and do not even deign to give parliament the slightest explanation of how they got together. What can this be but a coalition government?—one in which differing elements have come together to try to carry on the affairs of the country notwithstanding their differences on the question of the relations of this country to the whole empire. Up to this moment, so far as the country knows, they have disagreed. I contend, as declared in this amending resolution, that every constitutional precedent, every rule to be found in books dealing with the long line of parliamentary history either here or in Great Britain, declares that it is the bounden duty of the head of an administration in such a position as the present Prime Minister to give to the House and the country immediately a complete statement as to how this coalition was brought about. It is true, he attempted to do something of the kind last night. His reference to the disagreement between himself and his colleague was to the effect that two years ago they had a dispute about a question of fact. When I heard that statement last night, I hesitated to believe that I had correctly understood the hon. gentleman, believing that the Premier would not deal with such a question in that way. I waited to see if 'Hansard' would verify my understanding of what he said. I find that 'Hansard' does verify it. The hon. gentleman knew when he was making that statement that he was giving us only half the truth. He knew that this difference in policy existed until the time when he and the Minister of Public Works met and agreed upon the terms on which the Minister of Public Works and his followers would come in. He knew that there was a third party, the Nationalist party with whom he was dealing. This was shown by the additional fact that when he came to make these arrangements he did not go and ask the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) and the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) to come in singly, but, contrary to the wishes of the large body of straight Conservatives in Quebec, who did not want either of these gentlemen in the government, he committed to the leader of the Nationalist party (Mr. Monk), who was to come into the coalition, the task of selecting the colleagues whom he would bring with him. That statement has been made publicly, and is unquestionably true. It is not an ordinary thing for a Prime Minister to negotiate with a leader of another party. Does he expect this country to be satisfied with the story that two years ago this hon. gentleman whom he has taken into his cabinet, the Minister of Public Works, and he 'had a little difference of opinion about a question of fact' not a question of policy? I trust my hon. friend the Prime Minister will be serious at least on the assumption of the important duties which he has been called upon to perform. He surely does not think that the Canadian people will submit to the peculiar performance which he is attempting to impose upon them. Down in his own constituency of Halifax there are men who are wondering how it was that the Monk-Bourassa element were supporting this government. Does the hon. gentleman count on the slavish adherence to himself and his party of men who are looking for office, preferment and position? Surely, he will hesitate to inaugurate his career as

Prime Minister of this country by taking such a position as that. Rather should he follow the lines of the great men who have ruled in this country and in Great Britain, and make a statement to the public of the basis on which this coalition has been made. How can he refrain from doing so? Are we to be satisfied with what has been said, and to accept this as the last word to be spoken about the matter? Except as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works may have discussed this question here and there, is no one ever to know whether the Prime Minister gave up his high ideals for the working out of a plan of co-operation between this country and the rest of the empire in regard to naval service or whether the Minister of Public Works has given up his position on this question?—that position with which he and his coadjutors attempted to so alarm the whole province of Quebec by extreme language denunciatory not only of our leader but of his own.

Which one of them, Mr. Speaker, has gone back on his position? Sir, I say that the motion made by my great leader here is one which demands an answer from these gentlemen, is one that this House and this country demands an answer to. Either the Minister of Public Works will tell us whether he has gone back on his position, or the Prime Minister will tell us whether he has gone back on his. This House and this country await an announcement on this question.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (E. Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) who resumed his seat before recess, has certainly dispelled the gloom that was cast over the chamber yesterday and to-day. We heard the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and, with him on that side of the House, we heard the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), and the wails and woes that came up from these hon. gentlemen reminded one of a chapter of Lamentations. Apparently the word was sent forth to-day that something must be done to endeavour to cheer up the back benchers and so the hon. member for Pictou has done it to his heart's desire. One thing above all others that he tried to do was to endeavour to point out that upon this side of the House on the naval question there was a division of opinion. I think it would be well first to look at their own household and particularly on the question of reciprocity. Yesterday afternoon we had from the hon. member for South Wellington the statement that reciprocity was as dead as a door-nail, never again to be resurrected, never again to be brought forth from that bourne to which it had been followed by a large majority of the electors of this Dominion. But, this afternoon, the hon. member for Carleton, N. B. (Mr. Carvell) came forth with the statement that reciprocity still was a live issue in this Dominion. Well, we have to leave it to these hon. gentlemen to settle their differences among themselves. I tell them once again that they had better take heed to the differences that exist amongst themselves.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is not in his seat because I wished to congratulate him and at the same time to sympathize with him. The hon. gentleman has made complaint that for a long time sundry and divers gentlemen on this side of the House were knocking at the doors of the cabinet. What can be said of the hon. member for Pictou who, in season and out of season, was at the same portal and who is now doomed to the most bitter disappointment of all, because I think the man hardly lives who can see a time in the future when the Liberal party will again be ushered into being as the dominant party in Canada. The hon. gentleman spoke of the outsiders in the cabinet. If there have been some gentlemen introduced in the cabinet to-day who formerly had not the honour of seats in this House, what can be said of the preceding government when it came into power? They had drawn from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and it was a well-known caustic remark of the late Mr. M. C. Cameron, who represented the constituency of West Huron in this House, that when he made his appearance at the initial bow of the Laurier government he asked the Premier to introduce the gentlemen who were sitting on the front seats, and Mr. Cameron himself had been a member of this House for many years. A party may have some additions to it. We always welcome additions. Do not hon. gentlemen opposite welcome additions? I see the serene countenance of the hon. member for St. John, N. B. (Mr. Pugsley). In the times of the Liberal-Conservative party, when differences of opinion did result it happened that among the followers of Sir Charles Tupper, a gentleman named Wm. Pugsley was in quarantine in Montreal for a whole week seeing whether or not he could be admitted to the government of that day. And, it is well-known in New Brunswick that the hon. gentleman, on more than one occasion, was a candidate on behalf of the Liberal-Conservative party, and I have no doubt at all that had the opportunity been tendered to that hon. gentleman he would have sat pat, as a stand-patter of the stand-patters, in his

own seat as Minister of Public Works. Talk of principles ! Principles at least are not to be found with the hon. gentleman opposite.

The fact of the matter is that there has been a general election. We all seem to concede that this is a fact. There is a cause and there have been results and I see before me the smiling face of the hon. ex-Postmaster-General (Mr. Lemieux) who explained how the result was brought about. There is no complaint from him that the Naval Bill defeated the party, no complaint that reciprocity killed him, but he bears a grudge against a reverend gentleman, Father Vaughan, that a speech made by that gentleman last year brought about the downfall of the party. He will have to settle that with Rev. Father Vaughan himself. Whether it is so or not I do not know. Then, we come to other gentlemen. We come to the hon. the leader of the Opposition. Last night he assigned the cause to prejudice and passion. Well, if there is any man in this country who should be a judge of prejudice and passion I should think it is the right hon. leader of the Opposition. Has there ever been a time in his existence when that has not been his stock-in-trade ? Has there ever been a time when he has not fanned the country with it ? We heard of the time when he was threatening that if he had had that puny musket of his he would have shouldered it on the banks of the Saskatchewan. We also remember that, prior to the elections of 1896, with pious ejaculations, at Chicoutimi in the province of Quebec, he thanked God that there was not an Orangeman in the ranks of the Liberal party, while as a matter of fact he must have known that there was—I was going to say —the ex-Minister of Public Works, who was a prominent leader in his party in New Brunswick, although I will not charge that at the time he was a follower of the Liberal party, because his course in that regard was always very erratic. But, the right hon. gentleman well knew then that a gentleman from Addington in this House, Mr. Dawson, was a most prominent member of the Liberal party and he well knew too that Mr. John A. Barron, who represented North Victoria in this House, was a shining light in the Liberal party. Yet, despite that fact, when the then leader of the Opposition was in the province of Quebec where he wished to fan the wave of sectarian anger, prejudice and passion, he thanked God that there was not an Orangeman in the party. If the hon. gentleman wishes to read the whole debate which took place in 1896 he can do so and in which, when pilloried and held down to his words, the leader of the Opposition did not dare to deny the impeachment that that was an utterance of his in the province of Québec. Why? Because upon the seat of the hon. member for Chicoutimi there was a huge mass of affidavits and declarations from men who had heard him make that statement. I do not assume the hon. gentleman would deny in the House to-day that that was the speech that he made in Chicoutimi. That is the way that he was trying to pacify the people and to do away with all those appeals to race and religion in Quebec and in every part of the Dominion.

Now, we have come down to what probably was the real cause of the defeat of the party and we will go to the eminent authority of the pious and reverend editor of the ' Toronto Globe.' What does that reverend and pious editor say ? Every hon. gentleman knows full well that unless it was true the editor of the 'Globe' never would have said it. So, going to the city of Chicago a few weeks ago, he assigned as the reason for the defeat of the government the wholesale corruption of the people of Canada.

Some corroboration of his statement is to be found in the speech of the member for Carleton, N. B. (Mr. Carvell), who says it was the cash that brought about the defeat of the Liberal party in New Brunswick. This is a sad reflection on the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) that he did not beat the other fellows out in cash.

Another gentleman has come to the rescue in the province of Quebec to explain how elections are carried in that province. A fair inference to be drawn from the statement of the editor of the ' Globe ' is that the cause of the defeat was too much cash on the part of the Conservative party, and too little cash on the part of the Liberal party. We have always heard that the Liberal party are the party of purity. I shall not say that they are not, I shall allow the election courts into which they have been taken to prove that. There is now pending in the province of Quebec an election, and a note of warning has been thrown out by a Liberal newspaper in that province which intimates that there is no prospect of Premier Gouin having a corruption fund of anything like the proportions of that which the late government had in the province of Quebec, and he foretells that dire disaster awaits the party unless the cash is forthcoming. I quote from the Montreal ' Gazette ' of the 20th instant:

> Sir Lomer Gouin has only a meagre influence as far as an electoral fund is concerned, and a great number of Liberal candidates will be obliged to make their elections with prayers.

I wonder what they made them with in the last election in Quebec. I hold in my hand a clipping from a newspaper published at the time of one case that was unearthed in the province of Quebec, that was the case of Lotbiniére. I shall briefly read from the evidence:

The first witness examined was François Blouin, of Ste. Croix, who admitted having received $25 from the respondent. Philias Normand, of St. Antoine, admitted having received money which he used to treat; Joseph Lefebvre, of St. Antoine, received $40 of this, he kept $22 for his own share and the balance he spent; Alfred Lefebvre, of St. Apollinaire, received $80, which he spent.

I have reason to believe that one of the causes that has led to the return of a solid following of the party opposite in many elections in the province of Quebec was, as the editor of this newspaper, Mr. Langlois, says, that it is the funds that tell and the funds alone in the province of Quebec. The trouble is, I think, that all over the country the people have rather got sick of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was not so much a question of reciprocity or of naval policy, but a widespread feeling that the time had arrived in Canada for ordinary common honesty. What a spectacle was presented before the electors in the last parliament, a minister of the Crown charged with having a corruption fund, and the curtain being rung down before it could be inquired into. I shall not say whether that charge was true or untrue, the allegation was made, and was not inquired into. But if a corruption fund or a large amount of money had been handed to him personally he had high warrant for accepting it, because other ministers of the Crown had done the same thing. We have all read in the Toronto newspapers of the celebrated Fielding fund. We have all read in the Toronto 'Mail' of the large fund that was collected, and handed to the ex-premier of this Dominion, and if these things are true—and in the case of the Fielding fund, it was discussed openly in the House—the public as a whole had got sick and sore at heart of the corruption of hon. gentlemen opposite, and wished to put an end to it. As to the province of Quebec the people no longer had that implicit faith in the Prime Minister, by degrees he had been found out. Where had he been found out? In this, that in one part of the Dominion he had preached one doctrine, and in another part of the Dominion he would preach another doctrine; in fact he was all things to all men wherever he happened to meet them so that with these lapses of memory, if we are charitable enough to attribute it to that, the right hon. gentleman hardly knew what he did say as he travelled from one part of the country to another when he assigned to his opponents all manner of crimes and misdemeanours and indulged in false prophecies. That seems to be an inherent quality of the hon. gentleman. I recently read a reference to his early youth, and when I say this is from the pen of that versatile and talented ex-member Nicholas Flood Davin, it will be listened to with attention. Prior to the election of 1878 the leader of the opposition journeyed to the province of Ontario and among other places he spoke in the town of Strathroy. Mr. Davin says:

At Strathroy, after a little speech from Mr. Oliver, Mr. Cartwright plunged in medias res with characteristic vigour, dealing trenchant blows upon Sir John and his unprincipled crew, hurling figures around and above him at intervals, until the air fairly glowed with the coruscation of fireworks sent forth, with all the satirical shock and shiver peculiar to his rhetorical sky-rockets. The presence of Mr. Laurier was somewhat refreshing, because it seemed like a renewal of the old league between the progressive parties in Ontario and Quebec. To confederation we owe the rapprochement which rancour, excited by the representative question, had, of late rendered impracticable. Were the party what it once was, placed firmly on a basis of sound principle, instead of being a mere combination to retain office, one might recall the days when Robert Baldwin found a seat in Rimouski and Louis Lafontaine was returned for one of the ridings of York. Mr. Laurier is a young man of promise, a minister to whose utterances people are ready to listen, and whether friends or opponents, to weigh with generous indulgence; but it is much to be feared that party training is beginning to efface the frank ingenuousness of his nature. Mistakes in political history, such as those Sir Francis Hincks detected in Mr. Laurier's Quebec lecture, are pardonable; to misrepresent opponents and even passing events and recent transactions, so early in his career, are sadly ominous indications of deterioration. It is to be hoped that the hon. gentleman is not to furnish another proof that 'evil communications corrupt good manners,' and that one cannot take a dip in the slough of partyism without permanent defilement.

That was away back in 1878, and I think the country has found since that time that the foreboding of Mr. Davin was only too true, and that the hon. gentleman has been very inconsistent in many attitudes and positions he has taken in the public life of Canada both before and since he became Prime Minister. The trouble with the hon. gentleman was that he had been fed with adulation by his followers to such an extent that he had got into that position that he believed that he had really created Canada. I well recollect the statement of an hon. gentleman, once a member of this House but now a senator, that the right hon. gentleman was the greatest man who ever lived. The adulation that this gentleman showered upon the ex-premier was taken with the best possible grace.

He was afterwards rewarded I do not know whether for that reason or not, with a seat in the Senate.

Now, there is before the House to-day a speech of considerable interest to the people of Canada, because in it there are many

matters of deep import, especially to the western part of this country, the most important and vital part of this great Dominion. One clause of that speech to which I intend to refer for a little time is the clause with reference to the selection of the best route for the Hudson Bay railway. I understand that the last government gave a pledge to the people of the west that that railway would be constructed. The same pledge is being made by the present administration. Transportation is not only to the people of the west, but to the people of the whole Dominion, a most important question but to my mind it is most important to-day that the country should move slowly on this question with a view to adopting the best system that can be obtained. Before the public to-day there are four or five schemes involving the expenditure of millions of dollars. There is the Georgian Bay canal, which will entail an expenditure of probably upwards of $200,000,000. There is the deepening of the Welland canal, a fair estimate of the cost of which is some $50,000,000. Then we have upon us the heavy burden of the Transcontinental railway. The construction of the Hudson Bay railway will cost in all probability some $40,000,000. I am not going to quarrel with the government on the subject of the Hudson Bay railway, but I think the time has arrived when they should appoint a commission of the best men that can be selected to deal with this whole transportation question on its merits. There was a time in the state of New York when an expenditure of some $100,000,000 was contemplated by that state for the deepening of the Erie canal, and I well remember the statement made on that occasion by the New York Central Railway Company that if the interest on that amount were paid to that company it would be prepared to ship from Buffalo to New York every bushel of grain that would be carried there. I am going to ask the House to consider these various routes. As there is a notice with regard to the Welland canal enlargement, I shall not speak of that at any length. But there is already in Canada to-day a system of transportation that to all appearances is going to prevail as essentially the leading route, that is, the system that obtains between upper lake ports and the Georgian bay ports. It may not be within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has within the last year or two spent, at a prospective town on the Georgian bay called Port McNicoll, some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000, and that the government of Canada has spent a large sum of money in improving and deepening the harbour at that port; and I believe the time has arrived when, with larger vessels on the Great Lakes, and with an improved system of railway, and an improved style of cars, grain can be shipped from the head of the lakes to Montreal at three or three and a half cents per bushel. When it is remembered that the prevailing rate by vessel from Fort William to Montreal has been six cents a bushel, this House and the country must realize that before any large schemes are undertaken by the government, the whole question should be inquired into by a competent commission in order that the country may get the very best. With regard to the Hudson Bay railway I have only this to say, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is a huge concern, with practically unlimited money, and if it had been proved that that was a feasible route, and would turn out to be a profitable one, I believe that long ago the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have established that line of communication. Be that as it may, the government are apparently committed to the project, and I presume it will be dealt with in due course by this parliament. With regard to the Georgian bay and lake route, let me tell the House that heretofore the system of transportation carried on by the Canadian Pacific railway has been this: They carry to the head of the Great Lakes all the grain that is collected along their various lines of railway. At Fort William it is transferred to vessels which may go either to ports on the Georgian bay, or to Buffalo. But to-day, with the new means of transportation which the company has established at Port McNichol, and from there to Peterborough, they will be able not only to control the trade of the northwest, but to go to Chicago and Duluth and take the bulk of the trade of 250,000,000 bushels of grain that is going to Buffalo to-day, and bring it through on the Canadian Pacific railway. Now, is there a necessity to-day for all these various systems of transportation that are being mooted? Our own northwest produces 120,000,000 bushels of grain. Of this only 25,000,000 are transported from Canada, the bulk of it finding a market in our own country. In view of that, would it not be wise on the part of this country, before undertaking expenditures running into hundreds of millions of dollars, to postpone the whole question until it has been dealt with on its merits by a competent commission? Nobody would expect men like Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, and the board of directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to go into an expenditure such as they have done at Port McNicoll and to undertake the construction of a road from there to Peterboro, without being fully aware of the vantage ground which their company would secure thereby. A vessel from the upper lakes—and I take any point, either Fort William, Port Arthur, Duluth or Chicago—can make

two trips to Port McNicoll as against one to Buffalo; and when it is considered that we have on the Great Lakes vessels with a carrying capacity of 400,000 bushels of grain, and some with even greater capacity, and that there is an advantage of $4,000 to the vessel on her two trips as against one to Buffalo, one can see how much money that means in a season to the large Canadian shipper and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which will be practically the owners of the ships carrying the grain on that system. Heretofore all the grain carried on the Canadian Pacific railway has been landed at Owen Sound, carried from Owen Sound to Toronto, and from Toronto carried past Peterboro and on to Montreal, and in the winter season it is carried to St. John and taken charge of by the Canadian Pacific steamers.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are in a position to do this. They have their ships on the Atlantic, they have their vessels on the Great Lakes, and they will control more vessels on the Great Lakes, and they will be able to take the grain right from the elevator on the prairie and lay it down at Liverpool, and in consequence of the strategic position they hold in that regard they will be able to give a rate that will beat the rate to Buffalo. Now, a glance at the map will show hon. gentlemen this fact, that Montreal is closer to the north eastern states of the United States, considerably closer, than is Buffalo; and that is the reason why the Canadian Pacific railway people pin their faith on the hope that not only will they control the trade of the Canadian Northwest, so far as it is gathered by their own lines, but they will also take a great portion of the trade from the United States ports on the Georgian Bay. The government and the late administration—and I as representative from the riding affected am willing to and I do thank the ex Minister of Public Works for having regard to that fact—have been liberal, in meeting the wishes of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by establishing, and by helping to improve, this port at Port McNicoll. But Sir, if the position occupied by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in regard to the grain route is a strategic one, the position of the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the Georgian Bay is even better for this reason: At the town of Midland the Grand Trunk Railway Company to-day have three enormous elevators which are by reason of their construction capable of storing probably from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 bushels of grain which means that in the fall of the year grain can be brought from the Northwest placed in the elevators at Midland and at Port McNicoll, there transferred to the cars and carried to the port of St. John whence the Canadian Pacific railway operates lines of steamers, and to Portland, where the Grand Trunk operates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Grand Trunk Pacific steamships will leave St. John and Halifax.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). The hon. gentleman reminds me of the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific steamers will leave the port of St. John as well. It means an enormous advantage to the farmer of the Northwest not only on the outgoing crop, but on the manufactured goods which he wishes to introduce from the other provinces. When these vessels are on the Great Lakes and while they are at the respective ports, of course ports McNicoll and Midland—and before I forget it let me remind the House of this fact also, that the Canadian Northern railway is within about fourteen miles of Port McNicoll, and whether or not it is an accomplished fact it is a well defined rumour in that part of the country that to-day the Canadian Northern anticipate having a port close to those I have already referred to, and there will thus be at those points congregated and assembled the grain trade not only of the Canadian Northwest, but also of a great part of the northwestern states.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Now, there is also this further advantage of the Northwest. Ontario is simply girdled with the systems of the Canadian Pacific and of the Grand Trunk railways. The Grand Trunk to-day have a line of railway to their Midland port from Toronto of about ninety miles. It is a link line that has lately been constructed, a sort of cut-off line. At Toronto you assemble the manufactured goods to the extent of millions of dollars that go to our Canadian Northwest. Toronto is the assembling point from which the systems of the Grand Trunk, and the other different lines of railway radiate, and enter, and whether it be from any town in western Ontario, or whether it be from the city of Toronto itself, there will be a cheap rate obtained by the Grand Trunk for their vessels not only coming down, but also going back. The whole question in transportation in this western country has been the carriage of the grain in one direction, and going back in the other direction empty, and the latter problem will be met, and met to a large extent, by the conveyance back to the west of the manufactured goods of the different provinces by way of the Great Lakes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will get the trade of the American west as well.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Yes, as the hon. member suggests the American west as well.

Now, there are other matters that come into consideration in this respect, and that is the question of the employment of labour on the railways. I have heard estimated the number of men employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I am not going to mention those figures, they seem so large; but every man knows that in every town in Canada of any importance at all railway men are large factors in the progress and in the business of that town, by reason of the fact that they are in the main adults and large earners of money.

What then to my mind is presented to the government of the day, and what is foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne, is the establishment of a system of government elevators in this country, or taking control of the railway elevators so that satisfaction will be granted to the farmer of the Northwest in respect of the complaints that he has to make. Let us assemble grain at the base of the Great Lakes, in the fall of every year at the time when it is moving, and place it there at points where it can be moved forward in the winter months in quantities of 20,000,000 or 40,000,000 bushels. Let us even place there if possible 100,000,000 bushels of grain. But I believe before the government of this country plunges into such huge expenditure as the deepening of the Welland canal, or the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, or even perhaps the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, it would be well for them to take this question up by way of a commission composed of capable and competent men, men upon whom the railway companies or other ulterior influences cannot possibly prevail, and bring down to this House and to the country a well defined plan of transportation so that the country may have the benefit of it, and the farmer of the Northwest may have that which he to-day desires and which he is looking forward to—the cheapest possible freight that can be given to him. Now, I am told that the freight from say Portage La Prairie or Brandon to the head of the lakes is about six cents a bushel. That is a very considerable item. If you can reduce the rate from the head of the lakes to the ocean port of Montreal to three cents a bushel you are going to give the farmer of the west a rate which I think would satisfy him or satisfy him to a very great extent.

I have touched upon these two questions —the question of government elevators, and the question of the Hudson Bay railway—because they come within the purview of the address, and I hope that during the course of the session those matters will be debated and discussed to such an extent that the government will before the close of the session appoint such a commission of high class men so that the whole subject may be discussed on its merits. I have not said to-night one word, and I do not propose at this stage to say anything, as against the Welland canal deepening. That will come up, and no doubt there will also be introduced the question of the Georgian Bay canal. But I do say this, and I say it is a matter for contemplation by hon. gentlemen, that the first thing this government should do is this: Follow up the line of policy foreshadowed here whether it is by the establishment of elevators or their control at the Great Lakes, or whether it may not be as I think it should be, by co-operation with the great city of Montreal which has established at that port—and the city of St. John also—elevator accommodation of most capable dimensions so that the trade will be centralized there to the greatest possible extent, and the farmers of the west, the manufacturers of the different provinces, and the great railway interest—for it is a great interest—will get the benefit.

So far as the naval question is concerned, upon which a good deal has been said on the other side of the House, I have little to say, and for this reason,—that today there is a naval policy before the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen on this side found it when they came in, and they will have to deal with the question. I am quite satisfied, as a supporter of the government, to take the assurance of the Prime Minister that the government are going to meet the matter squarely and deal with it on its merits. The proposition has its adherents and it also has its opponents. I do not believe that this government ought to have its hand forced on the present occasion, or that it should be compelled to take a stand on this issue. I think that the fair opinion of the country and the House will be that on this question the government should be given a free hand. The people of the country, I think, are satisfied. They declared their satisfaction in no equivocal way in the elections that have just been held.

And if there was one source of strength more important than another in the ministerial party it was in the fact that they had at their head a gentleman who is known to the people as one who met public questions squarely and dealt with every issue without hesitation or equivocation. And every man, irrespective of politics, must admire the splendid position taken by the Prime Minister when he went through Manitoba and Saskatchewan and stated openly that, even at the price of power he was not prepared to recede from the stand he had taken on the reciprocity pact.

Every member of this House, whether on this side or the other, must congratu-

late the country on the present state of prosperity, and all will join in the hope that that prosperity may be continued for many years to come. And if prosperity is with us—and we all know it is—we are thankful that Providence has been kind, that the sun has shone and the rains have fallen, giving us abundant crops. Our people have been industrious and in their prosperity are content. They know that their prosperity is due in no small measure to the policy of protection brought forward in this country many years ago, a policy not broken into rudely or harshly by hon. gentlemen opposite even when they held the reins of power. As an admirer and humble supporter of this government, I do hope and trust that in their tenure of office they will stand by this policy which has given Canada prosperity since 1878 and by strict adherence to which we may look for continued prosperity for the future.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (St. John City). Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the very admirable address of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) on the transportation question I was impressed with his very great ability, and could not but think what a pity it is that one possessed of such ability should descend to such small ideas as some of those he expressed, and should indulge in personalities on an occasion when we are engaged in the consideration of questions of vital importance to the country. I do not propose to follow my hon friend in these personalities. So far as my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is concerned, nothing that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) can say will detract from the unique position which that gentleman occupies in the eyes of the people of this country and in the eyes of the English speaking world. He stands to-day before the whole world not only as one of the greatest of Canada's statesmen, but as one of the greatest of imperial statesmen. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has thought fit, even on a motion calling attention to the extraordinary position occupied to-day by two wings of the government towards each other, to refer to my having changed my politics some fifteen years ago. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) knows the circumstances under which I changed. He knows that at the time I had the sympathy of a large number of the people of St. John. He knows that a large portion of the people were then taking a stand upon what they thought—whether rightly or wrongly—was a great act of injustice on the part of the government of that day towards the port of St. John and the province of New Brunswick. Whether I was right or wrong is a matter of little consequence at the present time. The stand I took, I took conscientiously. And, Sir, if I had to act again under the same circumstances, I would do again exactly what I did fifteen years ago.

Now I wish, before proceeding with my remarks upon the address to add my congratulations to those already offered to the mover and seconder of the address for the very eloquent speeches they made. More especially do I desire to congratulate my old friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) upon the able manner in which he presented his views to the House. The hon. gentleman comes from the province from which I come, a province that has given many able men to other provinces of Canada, and to other portions of the world. New Brunswick has the honour to have sent my hon. friend into one of the newest provinces of Canada, where he rapidly took the highest position in his profession, until he has now arrived at the position of a member of parliament. New Brunswick gave to the same province its governor. It has given to imperial politics the leader of the Unionist party; and it has given to North Toronto a very able gentleman in the person of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). But when my hon. friend from Calgary goes back to New Brunswick, as he goes every year, or nearly every year, to visit his old home, and contrasts the progress and great prosperity which he sees in other portions of Canada, and especially in its western portion with the want of progress and development which appears in the district in which he was born, he must regret that, instead of sending her sons and daughters abroad New Brunswick could not send more of the products of farm and forest, mine and sea. My hon. friend was born and brought up in one of the loveliest sections of this country, on the banks of the Petitcodiac river, where the soil is capable of producing as abundantly as that of any other part of Canada. Still, I doubt if the population of that district is any greater to-day than it was on the day my hon. friend was born. Now, there must be a cause for this.

Those of us who have watched the trend of events in the maritime provinces ever since confederation, have been of the opinion that the upper provinces do not give, and will not give, and cannot give the people of the maritime provinces a market for their natural products, which it is very desirable for them to have if they wish to attain that measure of prosperity which the people in any part of Canada are reasonably entitled to look forward to. Our natural markets are in the great cities of the republic beside us. The natural markets of the maritime provinces are in the cities of Portland, Boston, Baltimore,

Philadelphia and New York. Looking out from the city of St. John, we imagine we can see across the few hundred miles of water, where there is a great consuming population of upwards of eight millions, who would be glad to buy the products of the people of the maritime provinces, who would be glad to buy our fish, to buy our farm produce. Ever since the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty which was put an end to in 1866, the natural markets of our people have been denied to the maritime provinces, and instead of the progress, prosperity and development which our great natural resources would reasonably entitle our people to expect, we have found practically no growth, practically no increase in population, practically no development of business. We have found many of our farms abandoned, we have seen little increase in population; and as my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) said to-day, the last census returns tell the tale in a most emphatic manner.

Well, Sir, I wish that during the late election I could have had my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) in the city of St. John to aid me in our campaign on behalf of better trade relations with the United States, for the very arguments he has presented to the House to-night would have been potent arguments with the people of St. John, and would have gone far to counteract the arguments advanced by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), by my opponent, Mr. Powell, and by Mr. Sifton, who came there to speak against reciprocity, and also, by the Prime Minister. What was the argument they used? They said: If we have reciprocity with the United States, if the products of the Canadian west are allowed to be admitted free into the United States, the result will be that the vast majority of the products of Canada will go south, or will reach the markets of the old world through the ports of the United States. I argued then, feebly it is true in comparison with the arguments my hon. friend has presented to-night, but I argued that, with the unrivalled trade routes which Canada possesses in the St. Lawrence, in the great lakes, and by the Georgian Bay, we would grasp in the future, if we had reciprocity, not only the trade of our own great west, but we would be also able to grasp a great share of the trade of the fertile states of the American west. That was the argument which I made, and any man who looks at the map, any man who studies the situation in the western states and in the Canadian west, will realize the truth of what I say, and the truth of what the hon. member for Simcoe has so well said to-night. Further, my hon. friend would have said just as I said, that in order properly to develop the trade, to develop it in the west, we must have return freights, whether the freight is being carried by railway or by steamer. My hon. friend said that the railways of our country will draw the products of the west down to the seaboard over Canadian routes to ship them to the markets of the world through Canadian ports, and take back the manufactures of Canada as return freight. I interposed the remark: To the United States as well? And he said, yes, to the western states as well. Is it not reasonable to suppose that if, under reciprocity, it would be true that the Canadian railways would draw eastward to Canadian ports a large portion of the products of the American west, they would want return freights? They would not want to send freight cars back empty. They would carry the manufactures of Canada into those western states where they would be disposed of at remunerative prices, and so greatly aid the manufacturing industries of eastern Canada. Take the case of farm implements. If we had reciprocity so that our manufacturers could send farm implements into the western states, the Canadian railways would be glad to carry those farm implements at a reasonably low rate in order to have the benefit of return freights for their cars which would be bringing out the products of the western states. Now that was one of the arguments which I made. And we had to meet as well as we could the argument which was made by our opponents to the people of St. John that if we had reciprocity the result would be that our whole trade which now flows to the east through Canadian ports would flow through the south and through the ports of the United States. For my part I had no doubt that the opposite would be the case, and I am glad that the people of St. John gave heed to the arguments which we sought to present; and although they did not send two supporters of reciprocity to this House, yet they divided evenly, and I had the honour of being returned from the city of St. John by a reasonably good majority. I am glad also that the province of New Brunswick at large sent a majority of members, eight members out of thirteen, to this House who were in favour of reciprocity.

Now it may be that there is no great pleasure in holding inquests upon dead issues. But hon. gentlemen have to-night discussed reciprocity to a certain extent, and therefore, even at the risk of wearying the House, perhaps you will allow me to present the matter briefly from the New Brunswick standpoint, and to state briefly what we contended for. What I think appealed very strongly to the people of New Brunswick was that this was a reasonable business arrangement between two

countries which would result in the benefit of both, and which must inevitably result to the benefit of Canada, and more especially to the benefit of the maritime provinces, and particularly to the province of New Brunswick. What are the facts? In addition to farm produce, an important industry in New Brunswick is lumbering. To-day our lumber manufacturers have no market for their shingles, which are a very important by-product of the mills, no market for their laths, no market for their boards, except the United States, none whatever, and we are obliged to sell these products to the United States in the face of a very heavy duty. Of the class of lumber of which I speak there was a considerable import from the United States to Canada last year, but it paid no duty. The public men of this country, representing both sides of politics, had thought it to be in the interest of our people that lumber of this class should be admitted into Canada free of duty.

We thought that in the interest of the people living upon the prairies it was of great importance that they should get lumber as cheaply as possible and that no duty should be imposed upon this class of lumber. What were the Americans doing with regard to this great industry which is of such vast importance to the people of New Brunswick? Last year, upon this class of lumber, Canada collected upon imports from the United States the magnificent sum of $50, and the United States collected upon imports from Canada the very large sum of $1,200,000. By this arrangement the United States government, by a stroke of the pen, agreed to throw off the $1,200,000 which they had collected as against the $50 which this government was collecting on their products of a similar kind. That was something that appealed to the people of New Brunswick.

But further, we were able to point to the fisheries, which are of great value. We were able to say that there was exacted upon Canadian fish last year that went over the American border very nearly $500,000, and that notwithstanding this duty we sent over four million dollars' worth to the United States. The value of the fish sent from the United States to Canada was comparatively small. The United States government agreed to throw off this burden upon our fishermen which would give a very great impetus to the fishing industry of the maritime provinces. In regard to farm products we recognize the conditions because we live near the American border and we know what is taking place. We know that the market for potatoes, hay, butter, cream, lamb, poultry and eggs, and other products of the farm, is a most excellent one for the people of the maritime provinces. We have a very great valley watered by the St. John river with the city of St. John at its mouth, and we are able to ship by water to New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston from the very valley of the St. John and we know that 500 miles of water freight is not greater than fifty miles of freight by rail. We have these great markets at our very doors and our people or a majority of them at all events. thought that nothing would do more to enhance the prosperity of New Brunswick than free entry for natural products to the markets of the United States.

Well, Sir, we had another argument to present and it is one to which I invite the attention of this government. It is one that is all-important to the people of St. John. We have had for sixty years a law known as the Pike law, passed by the Congress of the United States under which American lumbermen could cut trees from the forest in northern Maine, float the logs down the river St. John to the city of St. John, have them manufactured there in mills owned by American citizens and the products of the mills sent forward to the United States free of duty. As a result of that very amicable arrangement made by the United States quite an American colony has grown up in St. John, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) well knows. Hundreds of men are employed in that industry. On the 5th day of August last the repeal of the Pike law went into effect. To-day upon this lumber a duty is imposed of $1.25 a thousand on the products of their mills. Had reciprocity been obtained they would have sent their manufactured lumber into the United States free of duty just as they had been doing for the past sixty years. To one big firm in St. John employing many hundreds of men the re-imposition of this duty means a burden on their lumber industry of at least $50,000 per year. As I say, they employ hundreds of men and they are a great factor in the prosperity of our city. If we do not get some relief for them the result will be that their mills will be closed and their industry will be transferred to northern Maine where the manufacture of these American logs can be carried on and from where their product will get into the hands of the consumers in the New England states free of duty. I do not know whether my hon. friends opposite feel like making any representations to the government of the United States and asking them whether, in view of this industry having been built up and continued there for sixty years under this friendly legislation of the neighbouring republic, they might not be induced to continue it for a number of years at all events. Perhaps my

hon. friends may think that it might be taking a step towards the dismemberment of the British Empire to ask for a concession in this respect. However, I merely throw out the suggestion for the consideration of my hon. friends. The matter is one of very great importance. I tell my hon. friends that by the defeat of this movement for better trade relations with the United States a blow of the most severe character has been struck at the province of New Brunswick. There is no question in reference to that. With reciprocity our province would again become prosperous as it was during the years 1856 to 1866.

However, the people of Canada had the determination of that question. The people of New Brunswick stand with the people of Quebec, the people of Nova Scotia, the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Alberta. In all of these five provinces, the majority of the provinces of Canada, the majority of the people have voted in favour of better trade relations with the United States. Their voice has been drowned by the voice of the people of Ontario. Outside of Ontario there is a popular vote of 22,000 of the people of Canada in favour of reciprocity. I think that the people of the great province of Ontario ought to consider well as to whether, in voting down this businesslike arrangement, this fair and reasonable arrangement, they acted fairly to those sections of Canada to which the carrying into effect of this agreement would mean so much and do so much for the prosperity of the people. Ontario is the great manufacturing centre of Canada. She is sending out her manufactured goods by the millions into Saskatchewan and Alberta, whose people have spoken so strongly in favour of reciprocity. She is sending down her manufactures to the lower provinces and she has driven out many manufacturers which we had there some years ago. She has derived a profit and a benefit from the people of New Brunswick. It seems to me that it is well worth the consideration of the people of Ontario as to whether, when the opportunity does come for them to pronounce upon this question again, they may not feel that in the interest of their poorer brethren in these different provinces of Canada they should reverse the verdict which they gave on the 21st September.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Prime Minister rather sought to convey the impression that the people had decided this question upon economic grounds. I say no, so far, at all events, as New Brunswick is concerned. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that he appealed to the people upon other grounds than economic grounds. He knows that he appealed to them to protect the empire from losing this fair Dominion of Canada. He knows that before the campaign was over thousands of people in New Brunswick thought that it was a question for or against annexation. There are some places in New Brunswick where the ladies and children almost went crazy, begged of their husbands and fathers that they should vote down this movement in favour of annexation as they did not want the stars and stripes to float over the people of New Brunswick.

The other day my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) went to the city of New York and addressing the Canadian Club said that he wanted it distinctly understood that the government of this country and the people whom they represent, which would be the majority of the people of Canada, had the most friendly feeling towards the people of the United States and wanted to enlarge the commercial relations between the two countries. If he had told the members of the Canadian Club of the appeals which in his name and in the name of his colleagues were made to the people of Canada I do not think he would have felt that he was in good company in being present with a number of excellent American citizens. Is it evidence of a friendly feeling towards the people of a country that when you are discussing a business-like arrangement which the one government has made with the other you will tell the people whom you are addressing that the government was not sincere, that while it was pretending to offer you simply a trade agreement yet it had something back of it all and intended to make this agreement a means of drawing you away from your allegiance to the British Empire and forcing you to become a state of the American republic? If I can convince you that that was the course which was pursued in the province of New Brunswick, I think you will agree with me that no public man who encouraged appeals of that character ought, for some years to come, to be seen at any public meeting or gathering in the United States of America.

In the city of St. John at the great gathering which met to give a greeting to my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) shortly before the election a large number of transparent mottoes and campaign slogans were displayed; among them was one which greatly impressed the crowd and which was cheered. What was it? It was: 'No truck with the Yankees,' and my hon. friend the leader of the government made an appeal to the people of St. John on the ground of their being the descendants of the Loyalists, the men who had left their homes in the United States after the war of the revolution in which they had taken part, in order to save the colonies for the British Crown. He appealed to them, and he

knew he was appealing to the tenderest and warmest feelings of the people of St. John when he sought to touch them upon their loyalty because they are proud to be the descendants of loyalists. He is reported in the 'Standard, the Conservative paper published in St. John and which I believe is regarded as the mouthpiece of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen); I think I am correct in saying that popular opinion is correct in that respect because I doubt if any editorial would ever appear in the St. John 'Standard' unless the editor were sure it had received or would receive the approval of the minister. This is what the Prime Minister, then the leader of the opposition, said to the people upon that occasion:

Even if the economic advantages of the agreement were threefold I would still be opposed to the pact. You must have some regard for what was done by your fathers when their loyalty led them to leave their homes in the United States and come into a wilderness to commence anew. The pact would affect our nationality. A nation is a partnership of the dead, the living and those yet to be born, and I ask the sons of the loyalists to be on their guard because the great work which their fathers have done will be threatened. The loyalists acted on principle, and if they had not so acted this great country to-day would not be under the British flag.

What stronger appeal could be made to the inhabitants of a city a majority of whom are descendants of the Loyalists who had sacrificed all in order to remain under the British flag? Did the Prime Minister fix opposition to reciprocity on economic grounds? No. He knew he was in a city where it would be infinitely to the advantage of the people if this agreement were approved of and he knew that if the people were to deal with the matter on economic grounds alone, I and my colleagues would have swept the constituency by 1,000 votes. Therefore he threw the economic reasons to the winds and said: I appeal to you, the Loyalists of St. John, you the descendants of the men who sacrificed their homes and all the comforts of life and came and hewed out homes in the wilderness in order to live under the British Crown, I call on you to be true to the flag of your fathers, I call on you to stand by the old flag which they loved so well and for which they made such great sacrifices.

The next day the same newspaper says:

After such a meeting as that of Tuesday night, there can be no doubt that the people of this city as a whole are opposed to the Laurier surrender of our commercial rights to the United States. There are still freeborn British subjects who do not believe in handing over trade relations of this country to foreigners. They are determined to rule themselves and are not to be the serfs of an alien nation which has always sought the destruction of Canada, and in 1812 invaded its territory to accomplish this purpose.

Driven out of Canada at that time, largely by the militia of the country, they have since sought its ruin by adverse tariffs in the hope of creating a discontent that would lead to annexation. Failing to accomplish their purpose by this means, they now come forward with a left handed trade agreement by which they hope to get control of the country commercially and afterwards politically.

When these hon. gentlemen talk about being friendly with the people and government of the United States, I ask if they can be sincere in that after telling the people from the various platforms and through their newspaper organs that the government of the United States was not sincere in offering this arrangement, that while on its face it appeared all right, yet back of it was the deliberately formed intention and sinister design upon the part of the government of the United States to in some way get control of the commerce of Canada in order thus to force us into annexation, and so draw Canada away from the British Crown. I can imagine no greater insult being cast upon the government of any country than these gentlemen and newspapers have cast upon the government of the United States.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What about Champ Clark?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not excuse Champ Clark, but because a man in one country makes a fool of himself is no reason for hundreds of others seeking to get votes by appealing to the passions and prejudices of the people.

'No truck with the United States,' they said in St. John. Well, Sir, what are the facts so far as our trade with the United States is concerned? Our trade with the whole world last year amounted to $759,000,000. What was it with the United States? $404,000,000. And yet their slogan is: No truck with the United States. What was the total trade of Canada when the government of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce was a member, went out of power? In 1897, $249,244,274 was the total foreign trade of Canada with the whole world, the United States included. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you will see that the trade of Canada with the United States for the year ending the 31st of March, 1911, was 50 per cent greater than the trade of Canada with the whole world when the Conservative government went out of office. And yet we are told, no truck with the Yankees. Why, Sir, this agreement only had the effect of placing a comparatively small quantity of goods upon the free list. One would think, to hear these gentlemen talk, that the addition to the free list of a few million dollars worth of goods would have some terrible disrupting effect upon the

empire. If I remember rightly, it would affect only $9,000,000 worth of goods, and what was the value of the free goods that Canada imported from the United States last year without any reciprocal arrangement: $131,867,507, or some thirteen times as much as it was proposed to add to the free list by this arrangement.

Then, I want to make an appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce by an argument which he has often made to this House that it is most desirable, if possible, to have the balance of trade in favour of Canada. My hon. friend has made many a speech to show how injurious it is for Canada to have a balance of trade against her, and I take it that what applies to the whole Canadian trade will apply to its trade with any particular country. What were our imports from the United States for the year ending the 31st of March last? $284,934,-739. And what were our exports to the United States? 119,203,201. In other words the excess of our imports from the United States over our exports to the United States last year amounted to the enormous total of $165,731,536. Can hon. gentlemen wonder that when the members of the late government saw an opportunity to get better trade relations with the United States, so that we might be able to send there more of our lumber, more of our fish, more of our farm products, and so level up the trade between the two countries, we felt that we would not be doing our duty to the people of Canada if we had refused the opportunity? Had you any doubts, Mr. Speaker, from what you knew of the temper of the Conservative party some years ago, that if it had become known that the late government had an offer of reciprocity in natural products with the United States, and had rejected the offer, that the strongest condemnation would have come from the leaders of the Conservative party? And I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, now that you are removed from the storm and tempest of political life for a few years, and are able to consider the matter calmly, if you are not struck with amazement when you think that a plain and simple business agreement so advantageous to Canada should have been the means of arousing those appeals to national prejudice and to the loyalty of the people, with the result that to many thousands of people it was simply a question of voting for annexation or continuing to be a part of the British Empire?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you pause for an answer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to hear my hon. friend. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Simcoe has misquoted the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). My hon. friend from South Wellington did not say that reciprocity was a dead issue. What he is reported in 'Hansard' as saying is that the electors have for a time disposed of that question, having given their verdict upon it. I would be sorry if a member on this side of the House should say that reciprocity was a dead issue. So far as we from the province of New Brunswick are concerned, it is by no means a dead issue. We intend, as the opportunity arises from time to time—and I think I can speak for all my colleagues from New Brunswick—to plead for justice from our fellow subjects in the province of Ontario. We cannot help thinking that when they come to think the matter over, when they forget many of the things which had their influence upon them, when they come to know that the right hon. leader of the opposition was not responsible for the ne temere degree, they will have a different view—because I have heard it said that it had been stated in many places that Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced a Bill into parliament under which this decree became possible, and when they realize the complexion of this government, when they realize that the Nationalist party is practically in control, so far as dictating the policy of this government is concerned, we believe that they will change their minds. As to the Nationalist party being in control, have you a doubt, Sir, that if the Nationalists were not in this government, there would be an important clause in the speech refering to the naval policy? Why, that is the question that is in the minds of all the people of this country, and how absurd it was to frame a speech which makes no reference to the great question which is of vital interest to the people for whom they are supposed to speak. It is true they have referred to a few minor matters in the speech from the Throne, but upon this great question they are absolutely silent.

Now, I do not want to attempt to add anything to the magnificent speeches which have been made by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and the hon. gentlemen who have followed him on this side. I feel that they will have a tremendous effect upon the people of this country. Many Conservatives, when they understand from those speeches the situation, when they understand how they have been humbugged and deceived, when they understand that they are now living under a government far different from the one they anticipated they would have when they cast their votes on the 21st of September, will, I think, be intensely indignant.

I remember that in the city of St. John, after it became apparent from statements which Mr. Bourassa was making in 'Le Devoir' that there was an alliance between

my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier, Mr. Bourassa, and the other Nationalist leaders, on the one hand and my hon. friend the present leader of the government on the other, I ventured at a public meeting, a very largely attended meeting, to say that I believed there was this alliance and that it was capable of proof. I remember that a very prominent and very able young Conservative rose in the audience and said: Mr. Pugsley, will you allow me to make a few remarks on this question? I replied: Certainly. Then this young man said: I want it clearly understood—and remember he was one who occupies quite a high position in the organization of the Conservative party, he was a gentleman who spoke from many different platforms—I want it distinctly understood that there is no alliance between Mr. Borden and Mr. Monk, that there is no alliance between the Nationalists and the Conservative party. And added: The Conservatives of St. John would not stand for it. Sir, I venture the assertion that if it had been known there was the alliance which the subsequent events have shown to have existed and which was concealed from the people of Canada—the result as far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned would have been very different from what it was, and instead of our only carrying eight seats out of the thirteen, which was not too bad a record in view of the forces arrayed against us, we would have secured at least twelve seats in that province. Sir, I cannot tell you how deeply I, as representing the maritime provinces, regret that there is not an evident determination on the part of the government to proceed vigorously with the naval policy. I am one of those who listened with profound admiration to the speech of my hon. friend from North Toronto, now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, on the navy question. It seemed to me that he showed so clearly what was the duty of Canada that it would be impossible for the members of this House to do anything otherwise than they did do namely, to agree upon a resolution along the lines suggested by my hon. friend, and then to pass it unanimously, so that it might go forth to the country that all the representatives of the people of Canada in this parliament were united in favour of the policy of building a Canadian navy, to be manned by Canadian seamen, and to be controlled by the government of Canada, and, what is of vital importance, to be placed at the disposal of the British Empire in case of war, and to be used for the service and defence of the empire. But, to-day, Sir, we find that in the government there is a strong and a potent force which says in the first place: We shall have no Canadian navy. It is a waste of money, the money would be better employed in developing the resources of Canada, and who say in the next place: If we do have a Canadian navy it shall be used solely for the defence of Canada and that no government shall be allowed by parliament to have the power to place that navy at the disposal of the empire in case of war. And the gentleman who either really leads the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, or who is very close to the leader, Mr. Bourassa, has the coolness to state in 'Le Devoir' what are the questions that shall be submitted to the people of Canada when the plebiscite is presented. And think of it, Sir, one of the questions which he declares shall be submitted is as to whether the Canadian ships shall be available for the defence of the empire in case of war. Think of it being suggested to any self-respecting government that they should, without having a policy of their own upon the matter, that they should leave as an open question to the people of Canada a matter upon which some of them would speak, if they spoke at all, one way, and others of them, if they spoke, would speak the other way, as to whether the ships of this great and growing young nation, one of the most important parts of the empire, should, in case the safety of the empire was imperilled, be available for its defence and preservation. Mr. Bourassa actually suggested that that should be submitted as one of the questions which should be determined by a plebiscite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to dwell for a moment or two upon some other questions which are suggested by the speech, not all of such importance as the naval question, but which are worthy of some attention. It is stated that the government propose to aid the construction of highways throughout the Dominion, and, Sir James Whitney in his manifesto to the people of Ontario claims credit for the suggestion of this idea, because he says he was the first one to mention it to Mr. Borden, the leader of the government. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett, Calgary) who moved the address referred to the question of highways, but he gave no intimation—because I presume he was not instructed as to what information he might give—as to what the government proposed to do in this direction. Have they a policy on this, Sir, do you suppose? Do they intend to build a great national highway as a federal work from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or do they intend to take charge of the building of byroads throughout this great Dominion, and so take the work out of the hands of the provinces, and of the municipalities? What is their policy? What do they propose to do? I believe they will tell us they have not settled upon the policy yet. All they know is that they have made a promise to Sir James Whitney, and that there is an

election on in the province of Ontario. And they know very well that if they put it in the speech from the Throne it would enable Sir James Whitney to keep his promise to the electors.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because Sir, the premier of Ontario said that in a few days he hoped to be able to make a definite announcement that aid would be given to highways in that province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sir James Whitney is also reported to have referred to the fact—a fact which nobody can deny—that under the very excellent fiscal policy of the late government Canada has progressed so highly on the whole, its revenues have increased so well by reason of its vast foreign trade, that we have a surplus to hand over this year to our successors of about $35,000,000, and Sir James Whitney suggested to the people of Ontario, if he is correctly reported, that this surplus should all be used for provincial purposes in the building of highways, the improvement of agriculture, the building of colonization roads, and generally for the development of the newer sections of the Dominion, but having more particular reference to northern Ontario. In addition to that he announced that an agreement had been made to reimburse the Ontario government for the cost of building the government railway, the Ontario and Temiskaming railway, at all events to the extent of $6,400, per mile. Now, Sir, I do not hesitate to say that this proposition to hand over certain moneys to the provincial governments or to the municipalities to assist in the building of highways throughout the country is going to lead in the very near future to the very greatest possible dissatisfaction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the Dominion government once enters upon the building of ordinary highways, ordinary by-roads, throughout the country where is to be the limit of the expenditure? By what means are you to satisfy the different provinces of Canada, that they are being treated fairly? Upon what is the grant to be based?

The government has not felt able to say a word upon the naval question because they have not matured their naval policy. Am I right in supposing that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) cannot tell me anything about the government's policy with regard to the highways because that policy has not been matured? Having left out all reference to the navy and having put in what they have put in with regard to the roads we might have assumed that they have a policy with regard to the roads that they have given careful attention to it and worked out the details. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, I understand, is to follow me, to inform me and to inform the House as to the mode in which the government propose to distribute the federal moneys for the purpose of building highways in the various provinces of the Dominion. I could understand, if it were proposed that the government should itself take charge as a federal work of the building of national roads, such as a highway from coast to coast, that that might be justifiable and might be of great advantage to the people—I say nothing as to that until I give the matter further consideration. But, with regard to the other mode in which the moneys might be distributed—handed over to the provinces to pay part of the expense—I will say that would be entirely unjustifiable. It would work great detriment to the revenues of Canada and would prove a source of very great dissatisfaction to the people of the different provinces. Besides, how would it be done? Would it be based upon population? Or upon the length of the roads in the different provinces? The British North America Act provides a basis upon which subsidies shall be given to the different provinces, and I venture to say that it would be contrary to the letter of the British North America Act for the parliament of Canada to apportion subsidies to the different provinces for any such purpose and hand these subsidies over to the provincial governments unless and until an amendment of the Act had been secured, which amendment could be made only by the parliament of Great Britain. I think it is due to this House that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Hazen) should give some explanation of what the government propose to do in this connection.

With regard to terminal elevators, I think that upon this subject also the House is entitled to some explanation as to what the government propose to do. Why limit it, as the speech says it is to be limited, to elevators on the Great Lakes. What elevators are proposed to be taken over? Is it intended to take over the expensive elevators built by the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific at Port Arthur and Fort William, in addition to the elevators owned by what may be called private companies? If so, why limit it to the western shores of the Great Lakes? May not grain be mixed on its way eastward after it has passed through these elevators? Why not take over also the elevators at Tiffin and Midland? Why not take over the elevators of the railways at Montreal? What was the Minister of Marine thinking of as the representative of St. John, when

he allowed the speech to be silent as to the taking over or building elevators at the port of St. John to be under the control of the government? Surely it is of as great importance to have the elevators in the port of St. John through which pass every winter many, many millions of bushels of grain, and through which, we hope, in the not distant future will pass many more millions—surely it is as important for the government to control these elevators in order to make sure that the grain is not mixed, that no injustice is done, and that the reputation of the port is maintained at the highest notch, as that elevators on the western shores of the Great Lakes should be taken over. I merely throw out these suggestions for the consideration of the minister as I believe they are worthy of consideration. When I read the speech I thought it unjustifiably silent with respect to elevators at other points than those on the Great Lakes.

But the speech was disappointing to me and I am sure it will be disappointing to the people of Canada on another ground, that while reference is made to the Hudson Bay railway and to the opening of a new port in our northern country, no reference is made to the existing ports of Canada through which our trade is now being carried on. Is this because the government has no policy in that respect?

Mr. MONK. Had you any?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MONK. You never announced it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We did not talk; we worked. We went on, we had been going on year after year carrying out one of the grandest transportation policies that any country could have. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has borne testimony to what we have been doing. Let me, in answer to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) add just a word to what the hon. member for East Simcoe has said. We recognized a few years ago the enormous advantages which would be afforded if the ports of Victoria —now known as Port McNicoll,—and Midland could be developed for use in connection with the traffic not only from our own west but from the western states through Canadian channels. We found that from the head of Lake Superior to the eastern side of Georgian Bay is 260 miles shorter than to Buffalo. And that from Port McNicoll to Montreal is 70 miles shorter than from Buffalo to New York. So that the distance from the head of the lakes to Montreal by way of Port McNicoll is 330 miles shorter than from the head of the lakes to New York by way of Buffalo.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley)' will allow me: he had the report of the government's own commission in 1904 on the best policy with regard to Montreal and the other ports he had mentioned. Why did they not carry out the recommendations of that commission?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One thing my hon. friend ought to realize,—that to make a port free simply means taking the burden off shipping leaving it to rest on the people as a whole. We thought it better to dredge out the harbours, build the wharves, and encourage the railways and steamship companies. And we have found, I am happy to say, that the trade of the port of Montreal has been increasing so rapidly that, by simply charging reasonable duties, the harbour commissioners have been able to pay their interest year after year and it has not been found much of a burden upon the port. And, as suggested by an hon. member near me, Montreal has become the successful rival of the port of New York.

Mr. MONK. But my hon. friend did not carry out the representations of his own commission; he did not make Montreal a national free port as they advised him to do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have been going on spending a great deal of money for the purpose of bringing trade through Canadian channels down to Montreal, Que. and the ports of the maritime provinces. But has my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or has the government, any policy on this question? If so we naturally would expect so important a subject to be referred to in the speech. My hon. friend cannot say that they ought not to have a policy.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) must remember, that in fifteen years, he never once made that announcement himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. During the election in the city of St. John, I find that a despatch was sent by my hon. friend the leader of the government. It was headed 'Mr. Borden's special message to the people of St. John.' It was published by the St. John 'Standard' on the 20th of September, the very day before the election, just in time to reach the people of St. John through the 'Standard,' which was, according to my information, very generously distributed free at the door of every elector in the city of St. John, irrespective of his political affiliations. That message was as follows:

Mr. Borden's special message to the people of St. John.

Halifax, N.S., September 19, 1911.

Special.—On the 5th April, 1904, I moved a resolution in parliament declaring that the public interest demanded a thorough and efficient equipment of our national ports and

terminals on the Atlantic and Pacific. That has ever since been the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party and has been so declared on repeated occasions. The thorough and efficient equipment of St. John harbour is part of our policy. I desire to emphasize what I declared at St. John on the 5th September, namely, that the defeat of the Laurier government——

And will my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries pay close attention to this language? I appeal to him now as a representative of St. John, whose people are looking to him to see that there is no delay in granting justice to that city, and in proceeding to carry out the promises which the Prime Minister made to the people of St. John—made for what purpose? To get votes?

An hon. MEMBER. Oh no.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I will not say what it was for. At all events, it was sent specially from Halifax on the 19th, in order to be published on the 20th.

—that the defeat of the Laurier government will not retard, hinder or prevent in any way the construction of terminal facilities at St. John, or the equipment and development of that port as one of the Atlantic national ports of Canada.

Mr. HAZEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to hear my hon friend say hear, hear. But might I not suggest that they should be up and doing, instead of saying hear, hear?

Mr. MONK. We will go as quickly as you did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told my hon. friend does not go quickly. I am told that my hon. friend, in carrying out his official duties, found it easier to stop all the public works in Canada than allow them to go on. I have always found it involved very much less trouble to do nothing than to do something, and I have no doubt my hon. friend found it easier to do nothing, simply to give a general order, irrespective of the merits of any particular work, that they should be stopped. Now, Sir, have I not reason to complain, and have not the people of St. John reason to complain, that this great question which was thought by the Prime Minister of sufficient importance to require from him a special message to the people of St. John, through the 'Standard,' telling them what would be the policy of the Conservative party—have I not reason to complain that, upon this great question, the Speech from the Throne is absolutely silent? Remember that what the Prime Minister assured the people of St. John, and pledged to them, was that the defeat of the Laurier government would not in any way retard, hinder or prevent the construction of terminal facilities at St. John. But I have a further complaint to make, and that is against the Minister of Public Works. Pursuant to votes of parliament, I called for tenders for the construction of terminal facilities at the port of St. John. These were under consideration for a long time, as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows, before undertaking to go on with that great national work—because it is a great national work, and that is my justification for taking up the time of the House in referring to it—we had to have soundings taken, borings made, all over Courtenay Bay. That took a long time. We did not know what was underneath the surface of the sand and the mud there. The result of the borings showed us that there is a great basin which evidently had formerly been full of water, even at low tide, and which, with dredging, could be made into one of the finest harbours on the Atlantic coast. It is the only available place at the Port of St. John for the Grand Trunk Pacific to have their terminal facilities, it is the Atlantic port, open all the year round, which is nearest to the city of Montreal. It is, I venture to say, the one Canadian port in the winter season which can successfully compete with Portland and Boston for the vast traffic which the Grand Trunk Pacific is soon to bring to the Atlantic sea-board. Well, after a long time for consideration, after many conferences with the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific, after they had fully made up their mind that this was the ideal port, for freight business particularly, tenders were called for, and they were received on the 10th day of August last They called for the construction of a breakwater, for dredging out the channel leading into Courtenay Bay, for dredging out a basin, and for building wharves for the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Grand Trunk Pacific had agreed with the city of St. John, and myself as Minister of Public Works, that these wharves when built were to be leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific upon the same terms as the Transcontinental is to be leased by that corporation, and therefore, were to form a part of the Transcontinental system. Those tenders, as I have said, were received upon the 10th day of August and opened two days afterwards. But in consequence of there being no meeting of the government until after the election, they could not be considered until after our defeat, and therefore, owing to the magnitude of the work, and the very considerable amount of money which was involved, we thought it right that the lowest tender should be left to the incoming government to deal with.

Mr MONK. My hon. friend has really done nothing whatever in that direction. I

have not been thirty days in the department, and I have already made a definite arrangement for large improvements on the west side. I have done more than my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that. Let me say to him that if our government had been returned, we would have gone on, not only with the work upon the west side, but with the work of Courtnay Bay as well, the contract would have been entered into, and this work would have been under way. Will my hon. friend tell me the nature of the work he is doing on the west side?

Mr. MONK. I will explain it at the proper time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But my hon. friend made the voluntary statement that he was doing something on the west side. Would he say what he is doing?

Mr. MONK. I will explain it at the proper time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend think that is fair?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has accepted tenders for the west side, would he say for what work?

Mr. MONK. It is for a wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad indeed my hon. friend has done that.

Mr. MONK. I merely mention it to show that I have done something. My hon. friend was at the head of the department for a long time and did nothing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend then is oblivious of the charges which have been made against me in regard to expenditure at St. John. I have been charged with spending a very large sum of money at St. John.

If the hon. gentleman will do me the favour to go down to St. John and make some inquiry, or if he will ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think he will assure him that a great deal of important work has been done at St. John on the west side. Let me tell my hon. friend that the building of the wharf, for which he has accepted the tender which we called for and which came in in the month of September last, has only been made possible by reason of the dredging work which we have carried on there for the last two years.

Mr. MONK. I know the hon. gentleman has done a great deal there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend know that it is very important work in connection with harbour improvements? Did not my hon. friend stop that dredging?

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sure? Did not my hon. friend stop that and start it again in a few days after there was some change in the personnel of the dredging company?

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then rumor does not treat my hon. friend justly. It is rumoured in St. John that my hon. friend did stop the work and after some very hot telegrams and after there had been a little new life put into the company, he started the work again.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is quite mistaken about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A little new blood was infused into the company, some hot telegrams came to my hon. friend and he wired down to go on with the work. Still I will say to my hon. friend that I am extremely glad that he has ordered the work to be continued. It is a most important work and if it is any advantage to my hon. friend's party that the dredging shall be done by and under the control of good Conservative friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that makes no difference to me. I applaud the action of my hon. friend just the same in having this work go on and I am very glad that the making of the change in the personnel of the company took such a short time as that the work was not delayed many days.

There is another respect in which the speech from the Throne will be disappointing to the people of the maritime provinces. As you know, for a very long time the question of improving the accommodation of the people of the maritime provinces generally in connection with the I. C. Railway by the acquisition of various branch lines had been under the consideration of the late government and under the consideration of this House. Immediately before the adjournment last summer the then Minister of Railways and Canals had introduced a resolution authorizing the government to take over various branch lines connecting with the I. C. R. This is a matter of very great interest; it is a matter, I think, that is of as great importance as the granting of aid to highways. Of course, there is no election going on in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia and perhaps the question of highways is of more importance to Ontario at the present time than the consideration of the question of taking over the branch lines of the I. C. R. But nevertheless I do think that my hon. friend might very fairly have called the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that this was a burning question in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia,

and I think the government should have announced its policy in regard to the taking over of the branch lines of railway. As to this, surely my hon. friend will not say that the government have had no time to consider whether they should take over the branch railways or not because I find that the Prime Minister gave consideration to this question before the election also. On the 8th September, when my hon. friend the Prime Minister was at Summerside, he thought it of sufficient importance to send a telegram to Mr. Geo. W. Fowler, Conservative candidate for the counties of Kings and Albert, and now a member of this House, in which he stated to Mr. Fowler what would be the policy of the Conservative party in regard to the taking over of the branch lines of railway. I may say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this telegram was not sent so close to the election as his telegram relating to the harbour improvements in the port of St. John ; still it was sufficiently close to the election to show that my hon. friend at that time thought that the question was of large importance and that it was one upon which he should enlighten the electors as to what was the policy of the Conservative party. He says in this telegram :

Summerside, P.E.I., Sept. 8, 1911.

Mr. Geo. W. Fowler,—

Am convinced that interests of Intercolonial railway demand acquisition of branch lines as feeders and we propose to acquire them on reasonable terms if returned to power.

(Sgd.) R. L. BORDEN.

So we find that notwithstanding the fact that the then leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister of Canada, as long ago as the month of September last, had given sufficient thought to these questions, one the development of the harbour of St. John, the other the acquisition of the branch lines of railway, as that he felt safe in declaring what would be the policy of the Conservative party if returned to power, and yet I regret to find that in the speech from the Throne no mention is made of these important questions and we are left entirely in the dark as to what is to be the policy of the government in regard to them.

These are questions of grave importance to the people of a very considerable section of Canada, and I do think that the hon. gentleman, speaking as he did for the Conservative party, having, as he assures the people by these telegrams that he had, made up his mind as to the course that he should pursue, should have taken His Royal Highness the Governor General into his confidence and advised him as to the course which should be adopted and that His Royal Highness ought to have acquainted parliament with the fact that it was intended to deal with these two important subjects in the way in which the Prime Minister indicated that they would be dealt with by these telegrams, one sent to the people of St. John, and the other to the present hon. member for Kings and Albert.

I am very sorry that I have taken up so much of the time of the House. I did not intend to do so when I began my remarks. I had the honour of being asked to second the amendment to the address moved by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Let me say, Sir, that it seems to me that this is an amendment that ought to commend itself to the good judgment of this House. The leader of the government is entirely wrong, when he in effect, says that neither His Royal Highness nor the opposition have anything in the world to say as to the composition of the government. I entirely disavow such a proposition as that. Every one of these gentlemen is an adviser of His Royal Highness. His Royal Highness has the right to have called to his attention by the representatives in this House what has been the attitude of certain members of his cabinet with respect to questions of great national interest in the not distant past. He has a right to be informed as to what were the views which were presented by these gentlemen upon these great questions and this amendment, I think, is eminently proper as expressing what one would hope, if it were possible for hon. gentlemen opposite to release themselves from the trammels of party, would be adopted by the majority of the members of this House. Whether it commends itself to the judgment of hon. gentlemen opposite or not, it appears to us on this side of the House that, with a knowledge of the alliance—the unholy alliance—which had been cosummated between them and the Nationalists who have been taken into the government, we would not be discharging out duty to the people if we did not take the earliest opportunity of submitting our views to the House and embodying these views in the amendment which has been proposed by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, before making a few remarks in reference to the amendment moved by the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I wish to extend to my hon. friend from the constituency of Calgary (Mr. Bennett) my sincere congratulations on the fact that he was selected to move the address in reply to the speech with which it pleased His Royal Highness to open this

session of this parliament and also on the admirable manner in which he discharged that duty. I feel that this is a pleasant duty for me to perform in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman comes from the province from which I come and his career since he has gone to the west has been followed in New Brunswick with the satisfaction with which we always follow our sons when they go forth from our province to larger fields of usefulness.

I would also take the opportunity, in no perfunctory spirit, of tendering my sincere congratulations to the right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on having completed seventy years of life and to express the great pleasure it is to me on returning to this House to find that the right hon. gentleman, although he has reached three score years and ten has done so with his intellectual and physical vigour unimpaired and to express the sincerest hope that for many years to come he may continue to adorn the public life of this country.

I do not desire to say anything personally or otherwise offensive to my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and therefore I regret that he appealed to me with regard to a reference to his somewhat tortuous political career made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, (Mr. Bennett) The hon. gentleman said I knew the circumstances under which he changed his politics in 1896. To allow that statement to go by without a reference to it would be to admit that the hon. gentleman's reply was a complete answer to the statement of the hon. gentleman for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). Briefly I may say that in the year 1896 my hon. friend who sits opposite to me and who has sat opposite to me for many years in the legislature of New Brunswick and with whom I have had intimate intercourse at the bar of that province, was the candidate of the Liberal-Conservative party in the county of Kings. The hon. gentleman was nominated by a convention of Liberal-Conservatives held at Hampton. I was present at the convention. The hon. gentleman accepted the nomination and in a very vigorous speech told how loyal he was to the Conservative party in Canada and after being nominated by the Conservative party he entered upon his campaign. I remember going into the country of Kings and speaking in his support from the same platform as the hon. gentleman himself. But difficulties arose in the county of Kings; a temperance section of the Conservative party were unfavourable to the candidature of my hon. friend and as the election drew near, and as it began to be apparent that it was a difficult matter to solidify the different forces of the party in support of my hon. friend, the hon. gentleman withdrew from the contest doing so in a perfectly correct way by sending a

letter to Mr. Sinnett, president of the Conservative Association, saying that in consequence of divisions in the party it was not desirable that he should continue in the field saying: I hand back unsullied into your hands the banner which the Liberal-Conservative party did me the honour of placing in my hands. He added further: I do not withdraw from the contest because of any difference of opinion with the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada whose trade policy I believe is essential to the prosperity and good of this country, but in order that they may unite on another candidate whose chance of election may be greater than mine. Then the hon. gentleman, returning to St. John, when the elections approached allowed himself to be nominated as the candidate of an independent party in the city. My hon. friend has not been quite candid in telling the House the reasons for his nomination and the platform on which he stood. In the year before, 1895, largely through the efforts of the gentlemen who with me were representatives of the constituency of St. John, a subsidy had been granted for the first time in the history of the community, the result of which was that we had a direct line of steamers connecting with the Canadian Pacific railway from the port of St. John to Liverpool. The hon. gentleman came back to St. John and the issue in that election was the Manitoba School Act and the action of the Conservative party in attempting to pass a remedial Bill for the purpose of doing what I at that time candidly believed and believe yet was simply a measure of justice to the minority in the province of Manitoba. That was the one question in the campaign. My hon. friend has said that he ran as a protest against the way St. John had been treated in connection with steamboat subsidies and the way in which the port had been neglected, but he failed to tell the House of the effective part of the platform on which he ran and that which got him the few votes he obtained—because he lost his deposit——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What happened to my hon. friend?

Mr. HAZEN. I was defeated. But although in the city of St. John there were three candidates, it has always been a pleasure to me that I came out at the head of the poll, being defeated only by a few-votes in the county. That is neither here nor there, I have never thought it any matter of disgrace for a public man to go down to defeat so long as he does it standing on a platform to which he adheres, and of which he honestly approves. The hon. gentleman appealed for support on that platform of hostility to the Remedial Bill, and standing side by side with me at the joint meeting on the hustings he told a large audience that while he had little con-

fidence in the Conservative policy on that question he had no confidence whatever in the hon. gentleman whom he now calls his leader and therefore he could not support him in the contest. Therefore, I regret that the hon. gentleman appealed to me in this connection as I do not wish to say anything offensive, but I think I am right in saying that when the hon. gentleman gave the reasons why he left the Conservative party in 1896 he did not give the whole reason and he was not quite candid in the explanation he gave this House.

But I might add that within three weeks after the 23rd of June when the elections were held my hon. friend, who on nomination day had no confidence in the party led by the hon. leader of the opposition, was the most staunch and noble Liberal of them all. Now, Sir, I was surprised to-night to hear my hon. friend indulge in a jeremiad with regard to the condition of affairs in the province of New Brunswick. One would almost have thought from his utterances, so different from his usual utterances, that the people of New Brunswick were in a down trodden and depressed condition, that business was bad, that they were a poverty-stricken people, without hope and with no share in the prosperity of the country. I might have expected that from some other hon. gentleman, but it is hard to understand it coming from my hon. friend. Year in and year out in the legislature, when I was leading the opposition, for a time a very small one, to the government of which my hon. friend was a distinguished and prominent member, we were delighted when we heard read from the Throne by the Lieutenant Governor sentences telling how prosperous the province was, and how well off the people were, all due to the good government that my hon. friend was giving to the people at Fredericton, and to the good government my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was giving to the people here at Ottawa. I am surprised too because, during the last two years ending on the 21st of September last, my hon. friend, whenever he came to the city of St. John, never made a public speech without pointing out how immensely prosperous the province was, due to the legislation and the policy of the Liberal party at Ottawa; and day after day the St. John 'Daily Telegraph,' which advocates the cause of my hon. friend, kept pointing out, right up to the 21st of September, how prosperous the people were, and that was one reason why they should keep the government in power. Therefore, I am surprised at the position taken by my hon. friend to-night. I suppose it is due to the fact that when sitting in opposition we look through different glasses from those we look through when sitting on the treasury benches; but I would have thought that the optimism and the sanguine temperament of my hon. friend would not have led him in so short a time after he had left the treasury benches to make such utterances about his province. I dispute those utterances, because, while we are not making much increase in population, while the attractions of the west are taking away too many of our sons, I do not believe that man for man there can be found in any other province of Canada a greater degree of happiness than is to be found in the province from which my hon. friend and I come, in which we were born, and in which we shall probably spend the rest of our days.

Passing from that, the hon. gentleman has gone into a long discussion of the result of the election in the province of New Brunswick. I have been somewhat surprised at the position taken by my hon. friend. A gentleman of sanguine temperament, he has always possessed the gift of extracting sunbeams from cucumbers, and he has done that to-night on that subject. The hon. gentleman went into that election with everything in his favour, having at his back eleven members out of thirteen, and a government apparently strongly intrenched in power, a government that many people thought could not be defeated. The hon. gentleman had a strong and powerful support in New Brunswick, and two weeks before the election he stated that his own majority in St. John would probably be from 1,500 to 2,000 and that the Liberals would probably carry every seat in the province. The hon. gentleman now comes with his majority reduced from 1,500 or 2,000 to 61, and says that he had a reasonably large majority, and he exults in the fact that of thirteen constituencies eight elected Liberal members to this House.

But the hon. gentleman forgot to tell the House that two of the gentlemen who were elected as Liberals were elected by majorities of ten or eleven votes, and that the aggregate majority of four of the Liberals returned was less than 150 votes. Considering the fact that the hon. gentleman had every advantage, that he was a member of a powerful government, that he considered that the reciprocity pact would be a powerful factor in his favour, the hon. gentleman has little to boast about in the result of the elections in the province of New Brunswick on the 21st of September last.

Now my hon. friend tries to minimize the effect of what took place in the province by saying that the economic question was not discussed.

It seems to me that one of the principle reasons for the hon. gentleman opposite moving this amendment to the address in reply to the speech, and for the remarks made by hon. gentlemen

opposite, has been to try to make it appear to this House that the people of this country, in the verdict they gave on the 21st of September last, were not actuated by high and lofty motives, not by motives for the preservation of their country and the expansion of its trade, but by narrow and bigoted sectarian feelings; and the whole purpose and object of the amendment, and of the debate upon it from the other side of the House has been to set race against race and creed against creed. One hon. member tells us that the election was the result of passion and prejudice, and a reflection is cast on the three gentlemen of French Canadian birth from the province of Quebec, because, forsooth they entered a cabinet in which my hon. friend the present premier and my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, and others are members. They are told in effect that they are not loyal to their race for doing this. That is intended for consumption in the province of Quebec.

Mr. MACDONALD. Who was it made that remark?

Mr. HAZEN. That is the effect of every speech made on the other side of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. Nobody made that remark, and you made it up yourself.

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Pictou has been in this House longer that I have, but I trust that I shall be in the House a long while before I offend the amenities of debate by such a remark as that just made. On the other hand, members from the province of Ontario are told in effect that they should not be members of a government containing three gentlemen from Quebec who are held up as being Nationalists. That is intended for campaign purposes in the province of Ontario. But it is a dangerous weapon to play with. I am surprised at those hon. gentlemen taking exception to men sitting in the same cabinet who on certain questions in the past may not have seen eye to eye with each other. I look back to the campaign of 1896, when in some provinces hon. gentlemen who belonged to the other side of the House were stating that they were opposed to the Remedial Bill because it did not go far enough to do justice to the minority in Manitoba, while in other provinces men were opposing it because they thought no remedy at all should be given to the minority; yet when the elections were over gentlemen who held these divergent views became members of the same cabinet, sitting side by side at the same council board, and discharging their duties to their country as members of the government.

Mr. HAZEN.

The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvel) has stated that in the province of New Brunswick there was not a proper discussion of the economic features of the reciprocity pact.

The hon. gentleman has stated that he would speak for the maritime provinces in that respect. I challenge the hon gentleman's right to speak for the maritime provinces. The hon. gentleman, in that campaign, was outside his own constituency very little; he was kept very busy there. I challenge the correctness of that statement. During the campaign I spoke in almost every county, if not every county in our province; in every county I think in Prince Edward Island; and in one or two counties in the adjoining province of Nova Scotia. I have been taking part in political campaigns in my own province ever since the year 1882, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that during that time I never knew of a campaign where the discussion was kept down to one issue as it was in the campaign which closed on the 21st day of September last. I never knew of a campaign where so few side issues were introduced as in the campaign which has recently closed. Further than that I say to this House with all sincerity that I have never known a campaign where there was so little attempt to introduce questions of sectarian or of racial character as during the campaign in the province of New Brunswick in the month of September last. Wherever public meetings were held there was one subject and one subject only which electors wanted to hear discussed, and that was the reciprocity pact. I never in my experience saw such large meetings as there were in our province, and I never addressed meetings to which so many Liberal electors came as to the meetings that were held during last September. On all sides there was a desire to hear a free and full discussion regarding the reciprocity pact negotiated at Washington by the representatives of the Canadian government; and the longer that discussion went on—and it was discussed from every possible standpoint, from the trade and economic standpoint as well as from the sentimental, national and moral standpoint—the longer that campaign went on the more strongly I believe the idea was borne in upon the minds of the different business interests of our country, upon our lumbermen, our fishermen, and our farmers—that they did not want that compact with the United States, not only for sentimental and loyal reasons, but because they believed it would have the effect of unsettling a condition of affairs which was satisfactory, under which they were getting large prices for their products, and under which they were more

prosperous than they had ever been at any time in the whole history of Canada. But my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) seemed to be horribly shocked because there was some appeal to the loyalty of the people, because there were those who honestly—either mistakenly or not it may be—who honestly believed that the result of that pact would be to give the commercial control of Canada to the people of the United States, to give them the control of our fiscal system, and in time to bring our political system under their control also. My hon. friend sitting opposite was shocked because in the city of St. John that issue was raised by some gentleman who sat on a public platform. I am the more surprised at this, Mr. Speaker, because I read a short time ago an extract from the report of a speech which my hon. friend made in the city of St. John at a banquet given to the Hon. John Costigan when he was a member of the Conservative government of Canada. And in that speech my hon. friend from the city of St. John took the opportunity of saying that it would be more manly for my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to declare for annexation at once than to declare for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Now, Sir, if unrestricted reciprocity in the mind of my hon. friend then—I will get the extract and send it over to him if he would like to see it—if in the mind of my hon. friend at that time unrestricted reciprocity would lead to annexation with the United States, does he see anything wrong, does he regard it as a very criminal act, that with respect to the reciprocity compact that view should be put forward for the consideration of the intelligent electors of the country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. HAZEN. With pleasure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the time that I am reported to have made those remarks with respect to reciprocity, did not my hon. friend in this very House advocate reciprocity in natural products just as was proposed by the late government?

Mr. HAZEN. If the hon. gentleman will look at the speech which I made in this House in the year 1891, when I had the honour of moving the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, my hon. friend will find some remarks in that speech which I think will justify him in asking the question which he has put to me. But surely my hon. friend realizes there is a difference between the condition of Canada in 1911 and the condition of Canada in 1891.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had a flag, and we had an empire in 1891.

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, we have a flag and an empire, and we propose to keep that flag.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So we had in 1891.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend thought it desirable to-night to mention to this House a story that somewhere or other someone had said that my hon. friend opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was responsible for passing the ne temere decree, that he had introduced a Bill to the House for that purpose. My hon. friend must have a very low idea of the intelligence of the Canadian electorate if he imagines that a story of that sort, if indeed it was ever told, would affect a single vote in Canada. It would be almost as justifiable for me to tell the story here that was said to have been told—it may not be any more true than the one about the Ne Temere decree—a story that was told in a county in my province,in a district where the inhabitants are Acadians. It was said that a speaker went down there, and from the public platform made this statement: That if my hon. friend here (Mr. Borden) was called upon to become premier of Canada the result would be that the next occupant of the Vatican would be a Protestant. The one story is just as true, or just as false as the other. One would have just as much effect as the other. It is an insult to the intelligence of the Canadian people to imagine that any such story would have ever so slight an effect upon their votes, or the formation of their judgment.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend was not very candid, I think, in the attempt he made to have this House, and the country believe that the attitude of my hon. friend the leader of the House with regard to the improvement of the highways in this country was brought forward for the purpose of influencing the local elections in the province of Ontario. Why, the hon. gentleman ought to know—surely he does know—that that amendment was one of the planks in the platform, or the manifesto, which my hon. friend the Prime Minister submitted to the people of Canada for the elections held in September last. The hon. gentleman knows that at that time there was no thought of dissolution, I presume there was no thought then, or no idea then that there would be local elections at the present time, in the province of Ontario. And yet my hon. friend would try and have this country believe that my hon. friend the leader of this House took the course he did with regard to the improvement of the highways of the country for the purpose of influencing elections that were never thought of at that time, elections that no man knew or had any reason to suppose would

be brought on at an early date. I regret very much that this plank in the government's platform is not receiving the enthusiastic support of my hon. friend who comes from the city of St. John. Not only was this plank in the platform of the leader of the government, but it was referred to in the speech delivered by His Royal Highness from the Throne on the day parliament was opened. At the very first opportunity that was afforded to the Prime Minister he gave evidence of his bona fides by informing the House that a Bill would be introduced for that purpose at this session of parliament. That Bill will be introduced, and I am afraid my hon. friend, who to-night is giving evidence of possessing such an inquiring mind will have to possess his soul in patience for a little while until the measure is brought down. Then he will be informed of its details, and I hope the Bill will have his enthusiastic support.

But my hon. friend seems to sneer at the idea, no he does not sneer; that is not his way, but he does not seem to regard with favour this proposition. I am surprised that my hon. friend, who was so long in local politics should take that course. I remember that the present lieutenant governor of the province, speaking in the assembly, when he was Premier said that it was a matter of regret to him that gentlemen who had been members of provincial administrations, when they went to Ottawa seemed to forget that they had ever belonged to provincial administrations and to forget the interests of the provinces from which they came. Surely my hon. friend is not going to allow himself to be placed in the category in which so many were placed by the lieutenant governor of New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman knows that if a policy of this sort could be worked out wisely, nothing would conduce more to the prosperity of the country. He knows how difficult it is to maintain good highways throughout the country; how with the climatic conditions we have to fight, with long stretches of country in which the highways have to pass through woods in which no people were living, it is very difficult for the provinces with their limited resources to maintain good roads. If a policy of co-operation can be worked out that will have the effect of improving the highways of the country, I am sure that no policy will be more popular.

Then the hon. gentleman found fault with the speech because, he said, no reference was made in it to what was to be done with regard to the ports of the country. What, he asked, is to be the policy of the government with regard to the ports of St. John and other ports? And the hon. gentleman himself showed that he had a complete answer to his question, because he took from his desk and read the telegram sent by the Prime Minister in September 19, and published in the 'Standard' of St. John —and I am delighted that my hon. friend reads the editorials in the 'Standard' so closely as he does; I trust he will profit by doing so. That telegram laid down the policy of the Prime Minister, because he reaffirmed the position he took in parliament on the 5th April, 1904, when he declared by resolution that the public interest demanded a thorough and efficient equipment of all ports on the Atlantic and Pacific. That, said telegram of my hon. friend the leader of the government, has ever since been the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party and has been so declared on repeated occasions. The thorough and efficient equipment of St. John harbour is part of our policy. I desire to emphasize what I declared at St. John on September 5, namely, that the defeat of the Laurier Government will not retard, hinder or prevent in any way the construction of terminal facilities at St. John, or the equipment and development of that port as one of the Atlantic national ports of Canada. That is the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) and that is the policy he will live up to. It is a policy that, I am satisfied, will prove most acceptable and satisfactory, not to the people of St. John alone,—because the work in the harbour of St. John should not be regarded as a local work any more than the work in the harbour of Montreal should be so regarded—but to the people of Canada generally. It is a work undertaken that the traffic of this country, conveyed to the ocean ports by our systems of transportation, may pass out through these ports having the best of facilities for handling it expeditiously, economically and well, to Europe and other parts of the world. I feel satisfied that the members of this House will view with the greatest possible pleasure a generous expenditure for putting the ports of this country into such a condition that they can do the business that may be brought to them in a way not surpassed by the ports of any other country in the world.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) spoke as if there was something improper in my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) sending this telegram on that occasion, so soon before the election. He knows the reason why it was sent. The press supporting the hon. gentleman in St. John, and the speakers supporting him on the platform, day in and day out had been declaring that if the government were defeated the result would be that no work would go on in the harbour of St. John. Could my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) have

allowed that statement to go unanswered? He took the course that anyone would have taken and sent that telegram. I am surprised at my hon. friend objecting to the sending of a telegram at election time. If there is any hon. gentleman who has used the telegram as the means of securing political support it is my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley). For years there was hardly an occasion when my hon. friend addressed a political meeting that he did not at a very opportune moment receive a telegram which he read to the audience. I think I did hear once in the House of Assembly that one of these telegrams dated in New York or Boston and purporting to be sent by a Mr. Leary who was going to build a dock in St. John was actually prepared in St. John, by my hon. friend himself and Mr. Leary had not even seen it. So I am surprised that my hon. friend should think that the sending of a telegram was not fair political warfare.

The hon. gentleman also referred to the acquisition of branch lines for the Intercolonial railway. Well, why should not my hon. friend the leader of the government send a telegram to Mr. Fowler, then candidate in Kings and Albert, telling what his policy would be on that subject, in view of the fact that the question of buying branch railways has done service for my hon. friend and the party to which he belongs during the last two or three elections in the province of New Brunswick, and in view of the fact also that the people were told that no branch railway would ever be sold unless they returned the late government to power and elected my hon. friend to the House of Commons.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. minister pardon me?

Mr. HAZEN. With the greatest pleasure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that the hon. gentleman misunderstood me. My complaint was not so much that the Prime Minister had sent the telegram but rather that no reference to the matter appeared in the speech. My idea was that if the policy had been determined upon as shown by the telegram, it was due to parliament to make hon. members acquainted with the policy of the government in reference to a matter of such importance.

Mr. HAZEN. Perhaps the leader of the government will take the hint, and if, in future, he sends a telegram upon such a subject, he will have that telegram set out in full in the speech from the Throne.

I do not propose to follow the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) in his discussion of the reciprocity pact. That question was fought out and the people gave an emphatic answer. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has regaled the House by repeating at considerable length the arguments he advanced in favour of reciprocity during the campaign in the province of New Brunswick. Rightly or wrongly, the people who were the judges of the issue, pronounced against the pact. While he has stated that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) did not say last night that reciprocity is dead, I would like to read him the report of that hon. gentleman's speech as I find it in the copy of 'Hansard' lying upon my desk:

> And why should it lead to annexation? Can anybody tell me that? This reciprocity proposal is dead, but can anybody tell me now why it should have led to annexation?

Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to have quite got together on this reciprocity pact. The idea of the hon. member for South Wellington seems to be that this issue will not be raised again in Canada. But I judge from the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) and also from that of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) that these hon. gentlemen propose to try to galvanize it into new life. I can only say that I hope they will be successful in making it an issue in another election in Canada.

Now, I pass from matters of that sort to say a few words with regard to criticism levelled against this government because it has not declared in the speech from the Throne what its policy on the naval question will be.

I think hon. gentlemen opposite might fairly give the government time to bestow proper consideration on a great question of this sort. It is a question, it seems to me, that requires the most careful consideration at the hands of the government and at the hands of the members of the House of Commons. It is a question which is going to involve a tremendous expenditure to the people of this country, and I think it is the desire of all Canadians that when a naval policy is embarked upon, it shall be one that will conduce to the welfare of Canada and the strength and maintenance of the British Empire.

Now, Sir, my hon. and respected friend the leader of the opposition said that the old government had a well defined policy on that subject. The policy may have been well defined, but I submit to this House that it was not well considered, because the policy which they embarked upon and laid before this House was one which, if it had been carried to a conclusion, would have resulted in the expenditure of an enormous amount of money with little or no advantage to Canada or to the empire. Let me say that there is evidence that the hon. gentlemen themselves must have come to a conclusion of that kind. We find that in the month of February last tenders were asked for the construction of four cruisers of the 'Bristol' type and six torpedo destroyers. Those tenders were received on

the 1st day of May, 1911, five months before the government went out of office; yet during the whole of that time, apparently, the government did nothing with regard to those tenders. Now, Sir, why was it, if the government were convinced of the wisdom of their naval policy, that they did not, on receipt of those tenders, award the contract for the construction of those cruisers and destroyers? Why did they wait for five months, until they went out of power, without having taken a single step in that direction? There were nine tenders. There was the tender of Cammel, Laird & Company, which was the lowest, for $11,280,000. There was the tender of Swan, Hunter & Wisham Richardson for $12,174,000. There were other tenders, ranging from the lowest already mentioned up to $13,055,804. Those tenders did not include the armour plating, the armament, and certain supplies that go with warships of this sort, and which would have considerably augmented the cost.

Now why did the late government, after embarking on that policy, after receiving those tenders on the 1st day of May, allow them to remain in abeyance without taking a single step towards making a contract for the building of those ships? Was it because the hon gentlemen discovered afterwards that if they had done so they would have simply been throwing away about $15,000,000 of the people's money? Because the fact is, and I have evidence that cannot be contradicted, and which I am prepared to give this House at any time if my statement is challenged, that those vessels, under that contract, and under the conditions therein contained would not have been completed for six years from the time the contract was awarded, and by the end of the six years those vessels would have been obsolete, entirely unfit for the purposes for which they were designed. I cannot help concluding, therefore, that the late government, after issuing a call for those tenders, discovered the actual facts which I have just stated. Therefore, they did not award the contract for the construction of those ships, but they allowed the matter to stand. When the present government came into power, and when I, as Minister of the Naval Service, began to look into that question and found the facts I have just narrated to this House, I would have been entirely failing in my duty as a Minister of the Crown if I had advised my colleagues in the Council and the Governor General to sign a contract for the construction of those ships which, by the time they were completed, would have been obsolete and valueless for the purpose for which they were intended. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this country will approve of the action of this government in hesitating before rushing hastily into a policy which must involve an expenditure of so many million dollars every year. I think they will appreciate the course of this government in doing what was stated by the Prime Minister in his admirable speech in reply to the right hon. leader of the opposition, when he said it was the intention of the government to consider with the English Admiralty this whole naval question from first to last. When we have done that, I think we will be able to come before this House and this country with a policy that will appeal to all Canadians as a policy that will be the best for the people of Canada and the best in the interest of the empire in which we live. Mr. Speaker, I will not trespass further upon the attention of this House. Many years have passed since I had the honour of holding a seat in this House, and I want to thank the hon. members, and you, Sir, for the kindly attention which has been accorded me on my return to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Borden, the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, November 22, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TURRIFF moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to compel the different railway companies to submit any special tariff as well as any regular or standard tariff to the Railway Commission before it becomes operative. At present the general or standard tariffs have to be submitted, and to receive the approval of the Railway Commission before they can be put in force, but any special tariff can be put in force or they can raise the rates of a special tariff without consulting the Railway Commission further than to give them thirty days' notice after which the amended tariff goes into force, and then no action is taken by the Railway Commission until somebody who suffers brings a case before them. The object I have in introducing this Bill is that the special tariffs as well as the standard of general tariffs should receive the authority of the Railway Commission before becoming effective.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LABOUR CONDITIONS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B. C.). I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), and of this House to an article which appeared in the Toronto 'Saturday Night' of November 18, 1911, referring to a class of the community in the province which I represent, a class largely represented in the city from which I come. The article refers to labour conditions in the province of British Columbia, and the contention of the people of British Columbia that the country should be reserved as a white British Columbia. The words to which I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Labour, are as follows:

> The capitalist who is carrying on great enterprises out there claims that it is impossible to go forward without Oriental labour. According to his statement of the case, the white man of the coast is a loafer. He makes the excuse that he will not work alongside a Chinaman or a Hindu; but, says the employer of labour, the truth of the matter is that he objects to work altogether. On the coast the problem of union labour is a much more serious one than in the east. Labour organizations out there are chiefly in the hands of crooks and blacklegs whose favourite weapon is dynamite. The arrogance of these worthies knows no bounds, and in the elements which go to make a useful member of the community, they are distinctly inferior to the average Chinaman.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that that is a statement which cannot be allowed to go uncontradicted and I feel that the contradiction should, if possible, have as much publicity as the article in which the statement was made. It makes one wonder that a decent journal would condescend to publish such utter trash, which is absolutely without any foundation in fact.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. member that it is not in order for him to make a speech at this stage; he is only at liberty to ask a question or to bring the matter to the minister's attention.

Mr. BARNARD. I propose, with your permission, to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. I was proceeding to say that the people who compose the labour unions in British Columbia have as full a sense of their responsibility of citizenship and are as self-respecting and as respected as any other class in British Columbia or in any other part of Canada. I wish to ask the Minister of Labour if he knows of anything on the files of his department which would justify the statement that the weapon of the labour unions of British Columbia is dynamite or that the membership of those unions is composed of blacklegs and crooks, and I wish the minister, if he can conscientiously do so, to give his absolutely unequivocal and official denial of that statement.

Mr. CROTHERS. I can only say that I am not aware of any information in my department which would warrant the statements objected to by my hon. friend.

COAL SUPPLY OF THE WEST.

Mr. McCRANEY. I have here a copy of the extra of the 'Canada Gazette' published yesterday which contains the following order in council:

> AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA.
>
> Monday, the 20th day of November, 1911.
>
> PRESENT:
>
> HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL.
>
> His Royal Highness the Governor General in Council is pleased to order that the order in council of the 31st July, 1911, with reference to the remission and refund of duty on coal for use in eastern British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, shall be and the same is hereby revoked in so far as concerns the refund of customs duty on imported bituminous coal entered for duty on and after the 6th day of December, 1911.
>
> RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
> Clerk of the Privy Council.

I wish to ask the government what, if any, information, they may have as to there being sufficient coal in store in the west now or by December 6 next, to meet the requirements of the coming winter?

Mr. MONK. My colleague the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) is unavoidably absent. I shall see that he gets my hon. friend's question and gives it immediate attention.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett (Calgary): For an address to His Royal Highness, the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria). Mr. Speaker, permit me to join hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, in extending my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address for the very excellent manner in which they discharged that somewhat difficult and exacting duty.

The speech of the hon. gentleman who moved the address was very extensive and very comprehensive. It covered a good deal of ground and dealt with a good many subjects. I do not at all, Mr. Speaker, find fault with anything that is contained in that speech. I think it is a very ex-

cellent one indeed, and one that will sustain the reputation of the hon. gentleman who delivered it. At about the commencement of his speech, making reference to the trade question upon which the late government went to the country, he made the statement that there was a danger to the empire in that question, that reciprocity in itself contained the germ of danger to the British Empire. That of course is a very strong and striking statement to make. That is, if a fact, a matter that requires consideration, and one that would require careful consideration from any party before they would go to the country and submit to the people any question containing anything that was dangerous to the empire or to the connection of this land with the mother country. If it be true that there is no danger to this country, a danger to the sacred ties that bind us to the mother country in reciprocity, my hon. friend must begin far back and begin in his own political family and make a great many corrections, for the most illustrious members of the party to which he belongs were strenuous supporters of reciprocity, and I am sure that if such men, as I shall mention in a few minutes, favoured reciprocity and received the support of this country while strenuously supporting it, the hon. gentleman was not well advised when he stated that there was danger to the empire in placing before the people such a trade policy as that submitted by the late government. I will read in support of my assertion a statement uttered in this House on his responsibility as a minister of the Crown by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, then as now a member of the cabinet. He of all men in this House is an Imperialist, extremely loyal to the institutions not only of this country but of the motherland, and I am sure that if the young member from the west who so ably moved this address is looking for an example and a guide in loyalty and true devotion to the empire, he cannot follow a safer guide than the hon. minister to whom I refer. What did Hon. Mr. Foster say ? Speaking in this House on the question of reciprocity, and rather defending himself and the government of which he was then a member from aspirations in regard to that policy, he said :—

The government is ready and willing to come to the aid of the country now and implement to the best of its ability this desire which is growing and stretching out from the true and solid basis of trade prosperity at home, in a foreign trade with other countries, so that we may compete with foreign countries in the different wares that we make and the different products that we raise. This country and this government has always been desirous of extending its trade to foreign countries. In all honesty and candour that can be maintained and it cannot be denied. No matter what government has been on the treasury benches, no matter what party has been in power, there has been a continuous and persistent attempt to cultivate better trade relations between this country and the United States of America in a reciprocity that should be fair and equally beneficial to both countries. The negotiations of 1866, of 1869, of 1871, and of 1888 all bear testimony to that.

That, Sir, is the evidence of a witness whose authority will not at least be questioned by hon. gentlemen supporting the government. About the same time and under similar circumstances we find Sir Charles Tupper speaking upon the same question in this House. What did he say :

But no matter how they may endeavour to confuse the public mind, the people understand that the Liberal-Conservative party, as a whole, are still ready to make a fair trade arrangement with the United States, whenever the United States are prepared to enter into such an arrangement. We have said, time and time again, to the government at Washington, we have said it in all the official correspondence, as these gentlemen admit, our plenipotentiaries have said it; and true to that policy we are not taking an attitude unworthy of Canadians; we are not taking a cringing attitude. I believe we will yet succeed in making a fair arrangement with the Republican government lately installed at Washington, and we will do it as men and as Canadians. Just as independent in Canada in reference to our future and our present as the Americans, to their credit, are independent in the United States.

That, Sir, is the position taken by Sir Charles Tupper about the year 1888. Hon. gentlemen opposite will say : Oh, that is long ago. That is evidence that we cannot recognize as applying to the conditions of to-day. Well, Sir, if that be so I will quote the evidence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce not later than December, 1910, long before a general election had been determined on, before party strife had come to the heat which it attained during the recent contest, and when the hon. gentleman in question was calmly dealing with the question in an article in the University magazine. What does he say ? He is writing as if he were addressing himself to the American people or to an American citizen of the republic.

We owe you much. We admire your enterprise and your wonderful growth, and sympathize with the efforts you are making to grow rightly and develop the best forces of a great democracy. We covet your virtues and try to avoid your faults, individual, municipal and national. If we can make easier channels for trade between the two countries, consistently with the above conditions, we will be glad to co-operate. Meanwhile, as a neighbourly beginning, could you not give our products tariff entrance to your markets at the same rates which we accord to yours in our markets? You are bigger, older, richer, more skilled and more populous. What competition should you fear on a basis of equivalent

tariffs? If you were to do this it would be an earnest of good feeling and might dispose us to further converse.

That, Sir, is evidence of a very recent date from a gentleman who is supposed to understand the trade conditions of this country so well. If he had thought that there was any danger in the matter of reciprocity, as asserted by the hon. gentleman who moved the address, we do not suppose he would have given utterance to such language. Then not long ago we had the evidence of a man who for many years successfully led the forces of the Conservative party in this country, no less a man than the late illustrious Sir John Macdonald himself. What did that distinguished statesman say in his famous manifesto in 1891, when he was looking for reciprocity himself and when, in addition to that policy, other questions of a very vital character were before the people? The question of the loyalty of the people, the question of annexation was then put forward just as strongly as it is now. Knowing that that was in the air and was before the people, Sir John Macdonald in his manifesto said :

We said to the Americans, we are perfectly willing to deal with you upon equal terms. We are desirous of having a fair reciprocity treaty, but we will not consent to open our markets to you whilst yours remain closed to us.

Sir John Macdonald was not afraid that there was danger to the empire in reciprocity; he did not fear that the people of Canada under reciprocity would cross the line or that the institutions beyond the line would cross to us. The only obstacle to reciprocity that he anticipated was that the Americans would not give us access on fair terms to their country.

Now, I wish to give the testimony of so distinguished a Conservative as the late lamented Sir John Thompson, once a distinguished Minister of Justice and Prime Minister of this country. Sir John Thompson said:

I think I have said enough to show you that the government is favourable to a renewal of the reciprocity treaty or any enlarged trade relations with the United States, and that we have done all that it is reasonable to secure it.

On the question of the effect of reciprocity upon the loyalty of Canadians, we have the opinion, very tersely and very briefly expressed, of the Prime Minister of the day, Mr. Borden himself. Addressing a meeting in Montreal, in March, 1904—a meeting, I believe, under the auspices of the Manufacturers' Association, he puts to himself the question:

Is there any idea that reciprocity with the United States would in any way interfere with self-government in Canada?

And he answers himself.

No, there is not.

This was the hon. gentleman's expression of opinion at an important gathering, at a time when he was leader of the opposition in this House and knew that what he might say would be carefully watched and that he would be held responsible for his expression of opinion. Now, I am pleased to know that the Conservative party is wealthy in great men and wealthy in opinions in favour of the point I am making. I have here the opinion of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). I am not in a position to state the exact date when that opinion was expressed, but it was when he was a member of the House before, and must have been about 1891:

The relations and interests of the people of the two countries which compose the northern part of this continent, are, in a commercial way, in a social way, and in a friendly way, closely interwoven in many respects, and I believe, that if a fair reciprocity treaty can be effected along the lines of the old treaty of 1854, it will be of considerable benefit to both countries, and that it will meet with favour from all parties in the Dominion of Canada.

This is the opinion expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen) coming from that great city on the Bay of Fundy, of whose extreme loyalty we heard yesterday. Nobody will suggest that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be a party to the expression of opinion in favour of a policy, however beneficial from the commercial standpoint, that would interfere with the loyalty of the people of Canada. The expression of opinion which I have just read as that of the hon. gentleman is a sane and consistent one, and is no doubt as sane and consistent to-day, and just as applicable to the conditions that exist now as it was to the conditions that existed then. Now, I have the opinion of another man. I cannot say that he was then, or that he is to-day, a shining light of the Conservative party. But I must say that he was one of their leading generals in the last election; and, whether they approved him generally or not, they were quite willing to take advantage of his prowess in winning for them the laurels of the last fight. I refer to no less a personage than the hon. Mr. Sifton. Speaking at a banquet in Fargo and in the presence of the famous Mr. Hill, who had spoken before him on the question of reciprocity, Hon. Mr. Sifton said:

I endorse all that Mr. Hill has said in favour of reciprocity. I am in favour of any treaty that would give the citizens of both countries equal advantages. Canada is ready to meet the United States on any fair propo-

sition. First of all there must be a campaign of education in the states south of the border states. At present the administration at Washington feels that the sentiment of the country at large is against it.

The only difficulty that stood in the way of reciprocity in the opinion of Mr. Sifton in those days was that the sentiment of the people of the United States was against it.

Now, I think these statements prove, if proof were necessary, that the Liberal party was not alone in favouring reciprocity, but that the Conservative party also at all times had been in favour of it. And I venture to think that the Conservatives would be in favour of it to-day had they not found a way by which it could be twisted to their advantage from a political standpoint.

So far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned, I must say, the question of reciprocity is still a live one. I must say to the House and to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), that in the maritime provinces we need something to revive and better trade conditions. It is a sad commentary that, while some twenty or thirty years ago Nova Scotia was entitled to twenty-one members in this House, under the working of our constitution, I am informed, after the next redistribution, we shall have only sixteen. I am sorry to say also that the province of Prince Edward Island and the province of New Brunswick are suffering in like manner. What is the reason? The reason is that our population is falling away, that our best blood is drawn away to the large centres because we have no inducement to offer these people to stay. But, what are our resources, what are our industries in the maritime provinces?

In the little province from which I come our great industries are fishing, lumbering and mining. We want encouragement for those industries. Certainly, we want the coal industry of Nova Scotia encouraged in every way that it can be done. We want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to pay attention to the conditions in the River St. Lawrence, we want him as rapidly as possible to improve those conditions, and to make the navigation of that river as safe as possible, so that the transportation of coal from Nova Scotia to the different points along that river may be made as quickly, and as cheaply, and as safely as possible. We want the Minister of Public Works to open canals, we want him to enlarge the Welland canal, we want him to build the Hudson Bay railway, and we want him to build the Georgian Bay canal so that the vast mineral wealth we have in Nova Scotia may find its way to the west. In Nova Scotia we have an abundant and inexhaustible supply of magnificent coal for every fireside in Canada, and we want the River St. Lawrence to be improved; the canals to be opened, and the Georgian Bay canal to be built, so that our coal may find its way to the door of every man in the west, where coal in the west itself cannot be conveniently obtained. For these reasons, if we are to be shut off from dealing with our neighbours across the Bay of Fundy, with whom we could, I think, conduct a profitable trade in all we have to export from the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, if we are to be shut off from those markets, I impress upon the government the necessity of carrying out the projects of the outgoing government, which were intended to give us greater freedom of interprovincial trade.

I spoke a moment ago about the fisheries of the maritime provinces. I was glad to see from the observations made by the Premier himself at the banquet in Halifax, that he proposes to give some attention to helping along the province of Nova Scotia. What have we got in the shape of fisheries in Nova Scotia, and in the maritime provinces generally? It is not realized in the central parts of Canada, and even in Montreal and Quebec, how extensive are the fisheries of the province of Nova Scotia. We have a sea coast extending from Grand Manan in New Brunswick down to the shores of Quebec, of some 5,000 miles, extending three miles out into the sea, where we have the exclusive right. There is no other place in the world that possesses so large a territory of such wealth in fisheries. What are we getting from this wealth, Mr. Speaker? Practically nothing, because we are not equipped to handle that fish. We cannot send it to Quebec, to Montreal, to Ottawa, or Toronto, because we have not the facilities to do so. We are shut off by a tariff, which the present administration helps to maintain, we are shut off from our natural market across the Bay of Fundy. Now if this government does congratulate themselves upon the fact that they have succeeded in shutting out the fishermen in Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces from the markets of the United States, and that they are leaving that trade entirely to the New England states to make money out of it, I say that they are congratulating themselves at the expense of the interest of the fishermen of the lower provinces. We say that the government should take every means possible of improving the trade routes through which our products may reach the central parts of Canada, and that no money, no reasonable expenditure should stand in the way of making a complete success of the system outlined by the late government, by which our products were to reach the great markets of Canada

at least as far west as Toronto, and possibly Winnipeg.

Now I want to point our that we lost a great opportunity when we shut out our fishermen from the markets of the United States. What are the conditions to-day? An American vessel and a Nova Scotia vessel are standing off three miles, we will say, from the shores of Cape Breton. They fish together, they load up their vessels together under exactly the same conditions, they go to the city of Boston, and what happens? If they have mackerel, which is found in great abundance along the coast, particularly at this time, and earlier, the American, with the same fish caught in Nova Scotia waters, goes into that market free. The Nova Scotian who has borne the same expense of fishing, in curing, and everything else, in order to put his fish in the best possible condition on the market, is compelled to pay a tax of $2 on every barrel that he has to sell. Sir, we want that embargo removed. We said to our people in Nova Scotia that it was the purpose of the late government to remove that embargo, and to make them give us free entrance to that valuable market. It is unfortunate that that policy was not endorsed. It did not go through, because it did not receive favour from those parts of Canada where the conditions were not fully understood. I venture to think that if any fisherman of Nova Scotia were to go to the people of Ontario and say to them: You have wheat, you have an abundance of wealth, you have good transportation facilities, and you can deal with your business in your own way. I have fish, but I have no market in Canada for that fish, but when I look across into the United States I see a market that will take any quantity of my fish. I ask you people of Ontario to permit me without any hindrance or encumbrance, to take my fish across to the other side. Now, Sir, I am sure that every reasonable elector in the province of Ontario would say to that man: Certainly, take your fish across, and sell it to the best advantage you can. That is what we wanted to do, but unfortunately we did not succeed. Therefore I ask this government to take such steps as will help us out as much as possible, and relieve us from the disadvantage under which we have been placed.

Now, I am pleased to find from the words addressed at the last sitting of the House by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) that it is the policy of the government to carry forward the projects entered upon by the outgoing government. I was glad to hear from the Premier that it is his intention to carry out the programme of the outgoing government in connection with public works in the city of St. John. I hope that there will be no partiality or sectionalism in connection with this matter. We have been endeavouring for the last five or six years to build breakwaters, to open harbours, and to help along the fishing industry of Nova Scotia, particularly in that part of it which I represent myself.

The same thing has been done in other places, but I am more familiar with what has been done in the county I represent. I hope, therefore, that when the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works come to look over the estimates that were before the House last year they will see that amounts are appropriated for the building of breakwaters, wharves and harbours in the county of Victoria, Inverness and other parts of the Island of Cape Breton where the fishery is the chief industry and where these breakwaters and wharfs are necessary to enable the men in that particular part of the country to prosecute the somewhat hazardous calling in which they are engaged. When they come to think that they have deprived them of the opportunity of selling their fish in the best market, I hope they will come to the conclusion that there is at least one way in which they can make it more convenient and safer for our fishermen to catch the fish; that now that they have shut them off from selling their fish they will make it easier for them to go in and out, that they will build breakwaters to secure their boats from the storms and will improve the harbours where necessary to make them still more secure.

I am not familiar with the details of government procedure but I have no doubt that much of this business will come under the eye of the Minister of Finance. I hope when he comes to look over and possibly revise the estimates of last year he will not forget my observations in connection with the harbours and breakwaters that we were hoping to open for the fishermen of the county of Cape Breton, and in like manner that he will give consideration to all the appropriations that were proposed for works of this kind all along the coast.

There is also another matter along the line of the continuance of the policy of the outgoing government which was broached slightly yesterday, and that is in regard to railways. If the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are to have the advantages in connection with the fisheries that they ought to, they should and must have railway communication all along the coast touching at these fishing villages. Since I came first into this House seven or eight years ago I have been pressing upon the government, and with some success, that in the villages lying along the sea coast of Nova Scotia, where we catch our fish and where we

wish to sell them at any time and under the best circumstances, we should have the advantage of railway communication. We have only communication by water for a comparatively short period. After the drift ice sets in or the ice forms upon the coast we cannot send our fish away at all. The result is that the price is kept down after navigation closes and advantage is taken of our fishermen and they are paid poor prices. I submit to the Minister of Railways and to the Minister of Finance that they cannot do anything that would be more gratefully received than to extend these railways which it was the intention of the outgoing government to do. I want to point out to the Minister of Railways and Canals that a branch line is being provided for the Intercolonial railway in my own county from a point on the Intercolonial railway called St. Esprit, going down to the county town of Baddeck, giving that county, after a hundred and fifty years of long and weary waiting, railway connection. A survey was made, $200,000 was put in the last estimates, seven-twelfths of that was passed by this House and tenders were called and were ready to be opened on the 12th day of last month. I hope the Minister of Railways and the government will see their way clear to go on with that work and not only complete it to Baddeck but to extend it further to the fishing villages throughout that part of the country. I trust that these observations will reach the ears and attention of the hon. gentlemen to whom they are addressed. I may possibly have an opportunity later on of calling their attention to these matters, but before they make up their minds as to what they are going to put into the estimates, as I hope that they have not yet fully made up their minds they will come to the conclusion that this item at least is one which should have a place in the list.

The hon. gentleman who moved the address (Mr. Bennett, Calgary) made reference to the benefits that the farmers were to receive from the present administration. I am glad to learn that the farmers are to be remembered. The only hope we have in Nova Scotia or the maritime provinces in overcoming this difficulty of the cost of living is to make farming more attractive than it is now, to bring men back from other callings to cultivate the soil and to be able to restore and to maintain the connection between the farm and the young life of the country. I am pleased indeed that the Minister of Agriculture is taking this matter in hand. But, I am sorry to find that the first public act in connection with farming matters in this country under the present administration is not encouraging. Down in the county of Guysboro a fertilizer of a certain kind is being manufactured in connection with the reduction of dog-fish. A very excellent kind of fertilizer is made there and it has been in much demand by the farmers of the counties of Guysboro, Pictou and Antigonish. I find that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has thought it proper to raise the price of that commodity from $20 to $28 a ton. That is not starting out very well to encourage the farmer. For years and years, during the time that this material was produced at the reduction plant, the farmers were getting the benefit. Now, we have the declaration from this government that they are going to help the farmer. Help him, how?—help him in getting his fertilizer by adding $8 per ton to the price. What is the reason that is given by the government for adding this $8 per ton? They say: We can get that for it in Boston. This government, when they have anything to sell themselves, are quite willing to trade with the United States, they are quite willing to take their commodity to Boston and sell it there, and they will make the poor farmer and the poor fishermen, who are not permitted to go there with their products by reason of the policy of this government, pay the Boston price for such commodities as the government have to sell. That is not fair treatment of the farmers who were in a position to take advantage of that fertilizer. I bring the matter to the notice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as this thing may have been done without him knowing anything about it. If he does not know anything about it, if it is a matter of departmental detail put into effect without the knowledge of the members of the government, I direct his attention to it and I hope he will make a correction as soon as possible. I would also say to the Minister of Agriculture that I hope he will enter into some arrangement with the Department of Trade and Commerce by which these dog-fish reduction plants will be increased, because by such arrangement he will be able to kill two birds with the one stone; that is he will catch and kill the dog-fish, thus helping the fishermen in doing away with that pest, and, having caught the dog-fish, he will reduce them into fertilizer for the benefit of the farmer.

Fertilizer is perhaps a by-product, but at all events I believe that such a scheme as I suggest could be carried out with advantage to the fishermen, and the farmer, and I trust the Minister of Agriculture will be able to make some arrangement with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries by which this double barrelled machinery can be adopted. We are also promised in the speech from the Throne a scientific tariff. Well, the people of Canada are not

so very particular whether the tariff is scientific or not so long as it suits their conditions. The present Prime Minister tried his hand at what I suppose he considered a scientific tariff in 1906 when he moved a resolution in this House calling for a tariff giving adequate protection. However, he was soon glad to abandon that kind of a tariff, because he found that what was adequate protection for A was not adequate for B, and what was adequate for B was not adequate for C, and that no two people could agree as to what adequate protection meant. But now, when the hon. gentleman is in power and responsible to the people for the tariff he wants to shirk his responsibility by shifting it on to a commission. We should consider very carefully before we remove from the government and the parliament of Canada any question touching taxation such as this is. The tariff is the taxation of the people, and all taxation should be crystallized into legislation by the members of this House, on the initiative of the government, taking full responsibility for their acts. The government, and the Minister of Finance especially, should hesitate before throwing from their own shoulders the responsibility in this respect which constitutionally rests on them; a responsibility which the Hon. Mr. Fielding for fifteen years took on with credit to himself, and with glory and advantage to the country which he so faithfully served.

Speaking generally of commissions I may say that the experience of the labouring men of this country under the eighteen years of Conservative rule and government by commission, was not of the happiest kind. The government of Sir John Macdonald appointed a Labour Commission about 1886, and its report was held out like a revolving lighthouse so that you could catch a glimpse of it when the elections were on, and the labour organizations were asked to see how beautiful it was, but the moment the elections were over the Labour Commission passed out of sight, and its beneficial results to the labouring men of Canada were absolutely nil. I hope the government of to-day, and the people of Canada will take warning that government by commission has in the past been a failure in this country. Last night I heard the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) saying to the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley): You did not follow out the dictates of your own commission, which I suppose would mean that if a Tariff Commission makes any proposition it is to be regarded as a policy of the government, and must be carried out. That makes me think that we have to be very careful as to what powers may be given to this commission, and as to the class of men who may be selected as members of it. I cannot understand how any Tariff Commission could be better equipped to deal with the tariff of this country than are the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who have competent and trained officials to assist them. When, a few years ago, a proposition was submitted to reduce the number of members on the Railway Committee of this House, it was pointed out that if that committee would be made smaller its members would be more subject to influence brought to bear on them by the log-rollers who haunt the corridors of this parliament. It would be difficult for those who might endeavour to influence the framing of a tariff in this country to reach all the members of the House, as well as the members of the cabinet, but it would not be so difficult for them to get around two or three men on the commission who though they may believe themselves honest, may be fooled into making tariff regulations which would be inimical to the best interests of the country. For that reason, as well, we should be careful before launching on this new theory of a Tariff Commission.

Now, Sir, as to the amendment proposed by the right hon. the leader of the opposition, I have a few words to say. It is a surprise to hon. members on this side, and I venture to think it is a surprise to the more enlightened people of Canada, that no reference is made in the address to the naval policy of the government. Those of us who were in the House on the 29th of March, 1909, when the naval policy was launched by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) are quite familar with the policy of the opposition on that question. The Prime Minister of to-day has again and again declared what his policy was, and although he departed to some extent from what he regarded as the implementing of that policy, I am not aware that he ever departed from the policy he announced in seconding that resolution of the 29th of March, 1909.

That being the case and his policy having been well known to the people of Canada when he went to the country at the last election, I submit that that policy has been accepted by the people, that his naval policy has been accepted and that the people of Canada are willing that he should carry on that policy in his own way. They expect him to carry out the resolution that was passed on the day and date I have mentioned. There are many new members in this House and many people in the country who possibly do not know what the naval policy of the leader of the opposition at that day was, a policy which he has not forsaken so far as I am aware. The resolution was introduced by the present leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid

Laurier), and was accepted with some slight changes by the present Prime Minister who voted for it and supported it. There has been no change in it, it was the policy of both parties then, and as far as I know it is the policy of both parties to-day. It reads:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing Dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

That resolution, as far as I know, stands as the policy of the Premier and of the government to-day so far as the basis of operation is concerned. We would expect the First Minister (Mr. Borden) upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility of carrying forward this policy, to gather around him men who would be in sympathy with it. When that policy was announced the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), speaking in this House, declared to the world that he was not in sympathy with that policy as laid down by his leader of that day. On the 21st of March, 1910, speaking on a Bill introduced to implement that policy he said:

I shall vote against the Bill because it involves the recognition of military imperialism, because it aims at having that principle recorded in our statute-books. I shall vote against the amendment because I do not admit that there is any emergency under the present circumstances. I do not wish to justify the motion of the leader of the opposition. I have just said that I am against it. But I believe, in all sincerity, that it does not involve such serious consequences as the government measure. It involves an expenditure not of $25,000,000, as stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, but of only 18 to 20 millions.

Then he goes on further:

The sub-amendment, which calls for a referendum to the people on a question of such importance, is the only proposal which meets with my full and entire approval.

Personally, I believe that the policy to be followed by Canada is, and will be for a long time to come, the policy which has been followed ever since 1863, admitted by British and Canadian statesmen such as Gladstone, Disraeli, Salisbury, Sandfield Macdonald, Cartier, J. A. Macdonald, Blake, Mackenzie, until the days of Chamberlain, and which is limited to the defence of our land, to the defence of the empire on Canadian territory.

The balance of the speech of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) is strong and shows clearly that he is opposed to any naval operations at all. He is asked at the close of his speech:

Mr. WILSON. Does the hon. member for Terrebonne intend to support the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) at the next election?

Mr. NANTEL. I may say in answer to the hon. member for Laval that on this side of the House we are free to differ from our leaders. We have opinions of our own. We stick to principles, in preference to mere expediency.

thus implying, of course, that whatever position his leader of that day, if he had a leader, took, was a matter of mere expediency, and that there was no principle involved, but he for his part was prepared to stick for principle, and had no use for expediency. The hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) took this hon. gentleman into his cabinet knowing well that he was a determined foe of any naval operations in this country or any support at all to the mother country, produced or paid for by the taxes of the people of Canada.

On January 12, 1910, the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) made a speech on this question, a speech which does him credit. It shows that he was then firm upon the policy of aid to the British Empire and that he was determined, whatever others might do, that there was only one course open to him consistent with his manhood, his citizenship and his principles, to go right forward with the naval policy of this country. I would ask the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) to the opinion which the Premier then expressed, of men who would for a moment hesitate in coming to the aid of the empire, of men who would be prepared to accept the protection of the British navy, the British army and the machinery of government of the mother country, and contribute nothing towards its support. And they will learn that he regarded them as most contemptible kind of people and unworthy of any high

office or position in this country. I make these remarks so that when they read the observations of their hon. leader they will know whom he has in mind and to whom he is making reference. The Minister of Inland Revenue in that speech states that he would not regard himself as bound to do anything to assist England in a foreign war. Yet the present Premier said on the 12th of January, 1910, which is a camparatively recent date:

How would it be possible for any man in this country to imagine that Canada could be at peace with any great naval power in the world if that naval power at that very moment was at war with Great Britain? The thing is absolutely inconceivable. The nations of the British Empire are separated by great stretches of ocean, the empire covers every continent in the world and these great nations are divided by vast distances, but upon the sea, any British navy, any imperial navy, must be one. The jurisdiction and power of our government and of this parliament over expenditure and over control in time of peace must be maintained. I frankly admit that we must maintain that principle in view of our autonomy, but in time of war the naval force of Canada, or the Canadian unit of the British navy, must be part of the British navy when engaged in the preservation and defence of this great empire.

The Prime Minister quoted also the words of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey, who in June, 1909, gave his views as to the necessity of the navy for the maintenance of the permanency of the empire, and said:

The navy is the common security of the whole empire. If it ever fails to be that it will be of no use for us to discuss any other subjects, and the maintenance of the navy in that position must therefore be the care not only of us at home but of the self-governing Dominions beyond the seas.

The Prime Minister went on to say in his speech of January 12, 1910:

Thus the control of the militia in war emergency is vested in His Majesty. So it is absolutely essential under the resolution of March last that the supreme control of the Canadian naval force shall be vested in one supreme authority in time of war, acting in the interests of the whole empire.

The Premier goes on to say:

An army takes twenty years to create and a navy half a century.

The speediest organization would not make our Canadian naval service effective in less than ten years.

Probably 15 or 20 years would be required; and the crisis, if a crisis is to be apprehended, will come and probably within three years.

I wish to pause here, Mr. Speaker, and point out that the Hon. Premier predicted at that time when the crisis would come. He said that it would possibly be within three years from the date at which he was speaking. If he spoke truly there is now only a year and a few months until the crisis shall arise, and I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the First Lord of the Admiralty to become busy and put into operation as rapidly as possible a naval policy. The Premier continues:

If the Germans prove themselves the greater race, if they have greater resourcefulness, higher skill, superior organizing ability and more sincere and self-sacrificing patriotism, they are entitled to be supreme on the sea, as they are now on the land. We have no right to resent the challenge, but unless the ancestral blood flows less red in our veins we shall meet it with a heart no less firm than that with which our forefathers encountered the shock of the 'Invincible Armada.'

The Premier shows that a plebiscite is out of the question and certainly was not in his mind at that time. He further quotes Sir Edward Grey:

We must be prepared to defend our national existence under the conditions which are imposed upon us in our own generation. I am glad that it is not to us alone that this feeling is confined. I am glad that the colonies, such as New Zealand recognized that their national existence is one with us in this matter.

The Premier adds to this statement:

I am very sure, Sir, that there are a great many people in Canada, the vast majority of the people of Canada to-day, who devoutly wish that Sir Edward Grey, in making that statement, could have coupled the name of Canada with that of New Zealand and of the other overseas dominions.

He goes on to observe:

The mere circumstances that there are in Canada those who conscientiously object to co-operation in defence gives room for grave disquietude.

The Premier was very much disquieted at that time because such men as the Minister of Inland Revenue were giving voice in this House to different ideas and to what the Premier regarded as dangerous ideas. He says that it was a grave consideration that there were even a few gentlemen in this country who differed from his own policy on that question. Then he continued:

The mere circumstance that there are in Canada those who conscientiously object to co-operation in defence gives room for grave disquietude. I can understand the man who advocates independenec. In that case with ten thousand miles of coast line and a great seaborne commerce, we must of necessity become a naval power at enormously increased expense or else remain the plaything and laughing stock of the world. I can understand the man, if there be any such in Canada, who conscientiously advocates the union of this country with the great neighbouring repub-

lic, but let him remember that such a union would be followed by naval and military charges of from twenty to twenty-five millions per annum. I cannot, however, understand how any man receiving and accepting the protection of the British flag, the advantages of British citizenship, the safeguarding of our coasts, the security of our shores, the benefits and advantages of the diplomatic and consular service throughout the world, the talismanic protection of our flag, can reconcile it with our self respect to have every dollar of the cost paid by the over-burdened taxpayers of the British islands. We have the power to adopt that position if we choose, because our liberties which we hold as a right and of grace are in this regard absolute, but, with all respect for the conscientious opinions of others, I cannot conceive it to be a worthy or honourable course. It is not so much a question of our duties or obligations to the mother country as of our own honour and self-respect. I am the descendant of those who have never lived under any other than the British flag since it first streamed to the free winds of heaven. I am as profoundly and unalterably attached to British institutions and connection, and as ready to work, and if necessary to fight for them as any man in Canada. But if my country, one of the richest in the world in proportion to its population, should accept the humiliating, the degrading, the pauperizing position of receiving future protection and safety at the hands and cost of the British taxpayer without contributing one dollar in aid or assistance, I would say that the sooner the empire was rid of her the better for all. When the battle of Armageddon comes, when the empire is fighting for its existence, when our kinsmen of the other great dominions are in the forefront of the battle, shall we sit silent and inactive while we contemplate with smug satisfaction our increasing crops and products, or shall we pauper-like seek fancied but delusive security in an appeal to the charity of some indefinite and high sounding political doctrine of a great neighbouring nation? No, a thousand times no. There will be no such outcome. It may be that the Canadian people absorbed in the development of their marvellous natural resources have paid little heed to the wide world activities of the empire, and have realized but imperfectly the responsibilities and duties of their country as one of its greatest Dominions. But they do not lack the intelligence, the vision, the courage, the patriotism necessary to realize those duties and accept those responsibilities. So, if Canada be true to herself she will not fail in the day of trial, in the very forefront of the sister nations. But she must not stand unprepared. I say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, so far as my words have any weight with him: Go on with your naval service. Proceed slowly, cautiously and surely. Lay your proposals before the people and give them if necessary opportunity to be heard, but do not forget that we are confronted with an emergency which may rend this empire asunder before the proposed service is worthy of the name. In the face of such a situation immediate, vigorous, earnest action is necessary. We have no Dreadnought ready; we have no fleet unit at hand; but we have the resources and I trust the patriotism to provide a fleet unit or at least a Dreadnought without one moment's unnecessary delay. Or, and in my opinion this would be the better course, we can place the equivalent in cash at the disposal of the admiralty to be used for naval defence under such conditions as we may prescribe. In taking this course we shall fulfil not only in the letter, but in the spirit as well, the resolution of March last, and what is infinitely more important we shall discharge a great patriotic duty to our country and to the whole empire.

There is the position taken at such a recent date by the Prime Minister. But the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) did not at all agree with that position. Immediately on the Prime Minister, then leader of the opposition, taking his seat, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) arose in considerable heat, and said:

Everything, Sir, connected with the discussion of this all-important matter seems to be a surprise. For my own part, I little anticipated the turn which the discussion has taken this afternoon, and reasonably so, I think. It seems to me that, having taken the opportunity of expressing my view about this matter upon another occasion, I was entitled, in the ordinary courtesy which exists within the working of a party, to some indication that, upon this occasion, at the first reading of this measure, the party itself, as I understand it, would express its policy. I say that has been a surprise to me which, I think, I have not deserved. But, Sir, even under these circumstances, I would have been prepared to await the moment usually chosen for the discussion of the principle of a Bill to defend before the House, as I have defended outside of it—and intend defending in the future—my opinion in this matter. Unfortunately, expressions have been used which make it necessary for me to at once challenge certain statements that have been made.

He refers to the statements of his leader.

And let me say this further, Mr. Speaker: Although I have the misfortune to differ from many on this side of the House—and apparently from all on the other side—on this question, I consider that advantage gained in this country, where we enjoy those free institutions which we have been so earnestly invited to maintain and defend, in speaking of people who do not hold our own views as people without sense of honour, without self-respect. If that course is carried too far, those who have initiated such a mode of attack will be the first to suffer from it.

There is a clear threat that, unless the leader took care of himself he would be made to suffer by the Minister of Public Works; we do not know in what way, but let us put a generous construction on it and assume that it was simply in the way of politics—that is that the Minister of Public Works would give no assistance to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) in politics.

Another question enters into this naval policy of hon. gentlemen opposite since the

resolution was passed, and that is that nothing could be done by this country in support of the naval operations of the mother country until we are represented in Great Britain in some way or have a voice in the declaration of war. I need not be technical in this matter and say that the declaration of war is entirely for the King. Though we know that to be true, we also know that in practice, the King must consult his councillors before he declares war. It is not for me to know in what way these hon. gentlemen expected that Canada should be represented in the councils of the mother country; it is enough to know that that idea was declared in this House on the initiative of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). We heard nothing of this barrier to action, I think, until the hon. gentleman addressed the House on the Naval Bill. I have no quotation from his speech, but I recollect it well. It was then put forward in this House for the first time that we were to refrain from discharging our manly duty to ourselves and to our country—to use the expression of the present Prime Minister—until we are given representation in the councils of the empire. That may not come for some time, it may never come; but we have the declaration by the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Justice that nothing could be done by this country. No matter what might happen, even if the empire were going to pieces tomorrow by reason of the attacks from foreign nations—which God forbid—we must stand here and look on in an ignoble safety declaring in effect: We have wealth in abundance, we have men, we have capacity, we have opportunity, to help the mother country, but according to the Minister of Justice, we are forbidden to do anything until we have representation in the British parliament or otherwise according to a scheme to be developed. I submit that that is not sound principle, it is not sound policy. I submit that every part of this empire belongs to all of us. We belong to all, as all belongs to us. If Paul was right in talking about the faithful as 'brethren of the faith,' we equally are brethren of one great empire. A blow cannot be struck at one part of the empire, and leave the rest secure. An attack upon any part affects the empire from end to end, and if we fail to recognize this fact and act upon it, it is conceivable that such a calamity might happen as the wiping of the empire and its dependencies off the map. Still we have the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) declaring that until machinery is perfected by which we are to have a say in the declaration of war and the announcement of peace, this country with all its wealth shall not take part in the empire's defence. Such a declaration is not worthy of this country or of this House. It is not in accord with the sentiments of the people of Canada. If the people understood the question, if the question were put to them fairly, they would certainly not endorse the course proposed. At the time of the South African war, our brave soldiers did not wait to inquire whether they had or had not a voice in the councils of the empire. They only knew that there was danger, that prowess, ability and high spirit were necessary for the empire's defence. On that they acted.

Canada is not less loyal to-day than it was then. The idea is that we are growing step by step, and getting more loyal as we grow in strength.

Now, Sir, I hold the Premier responsible for having introduced into his cabinet four men, three of whom are absolutely committed to the policy of rendering no help at all to the empire. The Minister of Justice says that he would not agree that anything should be done until a certain condition was met, which means in the present circumstances of this country, that nothing will be done at all. That is the condition we have in the present cabinet. Sir, the policy, principles and ideas of the Minister of Public Works were well known to the Premier when he delegated to him the authority to select the ministers from the great province of Quebec. He knew what his views were on the naval question, and what they were in the group of men that he has around him. The Minister of Public Works picked out a Minister of Justice whom he knew was of the same opinion as himself; he picked out a Minister of Inland Revenue who was on record here as speaking of Imperialism in the most hostile manner. Imperialism, he says, in this country is a danger, is a doctrine that distils like drops of poison among the people, and the most dangerous of all Imperialists are the disguised Imperialists, because they do not show their hand. That is the language found in a speech of the Minister of Inland Revenue in this House, somewhere about the 21st of March, 1910. Anybody who wants to read it will find it there, and will find I am not putting words in the mouth of my hon. friend, whom I very much respect. Now, Sir, how could the Minister of Public Works better carry out the task confided to him of serving the Nationalists, than to choose such men as that? There are not any speeches delivered in this House by the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), but we find his speeches in the newspapers where he follows exactly the same line of thought as did the Minister of Public Works himself, as did the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), and the Minister of Inland Revenue

(Mr. Nantel). So the whole Quebec outfit that is gathered into this cabinet are men holding exactly the same opinion as the Minister of Public Works himself. Now how could the Prime Minister expect to serve the loyal people of this country by taking such men into his cabinet? The people of this country are strongly in favour of the empire, they are in favour of doing everything that ought to be done in putting us in a position, from a naval standpoint, of defending ourselves, of defending the homes of those who are dear to us. The people of this country are unwilling to occupy the position of beggars and poltroons, such as were described by the Prime Minister himself in the speech I have just read. Is that the position he wants us to adopt when he gathers around him a cabinet composed of men who have clearly and distinctly declared themselves as opposed to contributing to the naval strength of the empire? Is the Prime Minister going to ask the people of Canada, by a plebiscite, to say whether or not they wish to bring themselves into the category of the men whom he described in this speech? He says that if this country is composed of men of that kind, the sooner the empire is clear of Canada the better, the sooner the cord is cut and the sooner she cuts adrift from the empire, the better will it be for her own reputation. Is the Prime Minister going to ask the people of this country, by a plebiscite, to say whether they are willing to put themselves into that category? So it would seem, if he is going to ask the people of Canada to say whether they are in favour of doing their duty or not. It would be just as reasonable for me to ask you if you are a murderer, or if you have been guilty of any other of the criminalities on the statute books of this country, knowing well what kind of an answer I should receive from you. It would be just as respectful for me to ask such a question as that, as it would be for the government of this country to ask the Canadian people if they are willing to sit down in idleness, in abjectness, if they are willing to continue to receive the protection of the British navy while refusing to contribute one dollar to its support. If that is a fit question to put to the people of this country, and if the people are so hide bound by partisanship as to answer it, then I am very much mistaken in the temper of the Canadian people.

Now, Sir, we had some explanation last evening from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) as to why he would not proceed with the navy scheme commenced by the late government. He said that if he went on with it now, the ships would become obsolete in six years.

Well, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may be gifted with doublesight, he may be a prophet with powers beyond the ken of an humble individual like myself; but I do not see how otherwise he can say that the programme of the late government would turn out to be so utterly useless. The programme of the late government let him remember, was laid down by the British Admiralty. The plans and specifications were prepared only a few months ago by the best experts at the command of the British Admiralty. They knew the conditions in Canada, they knew we intended to build these ships in Canada, that was the policy on both sides of this House; and surely it is not to be supposed that they would have presented us with plans and specifications which which would be useless, for the construction of ships which would become obsolete in so short a time. They knew that Canada had no shipyards, and that the men taking the contract would have to get ready the necessary machinery and plant to build these ships, and does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries understand that the Admiralty placed in the hands of the late government plans that could not possibly be carried out with any advantage to the country? What evidence has he that these ships would not be useful and serve a good purpose when completed? Is it not necessary that we should make a start? According to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) we should make a start, going along gradually, and carrying out this undertaking like every other great undertaking that the Canadian people have assumed. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had no right to say that we should not go on with this undertaking, if we are ready in other respects, unless he meant to put forward a subterfuge, unless he desired to throw dust in the eyes of the people, to put the thing off. If that be so, perhaps the answer of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is as good a one as he could give. But there is this satisfaction to be got out of it, that the Minister of Public Works and his associates in the cabinet must understand from the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that they are not going to have it all their own way, there is going to be a navy, there is going to be a naval programme acceptable to the people of Canada, a policy that will be worthy of this great country. But there was a statement made by the minister to the effect that the outgoing government should have done something that they did not do, that they should have let the contracts. Now, let me point out to him that there was no opportunity for the late government to deal with this question. According to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this is a question that requires

thought, it is a question that must be dealt with with great care, it is a question in regard to which they must not jump to conclusions. If that be so they can better understand the position that the outgoing government was in. These tenders were received on the first day of May last, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries left for England on May 12, they left England on their return trip on the 3rd July and they arrived at Ottawa on the 11th. Parliament resumed on the 18th July and dissolved on the 29th. That is the answer that I have to give to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to show that there was no time for this government or for the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries to consider those tenders. It is no answer that is satisfactory to the country, for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to shift the burden of responsibility on the outgoing government. Even if they were mistaken in the course that they took then, even if they were not as active as they might have been, when he reads over the speech that his leader delivered on the 12th day of January, and finds that he says that the crisis may be three years, but it is going to come quite probably in three years, he will see that that only leaves him a short time, and that it behooves him to get busy and do his work regardless of what course may have been taken by his predecessors in office.

I submit, therefore, that the answers that were given us by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are not such as should have been given to this House and the country on so important a question as to whether or not we are going to proceed definitely and shortly upon this question of establishing a navy in Canada. Are we going to take that manly position in the empire which we must take in order to be worthy of ourselves and worthy of our sires? I submit that there is the greatest justification for the motion moved by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition and that there is every reason why we should put the facts before the people and give them to understand why it is that proper steps are not taken to place this country in its proper light as an important portion of the empire to which we belong. I, therefore, upon these grounds, and for these reasons, shall be pleased to support the amendment introduced by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Mr. ARTHUR DE WITT FOSTER (Kings). Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to answer some of the rambling remarks that we have listened to for the last hour and a half, I would like to express my congratulations and the congratulations of the constituency which I have the honour to represent to the hon. the mover (Mr. Bennett, Calgary) and the hon. the seconder (Mr. Sevigny) of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I am sure that congratulations are due not only to the sister province of New Brunswick for having produced such a speaker as we listened to, but also the province of Quebec for having produced another speaker, a speaker who addressed us in a sister language. I think this House is to be congratulated upon having in it such able gentlemen and, lastly that the country is to be congratulated upon having such able men, with such a future before them to look after its interests when some of the older statesmen shall have passed on.

The hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) who has just taken his seat opened his remarks by reading from a speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) a speech delivered by the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), as well as from one delivered by the right hon. Sir Charles Tupper in reference to reciprocity some years ago, and the inference we might plainly draw from his remarks, or the inference that he wishes us to draw, is that these gentlemen had swallowed their principles. It seems to me that it would not be amiss for the hon. member for Cape Breton to look at his own position, in reference to his record particularly on the important question which was recently before the people of the Dominion of Canada. In the year 1909 he advocated a higher rate of protection on coal than that which we already had in Nova Scotia and the Dominion of Canada. He was then for higher protection, a greater chance for the home market, greater development for our own people under higher protection. But not six months later, what do we find? We find this gentleman swallowing his own principles and adopting the policy of 8 cents lower duty per ton on coal—lower protection three months ago, higher protection one year ago. I do not think we need any better example of how men, not only on the government side of the House, if such may be found, but on the opposition side of the House, will swallow their principles at convenient stages in the political history of the country.

During the last election in his own constituency he was interrupted by some of the miners by the question: How is this 8 cents a ton lower duty on coal going to affect us? What was the answer he gave these men?—work hard and put your trust in God. I submit that this is most excellent advice, but let us see for a moment if the hon. gentleman followed that same advice himself. If we look up the record of 'Hansard' we will find that he had appointed in that constituency some 109 fishery wardens for a certain particular time

and that when the election came around we rather believe that he placed his faith and trust in them to a very much greater extent than he did in God.

I am somewhat surprised that he should deliver before this House a very lengthy dissertation upon reciprocity. One would think that he had some doubt in his mind as to whether the people of his constituency really believed that he was elected upon that platform or upon some other platform. I am bound to tell him that I believe that there is some doubt existing in the minds of his constituents and therefore he desires to place himself upon record in this House in order that his constituents and the country at large may have absolutely no doubt but that it was reciprocity that elected him. Grave doubts were entertained some few years previous to that, after the result of an election had been anounced in that self-same riding, as to whether or not it was a certain policy of the government that had elected him, or some other means. I refer to the time when a recount was refused to determine who was elected when in all probability if there had been a recount the result of the election would have been different.

In reading speeches in the 'Hansard' for the last few years, we have found our friends on the opposite side of the House quoting Sir John Macdonald.

They have been quoting the language of great Conservative statesmen to substantiate their case, but under no consideration would these gentlemen follow the advice and guidance of these Conservative statesmen when they ruled the destinies of this country. But now, they seek solace from the words of these men, words uttered when the conditions in Canada were entirely different from what they are to-day, and words which although appropriate at the time they were uttered, are not appropriate years and years afterwards. The hon. gentleman also went on to quote the Hon. Mr. Sifton as being in favour of a fair agreement between Canada and the United States, but the great difficulty was that Mr. Sifton and other enlightened Liberals did not feel that the reciprocity pact was a fair deal for Canada and, therefore, they felt it their bounden duty to oppose it. We were told during the campaign that the maritime provinces and particularly the province of Nova Scotia had been suffering for many years. Well, we have had a Liberal government in that province for close on thirty years, and I notice that every time the provincial elections come around these gentlemen proclaim from platform to platform that Nova Scotia is the most prosperous province of the whole Dominion, all of which they claim of course for their own excellent government. But, when they want something to say against the Conservative government at Ottawa they change their tune and proclaim that everything is going to blue ruin. In the month of June last when the local elections were being held every Liberal in Nova Scotia proclaimed the prosperity of the province, but two months later when there was an election for the Dominion House these very same men proclaimed that the province was going to dry rot, that it was stagnant, and that reciprocity with the United States was the panacea. But, Sir, I am pleased to say that we have very strong signs that there will soon be a change in the complexion of the provincial government of Nova Scotia. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House have been telling us what a bad thing it is to see a coalition government, as they claim it is, formed at Ottawa, and they tell us that evil results are likely to flow from it, but their answer is to be found in the two recent by-elections in the province of Nova Scotia when the people unhesitatingly pronounced in favour of the Hon. R. L. Borden and his government, and against the moribund government of Hon. Mr. Murray. I commend this to hon. gentlemen who are so worked up over what they term the alliance between the various elements of the present administration here. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) told us that we had no market for our fish, that we could not ship them to Montreal or to western Canada, and that reciprocity with the States was, therefore, most desirable for us. Has the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) forgotten that the counties of Digby, Lunenburg, Queens-Shelburne, Annapolis and King's returned members opposed to this reciprocity pact? The hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) would have this House believe that he and he alone has the right to speak for the fishing industry of Nova Scotia, and, that in the very face of the results of the elections in that province his dictum was to be paramount. I submit, Sir, that one of the supreme reasons why these counties rejected this agreement is that the people realized that the home market of the Dominion is the best market, and they looked to the future development of this industry under the able and efficient administration of that distinguished son of Nova Scotia who now leads the government. I would commend for the perusal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) the very able treatise on the fishery question written by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) and in that treatise he will find food for thought and enlightenment as to the fishery industry of the province. Then, the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) the very

first time he gets on his feet as a member of the opposition, asks this government to build railways in eastern Nova Scotia in his own constituency. I have not a word to say against the building of railways in Nova Scotia; on the contrary I believe that if there is one part of the Dominion more than another that needs and is entitled to railway development it is that province of Nova Scotia. But Sir, for the last fifteen years we have needed railways, and during part of that time we have had a solid phalanx of eighteen Liberals from that province supporting the government, but what railways have they been able to get their government to build? The Eastern railway from Halifax to the Eastern part of the province has been made to do service at every election, and yet, to-day, the hon. member from Cape Breton has to rise in his place and plead with this government for railways when, for fifteen years, the government which he supported denied to the province the railway development to which it was justly entitled. Sir, the people of the maritime provinces have borne their share in the upbuilding of the northwest and we are proud of the great Canadian heritage we have there; we are proud that we produced men to send to the great Northwest to till its fertile fields and to help to consolidate into one great whole a Canadian nation under the folds of the Union Jack. We glory in the privilege of being able to do that in the province of Nova Scotia. I submit that that province has a right to make a demand on the men of the west and the centre of this Dominion and that these men will recognize that right and will come back and help us as we have helped them—reciprocity within the empire.

We have heard something about a scientific tariff. Some fun was poked at the scientific tariff mentioned by the hon. mover of the address in reply (Mr. Bennett, Calgary). I think on reflection it will be seen that the people of Canada said very clearly on September 21 that they did not like the scientific tariffs that were being dealt out by the late administration. The speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) yesterday, was similar to one delivered in this House some eight or nine months ago. He repeated himself at least seven or eight times in his endeavour to make a case from very little material. He declared that the country was not satisfied that this alliance should take place between these two differing parts of the cabinet, the country wanted to know why and upon what terms an agreement was reached, what one had sacrificed and what the other had sacrificed. I would ask the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) if, when he was running his election in Pictou, he laid down a plank in his platform, and placed it before the Conservative electors, that in the event of Mr. Borden being called on to form a cabinet no man from the province of Quebec should be included in it? Did he ask the electors to vote upon such a question? Assuredly not. If he did not submit that to the will of the people, I ask what right he has to say that his constituents or the people of Canada want to know what was done here or there in the formation of the cabinet. I believe that what the country wanted to know was something of far greater importance than the remarks of my hon. friend, which were made for the sole purpose of stirring up hatred and placing one faction against the other. Is that the great ideal which my hon. friend from Pictou has been enunciating? I think the people of Pictou will be far more interested to know what the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Borden) has placed in the speech from the Throne, whether or not he has inserted in it those things which he promised to the people when he was in opposition. They will not ask us to plunge hastily into various problems that need some consideration, we have had too much of that sort of thing in the last fifteen years. They want to know if the Prime Minister is going to do what he has promised and whether he has announced that he will do so on the first opportunity that presented itself. The whole tendency of the remarks of my hon. friend from Pictou is to place one section of the community against the other. That is not the ideal for which we have been striving in Canada, that is not the ideal of the right hon. the leader of the opposition whether such statements are borne out by fact or not his constant effort was to coalesce all the various elements of the Dominion of Canada to the end that they may be united in one happy and contented people. In that, I think, the hon. member from Pictou may well copy the attitude of his leader, the right hon. the leader of the opposition.

But, if we look at the campaign in his own constituency, we find the hon. gentleman himself appealing to the sectional ideals and elements. He had printed a pamphlet setting forth the various things that would appeal to different parts of his constituency. One of his appeals was: See what I have been able to obtain for this county from the Liberal government. How much do you suppose he was able to obtain from the Minister of Public Works in the late administration for the county of Pictou? One million and fifty-eight thousand dollars' worth of public works. If you look at the next county, or the county beyond

that, represented by a member of the opposition in the late parliament, do you find an expenditure of $1,058,000? I venture to say you do not. Then it comes back to this, that either there must have been urgent necessity in the county represented by my hon. friend, or else he must have been taking a certain sum of money which ought to have been distributed to the various counties in order that each might have its legitimate share. I submit that in either case he appealed to the selfishness of the people in asking them to return him to power, not upon reciprocity, but upon the cry: See what I can get for you. I can imagine that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) would be somewhat sore in this new House, particularly when we find in that same pamphlet a little paragraph which reads that the hon. member for Pictou has been selected by his leader the Prime Minister to accompany him in his tour throughout the west, that he has been honoured. That would give you the impression that the Prime Minister thought he was head and shoulders above every other member on that side of the House, and he above all others was selected to go upon that tour. Not only that, but there was a subtle suggestion that if he was returned to power further honour would be placed upon him, and it was freely discussed and quite commonly understood in the county which I have the honour to represent that in case my opponent should go to England, the hon. member (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) would have been made Minister of Militia and so you see he himself was appealing from sectional standpoints to the cupidity of his constituents. I have read with some pleasure speeches which the hon. member has made but this one exceeds in repetition anything I have ever read in 'Hansard.'

We were told by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that had this reciprocity pact gone through, the trade of the United States would come down through Canada. That seems to me to be a particularly new doctrine, because on our side of the province the argument was advanced by the Prime Minister, I think, that if this proposition went through trade would flow north and south like water through a mill-race. If that argument was sound, we must conclude that trade would flow towards the south. All trade and products must tend to find the shortest outlet to water communication and since the shorter route is via American ports therefore we are bound to believe that the Canadian trade would pass down through the American ports. What then would become of the ports of St. John and Halifax? What becomes of the great scheme

which was laid down when introduced by the late government to build a national transcontinental railway from west to east.

What for? Not to carry the trade of Canada down through the United States, but to transport it east and west through the Dominion, and build up the great seaports of Montreal, St. John and Halifax. The railway has been started, and it is being built at tremendous cost, but the port of Halifax remains practically the same. Transportation was a great cry a few years ago, and the main topic upon which the late administration went to the people. They presented to the electors recently a proposition which tends to reverse the whole situation, and because the people of Canada would not stand for that particular scheme we are told they acted upon passion and prejudice rather than upon reason and sound common-sense. We were also told by the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), if I understood him correctly, that in New Brunswick there was nothing shipped but potatoes. Well, we have in the province of Nova Scotia more things to ship than potatoes. We were told that there was no market for lumber. Yet in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia we have a market for our lumber, and the very lumber dealers of those provinces, or a great many of them, pronounced against this pact. Yet we are told we had no market and the country was suffering by reason of that fact. Sir, we have an excellent market in the West Indies for all the potatoes we can raise in the province of Nova Scotia, and I am speaking particularly of that province. I do not know what the conditions may be in Carleton county, but I venture to say they have a fairly good market for the things they can produce. This year in the province of Nova Scotia we had 1,250,000 barrels, if not 1,500,000 barrels of apples, and the county of Kings—one of the richest and best counties in the whole Dominion—has sent a very large proportion of that fruit from its farms. Where are we going to sell this fruit? We were told before the 21st of September that we should sell it on the other side, and would receive so much per barrel; but when a man was sent to the United States to ascertain the state of the market, and to let us know exactly what the conditions were over there in regard to the fruit industry, and when he came back and reported to Kings county the information received first hand, what did that county do? The fact that I am speaking to this House at the present moment is an evidence of the sound commonsense of the people of Kings. Not so much, Sir, in electing me to this position—because I do not claim to be a brilliant representative, but I mention it as a tribute to the sound common-sense, and the business

capacity, of the people and to their ability to understand how this particular opposition was going to affect them in that part of the country.

Let me here refer to a point that seems to me to have been lost sight of from the east to the west in discussing the issues of the late campaign. Too little stress was laid upon that subtle paragraph in the reciprocity agreement regarding the pulp-wood industry. There you had an agreement which would have prevented provinces with pulpwood resources, the Dominion having accepted this reciprocity pact, from putting a stop in the future to the excessive outflow of that pulpwood. Now what are the conditions in the province of Nova Scotia in respect to pulpwood? Why simply this: We cut every year about 400,000,000 feet of lumber which is 100,000,000 feet faster than it grows. Now, the 1,250,000 or 1,500,000 barrels used in the apple trade have to be made out of this very lumber that is to be sent to the United States or to other parts of the world as pulpwood, and this requires 25,000,000 to 50,000,000 additional feet each year. How long do you suppose our timber supply would continue at this rate of cutting before our forests would be entirely denuded. And yet if the reciprocity pact had gone through our province would have been unable to pass any legislation to prohibit the exportation of that very article that we require so much at home. What do you suppose was the remedy proposed by one of the gentlemen on the opposite side of politics who spoke during the campaign? When asked where we would get our barrels he flippantly remarked: 'Buy them at T. Eatons.'

In the province of Nova Scotia we are raising fruit that will be found of advantage, and is received with favour in the Canadian Northwest. The Canadian Northwest is raising the particular thing that we require in the east. We have natural resources yet untouched in the province of Nova Scotia. Let us apply ourselves to the development of these resources and build up between the maritime provinces and the western provinces a great interprovincial trade. That is the great proposition that we in the east are seeking, that is the thing that we want to see fulfilled, and I believe we will see that wish carried out within the next five or ten years. There is no province in this whole Dominion that is richer than Nova Scotia, and none that has contributed more in material wealth, and more towards the upbuilding of this Dominion than the province from which I come. It has sent to Ottawa three premiers to adorn the government of Canada and to win mention in history as three of the greatest men that Canada has produced. As I have already said we have in Nova Scotia unlimited resources, and we ask for and we will obtain the co-operation of the people of the Dominion in making Nova Scotia one of the banner provinces of this Dominion.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, Ruskin has said somewhere that the ways of youth ought to be very quiet ones, free from much help or praise. Remembering that dictum, Sir, I shall not run the risk of helping my hon. friend who has sat down by criticism or by praise. I will, however permit myself to say that the country has nothing to fear which can produce a member at once so young and so gallant as not only to tackle, but to defeat him who was, from his professional position, presumably the embodiment of the gallantry of the nation. I will also allow myself one single word of encouragement to my young and hon. friend. If he will only practise his excellent dialectical skill to a greater extend in pummelling any one, be he Liberal or Tory, who proposes to raise the tariff in this country then I will be glad to stand at his back or by his side and wish more power to his elbow. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate my hon. friend the Prime Minister even in his absence—if he were present I am sure he would give me credit for sincerity—on his accession to the high position of premier of this great land. In the midst of much criticism of the public life and the characteristics of the public men of Canada, I think we do well on both sides to remember that at any rate this country can boast of a tradition by which no one is admitted to the position of the premier citizen of Canada without having the character of high personal integrity.

I am glad to concede that in the present Prime Minister we have, in this respect, a worthy successor to his great predecessors. With apologies to my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett), I venture to offer a further word of congratulation to the government as a whole upon the condition in which the country is handed over to their care—a condition very different, let me say, from that in which it was received by the preceding administration. It is the fashion, I know, among hon. gentlemen opposite, from the Prime Minister downwards, to talk of the prosperity of Canada as if it had endured for the last thirty years. Now, I have tried to find evidence of any prosperity in Canada before the year 1896, and I am bound to say that all the study I could make has not revealed one jot of such evidence to my researches. What is the test of a nation's prosperity? My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), is not present; I wish he were, I enjoy breaking a lance with him. And I am bound to say that I attach to one particular test very much more impor-

tance than he seemed to do in the remarks which he made to the House the other day. I contend that the surest test of the prosperity of a nation is in the expansion of its foreign trade. Is there not evidence of that in one of the first paragraphs of the speech from the Throne? How does His Royal Highness the Governor General, in the words put into his mouth by the Ministry, proceed to prove that Canada is prosperous at the present moment? Why, by the fact that trade is expanding with the utmost rapidity not only with the mother country but with other countries of the world. Apply the test to the claim, this first fallacy I shall call attention to, which is being continually peddled before the country in the speeches of my hon. friends opposite, and how does their case come out? In 1895, when they had been in power for seventeen years, the volume of commerce of Canada with the whole world was represented by the insignificant figure of $230,000,000. Or rather I should say it was represented by $224,000,000 in that year, the same being $6,000,000 less than the $230,000,000 which represented the foreign commerce of Canada in 1883, twelve years before. So far as this test is a guide on the point I am discussing, Canada, during the last twelve years of the previous Conservative government, had progressed indeed, but progressed as the crab is said to progress,—it had gone backwards. Take any other test you like to apply and compare the condition of Canada then with the condition of Canada now, and you are bound to concede that Canada did not know progress until the year 1896. Take the tests of the deposits of your people in the banks, of the homesteader taking up homesteads, of the immigrants coming into your land. Under any test you like you will find that Canada's condition was one of stagnation and retrogression in 1896. Nobody doubts for a moment that Canada's progress to-day is one of the wonders of the world.

Now, on this head, while repeating my congratulations to the government, I wish to refer to another policy which is constantly being formulated or insinuated by our hon. friends on the other side of the House, and that is that the progress and prosperity which Canada is enjoying at the present moment are in any sense due to the system of protection. As to what progress did take place after 1896, let me follow up the figures in regard to foreign commerce that I have already mentioned. The foreign commerce of $224,000,000 in 1895, was increased under the Laurier administration which took office in 1896, so that three years later, in 1899, our foreign commerce had grown to $321,000,000. That is, in three years of the late administration there had been an increase of nearly fifty per cent. Now, what had the Laurier government done to increase foreign commerce in that most remarkable, most phenomenal way? We are told that they never lowered the tariff. They lowered tariffs by the introduction of the British preference, and by that preference, they at once opened the markets of Great Britain to the agricultural products of this country. Is it any more than the simplest and most obvious common-sense that, if you have a dam across a stream and remove a part of that dam, some water will flow over? A tariff is an obstacle to foreign commerce; tariffs were lowered by the Laurier government; and it is surely good reasoning to say that the extension of commerce finds in that fact one of its explanations,

What did the Laurier government do else to account for the remarkable change which took place? They introduced an immigration policy. By that immigration policy, we are told, it is estimated that $100,000,000 is being brought in as the assets of the immigrants coming into this country every year. Think of that, Mr. Speaker,—one hundred millions of dollars of dry cash coming into the country yearly. Yet, according to the opposition, the country owes all its prosperity to protection. You have fourteen dollars per head of the population coming in, and these hon. gentlemen seek in some artificial tariff arrangement the explanation of the extraordinary prosperity of the country. Sir, this single fact is a strange comment upon the whole protective doctrine. Protection, if it has any object and any purpose, is meant to keep imports out of the country. But there is one hundred millions of dollars of imports yearly,—surely a better explanation of the prosperity of Canada than any artificial manner of restricting trade or raising revenue.

Now, I am glad to have been able to offer congratulations to my hon. friend the Prime Minister and the government generally upon the condition in which the affairs of the country were handed over to them. And here my words of congratulation, I fear, come to an end. I cannot congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), on the auspices under which he came into power. I wish I could. I am sincerely hopeful of the future of this country and as jealous of its public life as if I had been born in it, and I say again, I wish I could. But I cannot congratulate the Prime Minister upon the fact that in the province of Quebec during the recent election he may be said to have partaken of the light wine of old France purveyed by such a connoisseur as my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), while in the province of Ontario he drank a beverage flavoured with more than a dash of orange bitters.

In western Canada we conducted a simple, economic argument on this question, and in my particular province we had no

reason to be dissatisfied with the results. But when I reflect upon the condition of affairs in the east, I do not think it redounds so greatly to the credit of the public life of this country. When I reflect upon my hon. friend the Prime Minister walking into power, flanked on one side by that well-known unselfish patriot, Mr. Clifford Sifton, and on the other by that well known imperialist, Mr. Bourassa, with Mr. Armand Lavergne following in the rear, waving, I am told, or some of his friends did, the flag of old France, and the party asking elsewhere at the same time, 'Under which flag,' then I cannot help acknowledging the truth of the saying that politics, like poverty, makes strange bedfellows.

Now, we have heard a great many explanations of what happened on the 21st of September. Well, I myself think the best explanation probably is that 35,000 more people voted on one side than on the other. But there are other explanations that are perhaps worthy of examination for a moment. I have not come across anything more amusing than the explanation that was given by the Lord Bishop of London. The Lord Bishop of London has been informing the people of Great Britain that Canadian elections went the way they did on the 21st of September because Canadians preferred to remain poor and British, rather than become rich and American. The worthy Bishop, I have no doubt, had in mind a band of men, lean, ascetic, without any campaign fund, going forth to battle for principles as sacred as those of the Sermon on the Mount, and I suppose now the good people of the old land who take their politics from the bench of bishops, are congratulationg themselves that Canada has been delivered from the hands of such well-known bloated plutocrats as my right hon. friend and Mr. Fielding, and has passed into the frugal care of a cabinet poor but patriotic. I cannot think this explanation of the elections will commend itself to the Manufacturers' Association, nor yet to my good friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), whom I am glad to see in the cabinet, and who, before he went into the cabinet, warned the fruit growers of British Columbia, not that they were going to be made rich by trading with the Americans, but that they were going to be made poor if the pact went through. It may not be inconsistent with the duty of a bishop to join in the cry of prejudice against the Americans, whether they are rich or poor; but for my part I would a thousand times rather suffer defeat in trying to assuage international animosities than to achieve the greatest victory by inflaming them. Though, as I have said, the Manufacturers' Association and the Minister of Agriculture would not support the view of the bishop, he is not without support in this country. If he had heard my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) speak the other night he would have found that with the boldness we all admire he was supporting the Lord Bishop's view, for he told us that the result of the elections was a triumph of sentiment over selfishness. Just imagine the sentiment of the Manufacturers' Association. I would just as soon imagine sentiment on the part of the licensed victuallers of Great Britain who, with great honesty, are in the habit of putting up in their places of business during an election campaign the poster, 'Our trade is our politics.' And I am not so sure but that the manufacturers' association would endorse that view. Yet the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that the election was a triumph of sentiment over selfishness. Why, Sir, look at the appeals that were made to sectionalism. When it suited them they made an appeal to the east against the west. I did not read the speeches of all the candidates in eastern Canada, but I did read a dispatch from the east, at a certain period of the contest, which told us that this argument was being used, and I am going to claim credit for at least one western member, that I at once went on the platform and denounced it as a crime against the country. Who has launched this doctrine of the east against the west?

Mr. CURRIE. You have.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My hon. friend is suffering for the moment from a little irritation, natural to one in his circumstances. But there are some instances in which the Prime Minister did not make any mistake, anyhow. I detect in my hon. friend's interruption a very suspicious evidence that he was one of the guilty parties himself. In fact, if my memory does not play me false, I think his name was in the very dispatch that I have been mentioning. But I am going to call fairer minded gentlemen with whom I had the honour of a seat in this House during the previous parliament, I am going to call to their remembrance that in this House the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) used this language: We in the west to-day believe in western development, because western development is Canadian development; and why I regret the defeat of the pact more than anything is this, that it would have benefited every man, woman and child in Canada, in my humble opinion.

Now would it have done it? We heard T. Eaton's mentioned just now. When I sell a bunch of steers my wife sends an order frequently to T. Eaton's. Would not the orders have been more frequent if I had more for my steers? Western development

is Canadian development—I have argued in this House. All that makes work for the one makes it for the other. Was it that sentiment triumphed over selfishness? Not in the appeal to us in the west. When they needed a new and different argument they expanded their views a little, and they were ready to argue the position of Canada against the old country. With perfect honesty, a quality which did a great deal to put him where he is, the Prime Minister, when he came to the west, came out flat-footed not only against reciprocity but, as I understood him, against any increase in the British preference. Where was the sentiment in that attitude? A little extended, but still a sectional view, still a selfish view. When all else failed it was east versus west, Canada versus the old country, and the empire against the world. Mr. Speaker, are these hon. gentlemen contented with any such narrow view as that? The highest thought of the world to-day is not national, it is not even imperial; it is international. Ever since civilization dawned upon mankind, since we have known anything about trade, have not the greatest and grandest things all been international? If a man of my own profession, a medical man, invents something new, does he confine it to the country in which he happens to live? No, it is his greatest privilege, his highest ambition to benefit mankind. An inventor makes an invention and he may obtain every material good that is in it, but he is glad to be able to go forth to the world and give it for the good of mankind. Science, art and literature are all international, and not national. There is where unselfishness lies. But, whoever thought of an international system of protection? The thing is a contradiction in thought and in terms. It is impossible because it is in its very nature anti-social, sectional and selfish. It is the embodiment, the quintessence of selfishness

No, Mr. Speaker, what did happen was that a large number of the people believed they were voting for sentiment, but the trusts, mergers, corporations and big moneyed men were under no delusion in this matter. They used the sentiment of others to cloak their own selfishness. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) offered us an explanation, or one of his explanations, of the change of parties on the 21st September, in the words that the organic union of the empire was threatened. I quite admit that the people thought so, but if the House will allow me, it would not be uninteresting for me to explain why I did not think so. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that I wish they had sent all the copies of the pamphlet to the British-born, to myself. The harm done by it would have been extremely little. I was born and lived for forty years in Great Britain. I want to put this in, in case there may be hon. gentlemen in the House who believe what they said on this question. When I lived in Great Britain I shared with the other inhabitants of the country the right which they freely exercised of buying wheat, for example, from twelve different countries in the world, and selling wherever they could do it at a profit —a harmless line of conduct for any one of us within our private capacity. Are the people of Great Britain disloyal to the flag? I do not suppose that even the most patriotic, the most loyal man opposite would suggest such a thing as that; at least not all of them. But, if I was loyal to the flag when buying and selling with the world, in Great Britain, the thing that puzzled me was to know how I was to become disloyal to the flag by selling and buying with one more country after I had become a Canadian. I cannot understand it. I hope that my hon. and esteemed friend who follows me will enlighten me upon this point for doubtless that was the particular form that his electioneering finally took, although I do not think that loyalty troubled him very much.

This talk about the flag having anything to do with how you buy and sell is absurd. It is not even good Nationalism, for, mark me, Sir, it deprives me now, because I live in Canada, where I am proud to live and where I am proud to be a citizen, and it deprives me as a western homesteader, of a privilege which I exercised as an Englishman without law or anything else interfering with me; so that my privileges are reduced by becoming a Canadian citizen. The loyality argument was absurd to my mind. When I ship a car load of steers to Chicago I do not put a caboose at the end with so much loyalty in it. If I did, according to the theory of trade, I should have to take goods back from Chicago, or some other part of the United States to pay for the steers, and the United States, presumably, would put on a caboose with some of their loyalty, and it would be made up again. It was not only absurd but it was insulting to Canadians, for, what was the suggestion? And not only the suggestion, but what was the plain statement? That because, forsooth, you have an opportunity of extending your trade you are going to endanger the integrity of your country. The reduction of taxes is a common-sense thing to do and under direct taxation people never think of doing anything else. It is only when you tax people indirectly that they think taxes are good things. When one takes the opportunity of extending one's trade and reduces taxes at the same time the statement is that it is going to lead to annexation with the United States. It was insulting to Cana-

dians and for this reason that, according to my poor methods of thinking, the only way that annexation could be brought about was either by conquest on the one hand or by meek surrender on the other. America, one hundred years ago, shed the last blood of Canadian citizens and she could not conquer Canada then.

There is no Canadian who thinks that issue could occur here to-day. So that, the thing that frightened my hon. friends of the Tory party—and no Tory party is ever happy long without a scare—the thing that frightened them was that they,—not we, for no such thought ever entered our bosoms—would be led to give up Canada by a process of meek surrender. I leave them the thought as a compliment to their citizenship as Canadians. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) went on to indicate what he seemed to conceive would be one of the results of the election going the way it did, and he used the phrase "not only organic but commercial union." He must have spent some midnight oil in coining it, because I heard him repeat it at least three times, and I have not had time to read his speech to see how many times he used the phrase. Now, my only wish about that phrase is that he had come down from vague generalities and gone a little into detail as to what he meant by the 'organic and commercial union' that is likely to result from the rejection of this pact. I presume he means to indicate that he is a supporter of the policy which was first brought before the empire and the world by that brilliant statesman, Joseph Chamberlain. Well, how is organic union with Great Britain going to be strengthened by Mr. Chamberlain's scheme? That scheme proposed to tax the wheat of the world and to allow Canadian wheat to go into British markets more cheaply, the result of which process must be to increase the price of flour to the British workingman. The result of that scheme would have been that my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) would have hold of the British workingman, metaphorically speaking, by the stomach, and in that way there would be indeed a kind of organic union, and of course the length of time that union would last would altogether depend upon the ability of the man with the stomach to get out of the grip. I wish again that some one on the other side would descend from vague generalities and give us some details about what they are going to do for this commercial union. Presumably my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), as I proved last session, has been working for this thing for twenty years and now that he is in power he will surely get to business and do something. There is the excellent article of woollens that we need very much of in this country. Woollens are an essential article of clothing in a country where you have five months of winter, sometimes zero most of the time as I have seen occur once. A plentiful and cheap supply of woollens would seem to be a very great thing for people inhabiting such a country, so that I presume one of the first steps of this government in bringing about organic and commercial union—which, to use a verb familiar to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) he has adumbrated for so many years—one of the first things this government will do will be to go to Britain and indicate woollens as one of the things upon which they are willing to reduce their duties so that we homesteaders in the west will get the chance of buying the products of the Yorkshire mills which are the best woollens in the world. We need the chance to buy more cheaply all the more because we have been refused the right to sell where we like. Unless this whole talk of organic and commercial union and inter-imperial preference is a gold-brick to the British-born, I shall be interested indeed to see the present government make offers to Britain along the line of woollens with the smiling approval of my hon. and esteemed friend the chief whip of the party (Mr. Stanfield) and of my other hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Thoburn). It is only when you go into details and look at schemes like this that you see the difficulty.

An hon. MEMBER. Unshrinkable woollens.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). The woollens might be unshrinkable as my hon. friend suggests, but the policy is unthinkable. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) is great on new ideas, and in connection with the mention of fair trade (not free trade) he used the phrase that it was a new idea. Why, Sir, I remember in the early days of my political work in the old country that Mr. Chamberlain, when in the height of his power, and president of the Board of Trade in Mr. Gladstone's second administration, used to trounce the protectionists of those days who at that particular time called themselves fair traders. Fair trade is not a new idea; there is nothing new about the idea of protection any more than there is about selfishness which is at the root of it; it is as old as human nature. But, commercial union seems to be a new idea to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett). I wonder how he, who has done much reading--as he will soon give this House ample evidence of—I wonder how he has forgotten his history. There was a time when we had commercial union between

Canada and the old land. Has my hon. friend forgotten the navigation laws? The navigation laws were repealed by the wise Liberal government of Lord Russell in 1849 and these laws were designed to force Canada into exclusive trade with the old land. The date 1849 is significant, because five years later as a result of the repeal of those laws Lord Elgin negotiated his first reciprocity treaty with the United States. Now, Sir, the point I want to bring to the notice of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) —who doubtless in his blind and stumbling way loves the empire as much as I do— the point I want to bring to his attention is this; that before that repeal, and before that introduction of reciprocity there was disloyalty in Canada. The people were dissatisfied, but the gift of commercial freedom, (not commercial restriction) that is to say the freedom to make their own commerce restored that loyalty, that patriotism and that imperialism which are as strong to-day in Canada as in any portion of the British Empire.

And now Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two upon the amendment of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) which after all is the specific thing we are debating at the present moment. I was very much interested in listening to the first speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and I hope I may already call him my hon. friend. It was an able speech; a speech which fully justifies—if I can say so without offence—his inclusion in the cabinet. But it was not free from fault, and I think that one of its faults was as a piece of parliamentary debating, and as my hon. friend from Pictou very well pointed out in an interruption, that he in general terms charged the whole of this side of the House with inflaming race and party prejudice without producing one jot or tittle of a quotation to prove his case.

That is not a method of debating which will carry my hon. friend very far in producing conviction as to any cause which he is arguing. We are charged by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) with inflaming race and creed prejudices in this country. Why, when my hon. friend makes a charge of that kind in this House he presumes upon the credulity of his own followers. Did we issue 'The Appeal to the British-born' in the last election? I never used an argument upon any platform which I did not address to my audience as an audience of Canadians. I should be ashamed upon this or any other topic to speak to any audience of men, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, except as the members of one great country—and I have learned that lesson partially from my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who, above all men, so far as I have been able to observe his career, has for his magnum opus, his chief object, the cementing of all classes and creeds. If he has one pride it is Canada. I am glad to pay that tribute to him when he is leading the opposition, because I am as proud of being behind him to-day as ever I was when he was in power. I never wanted anything from him or from anybody else, I do not now, but I am proud to have followed him on this and a hundred other grounds; I am proud because in him, as all Canadians realize, we have had an incomparable party leader, a great asset of a whole people, a splendid example of a world citizen and, with all that, a simple and loving friend of every man, woman and child in the country. I am sorry that a slight aside on my part has had the effect of driving from his place the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen); however, in the absence of the minister I must continue to say just a few words about the amendment, and may I point out, Sir, that the amendment is justified to the hilt by the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine. The amendment has done some good already. It complains that no policy has been declared on the part of the government in regard to naval defence, but the Minister of Marine declared at last the fourth policy of the Conservative party upon this subject. It is exceedingly interesting to reflect upon the kaleidoscopic views of the party opposite in regard to naval defence. But I shall not do more than touch on them:

First act in the drama—German scare at full height. The hon. member for North Toronto, as he then was (Mr. Foster), comes down to the House with his full war paint on and with tears in his voice tells us about the weary Titan. Just before the curtain went down they decided upon the speedy construction of a Canadian naval service, and the gentleman in the biggest hurry was the Prime Minister because at his instigation that word 'speedy' was put in the resolution.

Second act in the drama—German scare still on, so badly on that we must send dry cash, $20,000,000 or $25,000,000. Down went the curtain on the second act.

Third act in the drama—Capture of the omnibus by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) whom I am more than pleased on personal grounds now to see a minister of the government—capture of the omnibus and a plebiscite on the part of this great loyal and imperialist party to find out from the country whether they should really do anything or not.

Last act in the drama—revealed by one of the recruits of the party and of the minister last evening, when he lifted the curtain just a little he justified the amend-

ment to which I am speaking, and he says he is now going not to the Canadian people, but to the British Admiralty. I hope that if he does so he will take my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), who still runs the omnibus—at least he possesses the works—and Mr. Bourassa over with him.

What are the circumstaances which have led the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) to announce this fourth policy within two years? Why he actually finds that if you are going in for a Canadian service, you will have to build some ships. That has been a perfect revelation to him—I am surprised at that seeing that he lives on the sea coast. He says he has a proposition to build nine ships. What did they expect to build when they were going into a naval service, airships or houses? Of course if you go in for a naval service, you must build ships; it has never been done in any other way. If my hon. friend the Minister of Marine had been in this House a year or two ago, he would have heard me give more startling figures than he produced last evening. He talks of nine ships, cruisers and destroyers, and he is so frightened at that that he gives up his first resolution, his second resolution and the plebiscite and he is going, I understood, as a deputation, to the British Admiralty to see if it would not be better to go a little more slowly. That plea for time does not for one moment touch the principle of this amendment—not for one moment. The figures which I quoted to the House were that our representatives to the imperial press conference in Britain, two or three years ago, saw 144 ships of the line in the Solent and only one of these ships was 12 years old. That is the brand of imperialism they go in for in Britain. They believe in the flag there. I doubt about my friends opposite of they are frightened out of their wits at the idea of building nine ships. I think that is a fair criticism of a party that has just come out of an election in which they have nearly shaken their arms off waving the flag. I have great respect for the loyalty which will die in the last ditch for the flag, but I am very suspicious of loyalty which wants the other fellow to die in the last ditch to provide him with bigger dividends on the one hand and is frightened at the idea of building nine little ships of war on the other.

As I said, the plea for time is no answer to the amendment before the House.

Now that amendment I shall support with the utmost heartiness, because it raises a question of the highest importance to this country. And let me say, and I hope to prove what I say, that in the first place the amendment involves nothing less than the personal honour of the ministry. That is very strong language, but according to the canons and traditions of the best political life with which I am acquainted—the political life of the government and parliament of the old country—that is what is involved in this amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). For what are the facts? Up to the time of the formation of the cabinet there was a distinct cleavage in opinion on this question of naval defence as between the two sections of the cabinet. I want to explain to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) at this point that I, of all men in this House, had the least possible objection to the inclusion in any cabinet of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. What I am concerned for is that he should go into that cabinet in accordance with the best traditions of British government, I mean government of the British Empire. There was a distinct cleavage; there is no denying that, it cannot be denied. Nor can it be denied further that it is a very constitutional practice that the members sitting in one cabinet, and as has been pointed out in the words of the amendment itself should be in agreement upon the principles upon which they are going to govern in regard to the vital questions before the country. May I give an illustration, to any one who knows anything of recent British history or how highly British statesmen regard their honour in this respect? All of us, many of us, remember when Mr. Gladstone was forming his first home rule administration, Sir Henry James, afterwards Lord James, was an old and honoured member of the Liberal party. He had been Mr. Gladstone's attorney general in the previous administration, he was in agreement with Mr. Gladstone upon everything but home rule, if he had gone into Mr. Gladstone's government he would have been the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain. When he heard Mr. Gladstone's explanation of what he proposed he laid down cheerfully the Lord Chancellorship of Great Britain and didn't go into the government, because he could not agree with Mr. Gladstone's policy upon the home rule question. The Duke of Devonshire was in exactly the same boat. Now, I do not know what ministers have given way upon this subject, but I think I have given evidence that according to the best parliamentary traditions that have ever been known in this world the question of the honour of ministers is involved. Nay more, the rights of parliament are involved.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Parliament passed a resolution on this subject, unani-

mously, parliament has a right to know whether the resolution is going to be honoured by this ministry and loyally honoured by every section of it. There was a cleavage until the two sections sat together in a cabinet. One of two things has happened. Either there is no change in opinion on the part of either section in the cabinet or there is a change. If there is no change then one side of the formation of the cabinet is guilty of breaking this constitutional rule, and has fallen short of the high standard of statesmanship shown by Devonshire and James, and I for one am a good enough Canadian to want as high a standard in these matters to prevail in Canada as ever prevailed in Great Britain. If there is a change the country has a right to know who has changed, and then all will go well.

It is a poor thing if Canadian traditions are to be given away in such a matter because some one is afraid to divulge that he has made a change in case it should hurt the chances of his political party. We have heard recently of a simile of a dog that had or did not have a collar on, but it appears to me in this case that some dog has got a muzzle on. I do not know that if I were to speak until bedtime I could make a point in regard to this amendment any clearer. I leave it with the cabinet in that shape. But I will vote for the amendment cheerfully on the grounds that I have given. Imperialism was the word we heard recently throughout the length and breadth of the land. My hon. friend the member for East Lambton wrote a letter to his constituents after the election was over and, if I mistake not, it ended with the words: 'Continentalism is dead, imperialism is alive.' Well, are they following up their imperial traditions in causing the Canadian standard to descend in this way? Mr. Speaker, during the recess, a year or two ago, while our naval debates were on there came into my little house on my western farm a poor Norwegian who had only been two or three years in Canada and in broken English he said to me: I wish you could do something for the old country, if there is any danger, Sir. I think more of that man's loyalty, and that man's imperialism than the three cent brand that I have tried to say some few words about this afternoon, that seems to animate the whole government benches.

Hon. F. D. MONK (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to my hon. friend from Red Deer. I confess very frankly to my hon. friend, we have sat together in this House for many years, that I have always found him entertaining. He is a cultured Englishman who has settled in this country, and I will be frank enough to say to my hon. friend that when I hear him I always think that we cannot have too many of his kind in this country. But, Mr. Speaker, there is this peculiarity about my hon. friend: He hates Toryism.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is right.

Mr. MONK. He is a Radical, and he is a hidebound free trader, and he seems to exult in the fact that he has during the fifteen years supported a protectionist government. Not only that, but I have heard often before to-day what my hon. friend has stated as to the prosperity of the country and he does not seem to connect that prosperity in any way with the prevalence of a fiscal regime which his party adopted when it came into power and has firmly conserved to the present moment. But where my hon. friend has surprised me slightly is in his unqualified support of this amendment. And perhaps the House will allow me for a moment because I can assure you Mr. Speaker I have no desire whatever, to unduly prolong this debate, to ask him what he thinks of the purport of this amendment? Is it not a representation to the Crown of a supposed division existing in the cabinet?

Can my hon. friend point out in British constitutional history any example of such a representation made to the Crown by the House of Commons within the last three hundred years? My hon. friend, who hates Tories, who is a Radical, who has kept track of the progress of British liberty,—how is it possible for him to support the representation contained in this amendment to the Crown of the supposed position in the cabinet? It only shows how very hidebound a party man my hon. friend is. For I submit to him that this amendment is one of the most extraordinary that has ever been proposed in any modern British parliament. The state of the cabinet is not a matter for the Crown. In olden times, cabinets were divided, ministers might not be on speaking terms; and in that remote period representations could be made and were made to the Crown. But, nowadays, the constitution, the humour, the control of the cabinet is entirely under the hand of the House of Commons. It is a committee of parliament. It is a retrograde step to make representation to His Royal Highness the Governor General on a matter which the House of Commons alone can and should take cognizance of.

But my object in rising is more especially to say something to my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He and I, in the many years we have sat together in the House, though we have not been on the same side, have always been good friends. But I would ask him, why has he exhibited since the 21st of September, and more particularly

since we met for the present session, so much bad humour? My right hon. friend has been peevish—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK—he has been morose; he has been in bad humour. And—will he allow me to say to him, though he is not present at this moment?—that he does not seem to have realized in any degree the effect or nature of what took place, to his extreme discomfiture, on the 21st September. I heard my right hon. friend's statement to the House—and heard it with great surprise—that the people, in that memorable election had been carried away by sentiment and by prejudice. Surely, he is judging lightly and insufficiently the demeanour of the people in that great election. Surely he is developing—and I make him no grave reproach about it—that very natural sentiment of vanity, which, when a man passes a certain age, leads him to believe that he alone is right and that those who do not follow his opinion are necessarily in error. The House, the country at large, view very differently from that the judgment of 21st September last. There was sentiment, there was feeling. There was a natural determination of the Canadian people to do by themselves and not to become the slaves of the great republic to the south. But there was also I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, a careful weighing, a prudent appreciation of all the conditions of that bargain which was extended to us by our neighbours after their refusal during twenty years or more to meet us on any terms of arrangement. It was not only sentiment, but it was also a careful and judicious appreciation of all the conditions of the pact which led the people of Canada on that day to affirm their determination to remain Canadian, to remain in the empire and to continue their development, as they have done since confederation, independent of all foreign influence.

Not only did my right hon. friend find in that verdict by which the people have affirmed their intention to remain what they are a proof of the influence of pure sentiment, but he added that the remarkable event which swept him and his party from power and put us here was a result of prejudice. I say that that statement is dictated by peevishness, moroseness, dissatisfaction. And will my right hon. friend allow me to say to him, this: If there has been prejudice, if that element has had any effect in that election, it is due particularly to my right hon. friend himself and his friends. If he has seen that feeling in his own province, if he has seen a diminution of his influence in that particular part of the country, he owes it to himself and his friends, and to the prejudice that they built up there.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). To the Nationalists.

Mr. MONK. We will come to them in good time. My right hon. friend started in the province of Quebec, long ago, a campaign with the view to establishing that he alone was in a position to protect his compatriots of that province—against whom? Against the encroachments of the Conservative party. That was the starting point of my right hon. friend; that was the object of the campaign he made in 1896. and he succeeded, he and his friends in persuading the people of the province of Quebec, or a large number of them, that there was in the Conservative party an unfriendly, a hostile, an inimical disposition towards the people of that province. And if to-day he meets the result that has occurred he owes it to the falsity of that charge and to the refuge he took in it for so many years.

What was the condition in 1896? Allusion was made to it yesterday by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). At that time it was contended by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in the province of Quebec that the untold sacrifice and effort of the Conservative party at that time in order to give satisfaction to the minority in Manitoba was nothing but simulation on the part of the Conservative leaders.

How many times have I heard my right hon. friend in the province of Quebec contend that the Remedial Bill, which was the cause of the defeat of the Conservative party in that year, did not contain a sufficient measure of justice for the minority of Manitoba. My right hon. friend promised that if he were given power he would give a greater measure of justice to the minority, and it is upon that representation in the province of Quebec, and upon his success in building up for himself and his friends a totally undeserved reputation for being the only just, the only fair men to the people of his own province, that he obtained that ascendency which he did obtain, and with the loss of which he is now threatened. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the fact? I point this out in order to show the House the gradation in the loss of popularity by my hon. friend, in the loss of that confidence which he never can regain in our province. The elections of 1896 gave my right hon. friend the power to carry out that promise. He did not do so. My right hon. friend knows what he did. These people to whom he had made that promise he threw overboard. Is that a fact or is it not? We know what the situation is to-day, and that whatever advantages or rights they enjoy they owe purely and simply to

the indulgence of the government of that province. Then came the second test—because the people of our province do not readily abandon confidence in a man when once they have given it. In 1905 my right hon. friend had a fresh opportunity. He knows what happened when he constituted these two new provinces. He came down to the House with a measure which he said was grounded upon the rock of the constitution. It gave, according to him, a just measure of protection to the minority in the territories that were going to be constituted into two provinces. Somebody raised their hand. My right hon. friend withdrew from that position immediately, once more he deceived the confidence that had been placed in him, and he abandoned the position he had taken up with regard to people whom he was bound to protect. My right hon. friend remembers that upon that occasion when we were discussing the constitution of the new provinces some of us moved an amendment by which we sought to obtain for the minority the important right of the use of their own language. My right hon. friend remembers that.

Mr. DEVLIN. Who abolished it?

Mr. MONK. You did.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will my hon. friend allow me one question? Who passed the law in 1890, abolishing that right in the Northwest Territories, was it the Liberal or the Conservative party?

Mr. MONK. At that time there was absolute unanimity in the House that the right of that minority to their language stood absolutely upon the same basis as the right to their schools, there can be no doubt whatever about that. In answer to my hon. friend's question, I say that at that moment, once more deceiving the people whose confidence he had obtained, my right hon. friend abandoned them, and when I rose in the House and claimed for the descendants of the discoverers of that country, the pioneers of that country, the right in the legislatures of the two new provinces at least to address the House in their own language, my right hon. friend was the first to deny it. So, Mr. Speaker, there was a gradation in the loss of confidence which the right hon. gentleman has sustained in our province.

Mr. DEVLIN. One more question. Who passed the law in 1892 abolishing the French language in the Northwest Territories? Was it the Conservative or the Liberal party?

Mr. MONK. I do not think that question is important. What we are discussing now is the situation that is before us.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman answer?

Mr. MONK.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MONK. Now there is another point upon which my right hon. friend took, during many years, a very strong position in our province, I refer to the naval question. In 1902, and from even an earlier period, my right hon. friend took the position that we were not bound to contribute to the assistance of the British navy. Rightly or wrongly, that was the stand he took until 1909. After the conference of 1902 he returned to Canada and was praised for the attitude he had taken there, he received encomiums from all parts of our province. In 1907 he took an even stronger position at the Imperial Conference of that year, and absolutely refused to take any part whatever, in co-operation with the other dependencies, in imperial defence. The chief point upon which my right hon. friend lost the confidence of his own people was when we called upon him not to inaugurate his naval policy without giving the people a chance to be consulted and to decide upon it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The position that I took in the Conference of 1902 was that we were prepared to take up the naval part of our defence as well as the military part.

Mr. MONK. Not to my knowledge. Those who read the proceedings of the conference of 1902 will find that my right hon. friend took the stand that we were doing all we could do in that direction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I took the stand that we were prepared to undertake our naval defence as well as our military defence.

Mr. MONK. What I submit is that the position taken by the right hon. gentleman at both those conferences does not admit of any doubt whatever.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None whatever.

Mr. MONK. It absolutely repudiated any idea of participation and at the Conference of 1907 the right hon. gentleman accentuated that position by stating positively when the motion of Dr. Smartt was submitted to the Conference, which called for some kind of assistance, that under no circumstance and under no conditions would he consider that proposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at all.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to call it six o'clock.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 23, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. EDWARDS moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: The amendment proposed by this Bill has in times past been the subject of negotiations between the Dominion government and the government of the province of Ontario. It has also been the subject of urgent representations on the part of the Dominion Marine Association, which controls practically all the vessels on the inland waters of Canada. The Bill has particular reference to the amendment of section 477 of the Canada Shipping Act. By that section as it stands at present there is a very unjust discrimination against Ontario vessels in the payment of pilotage dues in the harbour of Montreal. The object of the Bill is to remove that unjust discrimination and to place the province of Ontario on a parity with the other provinces. I need not say that large interests are affected by this Bill, and that practically every county in the province of Ontario is more or less interested in this amendment. When I state that a vessel sailing from Halifax, Newfoundland or New York to Montreal is exempt from the payment of pilotage dues, while a vessel sailing from Owen Sound, Toronto, Kingston, or any port on the Great Lakes is now subject to the payment of those dues, members will at once recognize that an anomaly exists. I believe that that anomaly is unjustifiable. The Bill is very simple. I merely am asking that vessel owners in the province of Ontario be placed on the same footing as vessel owners in the other provinces of this Dominion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER. On consideration I am inclined to think that this Bill is a Bill which should be introduced by resolution, as one affecting trade. It is true that it is to amend the Shipping Act, but it seems to me that when you amend the Shipping Act you affect trade, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the Bill until that point has been considered.

With the permission of the House, the Bill was withdrawn.

CANADIAN MISSIONARIES IN CHINA.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to ask whether the attention of the government has been called to the recent disturbances in China and the serious condition of Canadian citizens whose lives are in very grave jeopardy in that country? I have communications from two families in my constituency of which members are besieged in the city of Chung Tu where not only the missionaries but all the Europeans are confined to the Mission hospital. Already two missionaries have been stabbed to death in that place, a Canadian and an American, and there is great danger of starvation if not worse unless immediate relief can be obtained. I have been asked to bring this matter to the attention of the government in order that, in some way, if it be possible, the attention of the authorities may be brought to the matter with the hope that some speedy relief may be given.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. H. Clarke) for having brought this matter to the attention of the government. The matter has not come under the consideration of the government, in fact we were not aware, until my hon. friend brought it to my attention that the conditions were so serious as they seem to be. The attention of the government will be given to the matter at once, and we shall endeavour to make such representations as may be in order for the purpose of bringing about any action that is possible under the circumstances to secure the relief of the people who are in danger and destitution. I shall take steps this afternoon to carry out the request of my hon. friend.

COAL SUPPLY IN THE WEST.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would repeat my question of yesterday as to what information the Minister of Customs has that the supply of bituminous coal in the west on the 6th of December, when the order in council replacing the duty on bituminous coal becomes effective, will be sufficient to meet the wants of the people of the prairie provinces.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of the Interior). The government understand from the coal dealers at Winnipeg and other large centres, that, in view of the alarming conditions existing in the prairie provinces and western Canada prior to the settlement of the recent coal strike, they have laid in an extraordinary stock of coal and in view of this and of the fact that the strike has been settled and the mines are now running, the government have reason to hope that there will be a sufficient quantity of coal available for the supply of settlers in all parts of western Canada.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett (Calgary) for an address to His Royal Highness, the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Hon. F. D. MONK (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair last night, I was putting forth a modest endeavour to soothe the unduly irritated feelings of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and I was placing before the consideration of my right hon. friend the fact that if his friends, particularly in the province of Quebec, had held him up to our detriment, as the saviour of the rights of his race and the only one qualified to protect and save those rights, events which I mentioned had rather tended to dispel that illusion and that many who had before favoured my right hon. friend under the conditions of that legend, carefully built up, had subsequently withdrawn their confidence from him. But, Sir, we can go further and I submit to you and to this House that my right hon. friend does not give due consideration to the circumstances under which he was removed from power when he ascribes the events of September 21 to pure emotionalism, sentiment and prejudice. There were many other causes, and even taking the question of reciprocity, I believe that in the history of this country there will be no page more interesting, not only from the point of view of sentiment but from the point of view of the calm judgment, the courage and the determination of the Canadian people, than that page which my hon. friend calls an emotional page.

My hon. friend and his friends cannot fail to consider the effect upon public opinion of the numerous scandals which marked particularly the latter years of their regime. Does he think that with the Canadian people and the electors of this country the Quebec bridge scandal did not have a very serious effect? Never in my experience of public life have we had an example of such a glaring dereliction of duty as that which the government exhibited upon that occasion and which not only caused us to lose millions of money but also ended in throwing into mourning nearly a hundred of our labouring families. And what does my right hon. friend think was the effect upon the public mind of the North Atlantic Trading scandal? We had here the very singular spectacle of two of our officials concerned in the expenditure of over half a million dollars, as I recollect it, in connection with immigration positively refusing, under the protection of the government of the day, to inform us as to what persons had received these very large amounts. Let me advert briefly to what took place during the last three or four years in the Public Accounts Committee. I, for one, abandoned the investigation which more courageous members of the opposition of that time pursued before that committee. For my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and others were there at every moment to check the investigation into the expenditures of public money. To such an extent was this carried that it was utterly impossible for the representatives of the people to obtain accurate information as to the vast sums spent yearly by the government. In our province at least—and I am sure the same was true everywhere—the immense and unexpected expenditure in connection with the National Transcontinental railway was another cause of loss of confidence in the government. My right hon. friend and his ministers had stated that some thirteen or fifteen millions of expenditure would pull us through this immense enterprise, that we should build it, so to speak, with our yearly surpluses. But we all know that in the last session of parliament we had the admission of hon. Mr. Graham, then Minister of Railways, that this transcontinental line would cost us at least $188,000,000. And I believe that we shall have incurred an expense of $250,000,000 before that line is ready with all its equipment from ocean to ocean. The House remembers under what circumstances our investigation into the giving away —that is the only proper expression—of vast tracts of land in the Northwest took place and how the investigation was checked into the expenditure of money by one of the ministers concerned in the passing of orders in council by which the country parted, without consideration, with a tract of almost six thousand acres. Is it surprising, I say, and can we ascribe merely to emotionalism, or to the reign of prejudice the verdict which the people gave in September last? I believe that the sooner we adopt in this country the rule which has prevailed for years in England, of not keeping a government in power for more than ten or twelve years the sooner we shall obtain that degree of good government which they have already obtained in that country. And although everything leads me to believe that our own lease of power will greatly exceed that number of years, I must confess—and I am sure my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) will agree with me—it is not wise for the people to keep a government in power longer. The fact is, I was closing a transaction yesterday with an important member of the Liberal party,

and, invited to state the term of our probable stay in office, I told him that I was not in favour of keeping one government long in power and said: You cannot have me for twenty-five years, and I favour rather fifteen years. At the same time, everything leads me to believe that, if the same conditions prevail as when we came into office, the term of our power will be extended beyond that period.

But what particularly disquiets hon. gentlemen on the other side, is the existence—according to them—already of dissensions in the cabinet. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) thought he had made a point, if I mistake not, when he qualified this cabinet as a cabinet of coalition. Well, I do not know that a cabinet of coalition is, per se, a very bad one. When the right hon. gentleman formed his cabinet in 1896 he took in elements which up to that time had been somewhat strange to him. He took in my late friend the hon. Mr. Dobell, of Quebec, who was supposed to represent the discontented Conservatives at that time if I mistake not. He took in another element from discontented Conservatives in the person of the late hon. Mr. Tarte; and I believe that was the occasion of a great deal of bitterness to my right hon. friend, bitterness which lasted up to the time when Mr. Tarte left the cabinet. There is nothing absolutely wrong in the taking in of what my right hon. friend called 'strange elements.' But, in the peevish mood, the scolding mood, in which hon. gentlemen opposite are, they think that they see dissension. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)—as I am informed, an aspirant Minister of Justice—during a certain time—stands on the watch-tower. He scans the desert before him, and thinks he sees dissension, 'Sister Ann, Sister Ann,' they say to him, 'do you see anything in the distance?' There is nothing to see, Mr. Speaker. We have not yet even reached the stage when they 'fight like blazes' as we were told they did by a member of the late government. I went down to take part in the magnificent demonstration given to the leader of the government some days ago at Halifax; and as one who has sat in this House with my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) during the whole of fifteen years since we entered parliament together, I was proud to declare there that, amongst the many excellent qualifications he possessed to lead the party, there was none which I thought so outstanding during these long years as his extreme delicacy in all relations. I cannot conceive how it is possible for any man to have any serious differences with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) who sits at my right. The declarations made in this House by my hon. friend the leader of the government on all occasions since he has assumed the reins of power have given absolute satisfaction not only to myself but also I am sure to all those on this side of the House.

But what gave rise to this idea of difficulties? My right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, if I remember his words correctly, stated a day or two ago, in this very debate, that there had been at most a difference of opinion between himself and myself—and I am referring to myself, because I have been in this discussion, I think, somewhat in the position of a 'caper emissarius à tête de Turc,' as we say in French. That is, I believe, absolutely true, there never was any difference or dissension between us. Let me briefly recall some of the leading facts. I was, Mr. Speaker, when a boy a great admirer of the circus, where I went to see famous acrobats who could leap over high elephants; but I never witnessed anything so remarkable as the leap which my right hon. friend made in 1909 when, jumping over all platforms, as is his habit, and clearing the platform he had adopted at the conference of 1902 and 1907, he brought down to this House the resolution to which reference has so often been made, in the month of March, 1909. My right hon. friend then took up a position which he had never taken up before, and which was at variance particularly with the attitude he had always professed to hold in the province of Quebec. I voted upon that occasion, Sir, for that resolution, and I never regretted it, and I would do it again under similar circumstances.

What were the circumstances? Many members of this House were here then, and can remember them. A day or two before—and I am speaking from memory, but in this respect I think my memory is pretty correct—a very important debate had taken place in the British House of Commons sitting in committee on the naval estimates, and a very violent attack had been made upon the government of the day, in which it had been asserted that not only war was imminent, but that the British navy, so long easily considered the first navy of the world, had been unexpectedly found in an absolutely defective condition. A panic ensued, a panic which I am informed by competent authorities, lasted for at least two weeks in England; it was a war scare. It was under those circumstances that the motion of the 29th of March was brought up in this House. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, because I have at times in this House, very unfairly I believe, and friends of mine with me, been taxed with disloyalty. The moment of danger for the British Empire will never be the moment which I and my friends with me, will choose to discuss our relations with the mother country. That was a moment of emergency, that was a question of fact. It was a moment of danger,

and I gladly gave my adherence to that resolution, as I would, and as every true Canadian should, under similar circumstances. But, Mr. Speaker, that panic did not last long. Shortly afterwards the leaders on both sides in the House of Commons reassured the public, and all fears were dispelled, and it became a well ascertained fact that never at any moment had the British navy been in a condition of inferiority, as had been asserted. It was still the two power standard, it was still easily in a position to maintain the supremacy of the sea. A few months afterwards Lord Brassey, in a lecture which has become celebrated, which he delivered at Cape Town, I think, on the 22nd of December of that year, gave a full explanation of the condition of the British navy, which can be found in the British Navy Annual, from which it is made to appear without any doubt whatever, that that navy was and is in a very high state of efficiency. I mention this because sometimes I have been asked why I voted for that motion I say again that at that moment, when a new question of policy was under consideration, when the desire was throughout the great dependencies of the British Empire to show that every one of those dependencies stood side by side with the mother country, no loyal man could have refused to support that resolution.

Mr. ETHIER. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. MONK. Certainly.

Mr. ETHIER. Is it not a fact that during the last campaign in the province of Quebec, when the hon. gentleman and his Nationalist friends were accused of having voted for that resolution, he defended himself by stating that the motion was passed in his absence, that he never voted for it?

Mr. MONK. I did not think that I would have to defend myself against the Nationalists. I thought from what has been said in this House during this debate, that I was one of them myself. I may say furthermore, in answer to my hon. friend, that I never heard of what he has just stated. I never was accused of having voted for the resolution. I have often been asked why I voted for it, and I am giving one of the reasons here now. Let me further tell my hon. friend and the House that I am not aware that I was guilty of inconsistency in supporting that resolution. I do not know whether many of us have read carefully the reports of those great conferences, I have read them several times over. And let me call attention—because it is necessary for the purposes of the present discussion—let me call the attention of the House to what was contained in that resolution of the month of March, 1909.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Did my hon. friend say that he voted for this resolution?

Mr. MONK. I adhered to it, certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You voted for it?

Mr. MONK. Certainly. But let me say in further answer to the right hon. gentleman, that I was not present in the House when it was declared carried. But we all remember the circumstances.

Mr. DEVLIN. That was your defence in the country.

Mr. MONK. Let me say to the hon. gentleman of the butting in habit, that there were very few members in the House when that resolution was declared carried. It had been the subject of a conference between my right hon. friend and the leader of the opposition; I am sure my right hon. friend, though he is momentarily ill disposed towards me, will bear me out in that. My hon. friend who at present leads the government, and the right hon. gentleman, in that conference, agreed upon the terms of the resolution, and it was declared carried. But by that time I had gone home and was in bed. At the same time, I was quite satisfied with its terms. Curiously enough those who rose in the House and spoke against that resolution and the next day afterwards apparently adhered to it, because it was carried unanimously, never came back to this House. I did not speak myself, but I approved of it under the circumstances I have indicated.

But, I have wandered slightly from the subject. What I wish to call your attention to, Sir, is that the resolution declared that it was the desire to carry out the suggestions made by the British Admiralty at the Imperial Conference of 1907—speaking from memory, and I am sure I am right in that. What were the suggestions made by the British Admiralty at the conference of 1907? Lord Tweedmouth, at the conference of 1907—and he did not get the approval of the right hon. leader of the opposition as we all know—submitted to the Colonial delegates there gathered together the old plan of the British government, the plan which had been matured by the British government beginning about the year 1885 and which had been evolved by a committee of the British Privy Council assisted and inspired by the best experts. In two words—for I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House—that plan was that the British Admiralty took charge for itself of the supremacy of the seas. It was their business—I am interpreting the report as I understand it—to take charge of the supremacy of the seas and the guardianship of the trade routes. Where did we come in? We came in in this respect, that we were asked to provide

against any sudden attack or raid upon our coasts and, furthermore, we were required to provide ports of refuge and repair, naval ports, and coaling stations for the vessels of the British fleet. I wish to draw the attention of the House to that point. There were other details but that was, en résumé, the plan that the British government themselves evolved and the plan which was referred to at length by the Duke of Devonshire when, in 1890 or 1892, he presided at the meeting of the Imperial Federation League and explained this plan to them. It is referred to at greater length in the proceedings of the House of Lords in 1892, I think, when the Duke of Devonshire gave an answer to a question put by Lord Minto, and subsequently further explanations were given by the noble lord who had preceded the Duke of Devonshire in the office he then occupied. I am giving these references because what I am saying can easily be verified. I mention that for the purpose of showing that the plan, whatever its merits were, was different from the one which was finally adopted by the government.

No matter what you say, no matter what you call me, I was born and bred a Liberal-Conservative, and I never varied in my allegiance to that party. I intend dying in that faith because I believe it is the party that has built up this country, but what I desire to accentuate is merely this and it confirms what my old friend the leader of the government stated here. We never took up any other ground in Quebec, in the campaign, in the doctrine, call it what you like, that we preached, than this one: We are loyal subjects of the Crown; we do not approve of this plan and of this navy; we use our right to criticise it; it was adopted without any mandate from or consultation with the people; we pledge ourselves to accept unreservedly the verdict of the people consulted on this question.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), whom I might qualify as an aspirant Minister of Militia at one time and the hon. member for Carleton, N. B. (Mr. Carvell), who was an aspirant Minister of Public Works, who aspired to the position that I have the honour to occupy myself to-day, seemed to take pleasure in calling us disloyal. Disloyalty is a crime. I would ask these gentlemen, if I did not understand a word of the English language, read no French, knew nothing of the people amongst whom these gentlemen live, knew nothing of their history, of their traditions, of their aspirations, and not understanding their language or anything about them, I ventured to denounce them as disloyal, what would they think of me? Can they find that there was anything unconstitutional or unpatriotic in the ground that we took during that campaign? They were loyal speeches and these hon. gentlemen cannot prove that they were anything else. Do not these hon. gentlemen know the noble history of the race that inhabits our province? Why, they have in this House, time and again, thrown that reproach at me and at those who have defended the grounds which I have just exposed to the House. Is it not the undeniable privilege of every British subject to criticise? Can he not say that, good subject as I am and loyal subject of the Crown, I do not approve of this plan? The people have not been consulted. I claim you should get your mandate from them, and I bind myself beforehand to accept the verdict of the people upon this question. Does the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who preceded me in this debate and, who, apart from being an out and out free trader, is a democrat who has left his country to live in the free west and who knows something of the freedom of British institutions, believe that that is a fair ground for any man to take under the British flag? Why therefore tax us with disloyalty? We took that ground in our province and with the varying doctrines that were put forth by this man or that man, by this party or that party, having determined to preach that principle, we condemned the leaders on both sides. That was our ground. The right hon. leader of the opposition took that ground and everybody else in this House has maintained it. Before me in this House the right hon. gentleman said that any permanent policy must be carefully thought out and must be submitted to the people. Am I right in that or am I wrong? I was not the first to raise that point, a most important point, an impregnable point in this House. It was raised by others before me. The right hon. leader of the opposition took that ground because that is the ground that he gave, the hon. member for Digby, before me, mentioned that point and the question is grave and serious enough, it is important enough for each and every one of us and for the whole country that no man can be blamed for taking that point and should not be reproached with disloyalty. I hope we have ended the time when the reproach of disloyalty shall be bandied from one side of the House to the other. I am confident that the leader of the government has taken the view of this question which should be taken. Notwithstanding its gravity, its importance, its seriousness he will know how to solve it for no man is better qualified to do it than he is himself.

Probably the illusions under which my right hon. friend suffers at the present moment, and the feelings of disappointment and acrimony which he experiences are of such a nature that he does not discern public opinion, but surely he must

know that that navy of his does not meet with public approval. It is a useless navy for this country. Nobody would dream of defending a country with cruisers of that type. It is a navy of enormous cost, and in my judgment it fails in every way to fulfil one of its objects, which was to take part in the defence of the empire. Who ever heard of cruisers to defend a country? Ships of that type are for scouting the seas, harassing the enemy's commerce, conveying troops, and they could not stand for a single moment before ships armed with heavy guns. They are absolutely useless for the purpose of defence. My right hon. friend's navy was an ill-conceived plan.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him a question. I would like to ask him what type of a naval ship he favours.

Mr. MONK. That is the question which my hon. leader has under consideration, and I am sure he will solve it properly. My regretted friend, Mr. Brodeur, that eminent mariner, discerned tempests and typhoons long before his friends foresaw what the people would think of the navy, and he got to safe anchorage just in time. Sir, we have very grave and important questions before us.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will my hon. friend excuse me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The hon. gentleman should answer my question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Without the permission of the hon. member having the floor, the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) is not entitled to interrupt.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I really am sincere in this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes I am. With the consent of the minister I was permitted to ask what I considered a very pertinent question, and the minister has not yet given me any answer. May I insist on an answer.

Mr. MONK. I thought I had already given a satisfactory answer to my hon. friend, but I am not an expert in seamanship as the hon. member is, although surely he must know, because any tyro in naval matters knows that cruisers are of no use whatever as battleships. Every one knows that cruisers cannot be used for battle because they cannot stand before the heavily armed ships. It is the heavy guns. I am sorry my hon. friend the Minister of Militia is not here for I am perfectly sure he would confirm me in that opinion. I do not wish to take up too much time on that matter.

Mr. MONK.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. What is the cause of the merriment opposite. I am delighted, Sir, that after having heard the very lonesome and mournful speeches of some of these gentlemen opposite I have been able, through an honest endeavour, to bring some cheerfulness to them. I am not going to give a lecture on naval architecture but I may mention that being ill some time ago I went down to Fortress Munroe where I saw many ships and many guns and there I learned what I did not know before and what possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) does not know that it is an axiom that cruisers being light and swift ships they cannot bear the discharge of a twelve-inch gun, and that for fighting purposes and for attacking purposes and for the purpose of guarding a country you can only use these heavy ships which can discharge twelve-inch guns and at the present time thirteen-inch guns.

Mr. FOSTER. Like the 'Niobe'.

Mr. MONK. The 'Niobe' could not use such guns. If we procured the 'Niobe' for training purposes—well, I do not want to go into that matter now and to take up time unduly, but in the Railway Committee room perhaps some evening I may be able to give an account of my trip to Fortress Munroe, and what I learned about naval architecture. At all events I learned enough to say that this naval scheme of my right hon. friend is not worth much.

Now Sir, we have urgent and serious questions before us. I listened with great interest to what my two young friends from Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) and Calgary (Mr. Bennett) said most eloquently—more eloquently that I have ever before heard said in moving and seconding the address—as to the great and immediate duties we have before us. I also bear testimony to the very able address given upon a subject which I have at present under particular study, by my old friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) when he spoke to us as to the solution of the question of transportation. More than once in this House in previous parliaments I have listened with attention to what my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has told us about transportation upon the Great Lakes. My right hon. friend and his colleagues of the late government had before them since 1903 or 1904 the report of a commission which proposed a satisfactory solution of the problem of transportation and I think there is much in the suggestion made by my hon friend (Mr. Bennett) as to the necessity of perhaps taking up again the work of that commission. It is remarkable that these gentlemen opposite who want the new government within a day or two of its existence, to declare its

policy on most abstruse and difficult subjects never carried into effect the suggestions of that commission which recommended national free ports and canals. The late government seems never to have had the energy to deal with any of these questions. So true is it that a governement that has remained a long time in power seems to have lost its energy and strength, and moreover, thinks it may arrogate to itself the right of doing things without taking the opinion of parliament or of the people.

My hon. friend the late Minister of Public Works asked me too if we would do anything with regard to the port of St. John, New Brunswick, which he had under consideration just before the vote of the people relieved him of the exercise of that function. But my hon. friend is not quite right. If the report of the commission on that matter is well founded—and the government seem to have pigeon-holed it the moment it received it—you cannot consider only one port. You must consider the claims of St. John; you cannot overlook the claims of such a great port as Quebec. You must take all the ports and consider them in a general plan; and I venture to say, in connection with this one of the great problems before us pressing for urgent solution, that if at that time the government had taken it up seriously, and had expended $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 judiciously and carefully in carrying out the suggestions of the government, the government would have been twenty-five years ahead of what it is to-day. This is one of the problems we have to solve. Mr. Speaker, there is absolute satisfaction and harmony amongst us in spite of the hopes which some hon. gentlemen opposite try vainly to kindle. What I express the hope of, Mr. Speaker, to you, whom I am so proud to see in the Chair, is that the government will be able, even with the assistance of our disappointed friends opposite, to carry out the programme which is before us.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville). Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me join with my hon. friends on both sides of the House in the compliments which have been extended to the mover and seconder of the address. Everybody will admit that both of these gentlemen, the member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) and the member for Dorchester (Mr. Albert Sevigny), are two notable additions to the debating power of the House of Commons. Sir, speaking as a Liberal from the province of Quebec belonging to the loyal opposition, I wish also to extend my sincere congratulations to the hon. gentleman who leads the government over his recent success. He will not doubt my sincerity. I have always had for him great admiration, and my sincere hope is that he will give this country a strong and progressive government. May I add that, coming after such nation-builders as Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Thomson and Sir Charles Tupper his is no light burden indeed.

Sir, a change has taken place in the administration of the affairs of this country; but, Mr. Speaker, those who sit to your left can look with some pride at their record of achievements while they were in office. Need I say that the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, and who has the respect and admiration not only of his party, but of the whole country, and I should say of the whole British Empire, has given this country fifteen years of unbroken prosperity and progressive legislation. Every one bears witness to his statesmanship, to his eloquence, imposing, lofty, persuasive and sage, to his deep knowledge, not only of Canadian affairs, but of imperial affairs as well. His broad patriotism has been acknowledged by the highest in the land, and in the empire. We are proud of him. We have been taunted by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works with having, so to speak, idolized the ex-premier of Canada. Sir, whilst it may be said that ministers of the Crown and especially prime ministers are idolized on account of 'the boast of heraldry and the pomp of power,' my hon. friend will readily admit that if the same chivalrous admiration follows a man when he crosses the House from the right to the left, that man must indeed possess noble qualities and great qualifications. There are no blandishments of office on your left, Mr. Speaker, and to-day the right hon. gentleman who leads His Majesty's loyal opposition enjoys perhaps more respect than he ever did when he sat on your right.

I must say, however, that my hon. friend the leader of the government has not been very generous in his compliments as regards the administration of the right hon. the leader of the opposition when he sat in his place. He said the other evening that from a legislative or from an administrative point of view nothing was due to the policy of the right hon. gentleman as regards the prosperity of this Dominion. I say that the hon. gentleman has not been very generous. He should at least have followed the example of the great leader of the Conservative party in England, a good Canadian, and a sound imperialist, Mr. Bonar Law, who, speaking at Leeds on the 16th inst., used the following language:

> I never said a word in criticism of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government. It would have been the height of folly to do so, for we must never forget that it was the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier which gave to the work of our people a preference in the Canadian market. We are grateful to him for that, but we

are grateful to him again that that example set by him has now been followed by every one of the self-governing dominions.

Sir, there is more than this. Not only has the right hon. gentleman during his administration given the British Preference, thereby reducing the taxation but no man has done more to promote the union of the various races in this Canada of ours. He has increased the revenue of the country to a wonderful degree, and under his guidance the powers of the Railway Commission have been enlarged in such a way as to deserve the encomium of the president of the American republic.

He has reduced the postal rates, in this, leading in the van of sound Imperialism throughout the overseas dominions. He has developed the resources of this land, increased the provincial subsidies, deepened the channels, making of Montreal, the commercial metropolis of this Dominion, the successful rival of the great city of New York. He has built the National Transcontinental railway. The right hon. gentleman retires from office leaving the country in a highly satisfactory position financially. I listened with great attention the other evening to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), against whom I would not use any persiflage although if I remember well when I was a young member of this House in 1896 he did use some persiflage, addressing himself to the then Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and taunting him because, forsooth, he had not been taken into the Laurier government as Minister of Finance, but had been shelved in the department of Trade and Commerce. I am glad to see that, after the storms and stress of political life, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is still a prominent figure in the Liberal-Conservative party, or I should say in the coalition government, and that he fills an important office with ability and with distinction not only to his party but to his country. I listened with reverential emotion and stillness to that born master of moving cadences and high sustained modulation. I was rather astonished when he said that he was not in a position to modulate or to formulate a policy. When I think of the many surpluses accumulated by the late government during 15 years of wise and prudent administration, when I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has accepted the seals of office with a buoyant surplus of over $30,000,000 I hope that for the future, judging from his past experience, although he has nothing to modulate and nothing to formulate he will at least have something to emulate.

Under the guidance of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has done nothing according to the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) to develop this country of ours, new provinces have been created, there has been a wonderful trade expansion; in fact we stand at the head of modern nations as regards trade, and finally, by our immigration policy, we have settled the great lone land, the Canadian west.

The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was interrupted on Monday by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). He said that the Laurier government had done nothing with regard to the transportation problem, and the minister has repeated this in so many words this afternoon. Will my hon. friend bear in mind that the late administration has spent for the solution of the transportation problem in this country over $121,000,000? The St. Lawrence Canal system was rushed to completion when we took office, and by 1910 a clear channel of 14 feet was available from the Great Lakes to ocean ports by Canadian waters. The late administration gave special and urgent attention to improving the condition in the harbours of Lake Superior, where the western grain has to be transhipped from the railways and in the eastern harbours on the Great Lakes where it is again transhipped to the railways for carriage to Montreal. We gave deep attention to the harbour of Montreal which is our national harbour par excellence, so much so that to-day the largest boats of the Canadian lines can navigate the St. Lawrence river with security, and that in the race of grain carrying transportation, Montreal is admittedly ahead of New York.

Whilst the late administration accomplished all that, they thought that something should be done towards relieving the taxpayers of this country and this brings me to say a few words on that vexed question of reciprocity in natural products. The measure of reciprocity in natural products proposed by the late administration was a step forward not only from a commercial but also from an Imperial point of view; but the manufacturers and the great interests of our country became nervous, they were afraid. We have an old French proverb: "La peur est mauvaise conseillère," Fear is a poor adviser. The manufacturers of this country were afraid in 1897 when Mr. Fielding introduced his tariff, they were afraid when he gave the British preference, they were afraid at each subsequent increase of that preference, yet, Sir, never were our industries so prosperous or our trade so buoyant as under these conditions. I admit that it is wise to be cautious in tariff matters but the world moves on and commercial changes become imperative at times. Our commercial relations with the United States are admittedly not what they should be. My hon. friend (Mr. Fos-

ter) went to New York the other day and delivered there a very mild, very courteous, very diplomatic speech. He did not hurl in the face of the American guests of the Canadian Club of New York the fervid rhetoric which we heard in some provinces in the last campaign. No, he said to his American cousins that the trade relations between Canada and the United States were not what they should be and that some day, not too far distant, a solution would be found to the trade impediments. Sir, that was understood by President Taft, when he made an offer of reciprocity in order to remove the barrier as regards a series of natural products between the two countries.

The pilgrimage was from Washington to Ottawa. That is the greatest compliment that can be paid to the late administration. The pilgrimage did not go from Ottawa to Washington. I do not wish to dwell unduly on this question of reciprocity. But, Sir, if this is not the occasion on which I should explain what reciprocity is—if we have heard enough of that phase of the subject—still I think it is my duty as a Liberal, as a member of the late administration, as a public man, to state at least what reciprocity was not, but what it was represented to be. It was not a treaty like the Elgin-Marcy Treaty of 1854-66. It was merely a customs convention. It did not affect in the least degree any of our leading manufacturing industries. That point was made very clear during the campaign, and during last session. I did not detract from the preference which we gave to England, although it was stated in public that the preferential treatment given by Canada to England in 1897, and increased in subsequent years would be affected by this convention. So much so, that in England, no less a man than the Colonial Secretary had to explain that the Canadian government had never meant to remove the advantages which accrued from the preferential duties of 1897. The other day, Right Hon. Mr. Harcourt delivered a speech at Haslingden in which he used the following language:

> Canada had no intention of varying the preference which, to our mutual advantage, she afforded to British trade. The negotiations with America were in no way connected. With the fact that the mother country felt herself unable, in the interest of our own population, to give these reciprocal advantages which could not be afforded by taxes upon raw materials and food, and the abandonment of reciprocity with the United States did not mean or entail any enlargement of Canadian preference or any revival of a request for fiscal changes in this country, which its people had deliberately and repeatedly decided that they were unable to afford.

The significance of the late election is interpreted in various ways. In England, from the reports in the papers, we are led to believe that the triumph of hon. gentlemen opposite is said to mean the giving of a mutual preference between Canada and Great Britain. It must have been quite a damper on imperialists indeed on jingo enthusiasm, when Lord Grey, our late Governor General, an impartial witness delivered the following speech at the Colonial Institute a few days ago:

> I can also say with equal confidence that, notwithstanding some desire to the contrary, there is no expectation in Canada that the recent Canadian elections should be used as an argument for introducing any change into the tariff of the United Kingdom.

I say Lord Grey is an impartial witness. He heard the promises made throughout the country made especially in the province of Ontario that if that cursed government was wiped out of existence the new administration would give to Mr. Chamberlain's party the much coveted mutual preference.

Mr. FOSTER. How could that be?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Be what?

Mr. FOSTER. How could a Canadian party give to the people of the United Kingdom a mutual' preference?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A Canadian party could not do it alone; it takes two to make a bargain. But this was represented as the beginning of the bargain as the overture to the arrangement that would be made in the future.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman modifies his statement?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I leave it as it is.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he stand by his statement, made five minutes ago, that the reciprocity pact did not in any way interfere with the British preference?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It only interfered with the British preference, if at all, in a very slight degree. I have not the figures at hand; they were given last session. But only to an infinitesimal degree did it interfere.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I have that more moderate statement from my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux). I have been instrumental in getting two of his statements moderated.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Sir, I say this reciprocity convention did not affect our fiscal autonomy, or our future in any way. The industries affected by it were those of the farmer, and the fisherman. Our Customs Act put on the free list over 200 articles; and by schedule (A) of this agreement the important articles added to the free list

were farm products, live animals, grain, fruit, fish—with certain exceptions—and a few other articles. Surely, this addition could not have changed our allegiance. It is not true that our hearts go with our trade. If that were true American trade with Canada would not be an experience with us, but only an experiment. In 1879, when the National Policy was introduced, a permanent offer of reciprocity was made to the United States. And in 1888, after nine years' operation of the National Policy, if it be true that our hearts go with our trade then our hearts were with the United States rather than with Great Britain, because our trade with the United States was $12,000,000 more than that with Great Britain. In 1896 our trade with the United States was three and a half millions more than with Great Britain and to-day our trade with the United States is equal to our trade with all the rest of the world put together. All classes in this country trade extensively with the United States except farmers and fishermen. If it be true that our hearts follow our trade, the miners, the lumbermen, the manufacturers were long ago annexed to the United States. The miners sell eighty-seven per cent of their surplus products to the United States; the lumbermen sixty-seven per cent; the manufacturers nearly fifty per cent. But the fishermen sell only twenty-five per cent of their catch to the United States, and as to the farmers, out of $144,000,000 worth of products sold, only $19,000,000 worth are sold to the United States.

What, then, can be the meaning of the verdict of the 21st September last, as regards reciprocity? Sir, I am a loyal Canadian. I accept the rule of the majority, I bow to the decision of the majority. But I have no apology to offer for the stand taken by the Liberal party on that question of reciprocity. I respect the verdict of the people, I accept it; but I say most distinctly that it was the verdict of fear over self-reliance, it was the verdict of passion over reason. Reciprocity was not judged on its merits. Other issues overshadowed the real issue. Flag waving, appeals to the British born by Mr. Hawkes, the new immigration agent, and the old annexation bogey, did it. Look at the result of the polls. With all the flag waving, with all our alleged annexation proclivities, with all that campaign of fear over self-reliance, if you examine the pluralities of votes given during the last election you find that in five provinces out of nine there was a decisive majority in favour of the pact. Sir, speaking of annexation, let me say that the Liberal party standing in this House around its chief, and its colours, repudiate any other feeling but that of loyalty to the mother country. Sir, treason is a crime. The immortal Edmund Burke has said:

> It looks to be narrow and pedantic to apply the ordinary ideas of criminal justice to a great public contest. I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people.

If the words of Burke are true as regards a whole people, they are equally true as regards a good half of the people, because one-half the Canadian people voted in favour of reciprocity on the 21st of September last. I know it has been denied that such mischievous appeals were made in certain sections of this country. But again we have the testimony of an impartial witness, Lord Grey, in his utterance at the Colonial Institute dinner. Here is what he said:

> In order that I may convince you that Canada is absolutely and passionately loyal to the imperial connection, let me point out to you that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whom some of you have been taught to regard with suspicion, was fully persuaded that his policy would, if adopted, strengthen both Canada and the Crown. To secure the free entry of the products of the farm, the fisheries, and the forest into a protected market of nearly a hundred millions by the purchase of reciprocal admission of similar products from the United States, appeared to him to be an economic advantage which it was his bounden duty to secure for his country when the unexpected opportunity placed it within his reach. His policy may have been a good or a bad policy —it is not for me to say—but it was certainly in no sense the policy of disloyalty to closer connection with the motherland.

Why did our late governor use this language on his return to England? It was because his ears were full of the resonant note which he had heard during the last campaign, branding the right hon. gentleman as an annexationist, and branding the Liberal party as a disloyal party. I have said that it was not reciprocity alone that carried my hon. friends opposite into the seats they now occupy; there were other issues, and whilst reciprocity was the dominant issue in the English-speaking provinces, let me assure my hon. friends who sit side by side in this coalition government with the representatives of the province of Quebec, that in my province the dominant issue, in fact the only issue, was the naval question.

Mr. PELLETIER. No, no.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr Speaker, so much was that the case that hon. gentlemen who are in this House trusted representatives of the Nationalist party presented themselves as candidates in favour of reciprocity, in order to avoid the discussion of that question in the counties of Quebec. Why? Because the question of

reciprocity was intensely popular in our province. I will go further. The leader of the movement, the head of the Nationalist movement in Canada, Mr. Bourassa, has published over his own signature a pamphlet on the question of reciprocity, in which he accepts the proposal of reciprocity with the United States, because in his judgment it is the safest weapon for Canada against imperialism. I repeat, Sir, that in the province of Quebec the naval issue was practically the only issue discussed before the electors in the various constituencies. There is no mention of this question in the speech from the Throne; but in Quebec, I say again, it was the only question. If we lost some Liberal constituencies we owe it to the fact that the naval issue stood so prominent in the debates.

I see my hon. friend from Yamaska (Mr. Mondou), a bosom friend of mine, smiling. He is my best witness. He was elected as an opponent of the navy, and he was also elected as a supporter of the reciprocity pact. Sir, there were three schools of thought during the campaign on that naval question. First, there were those belonging to the Liberal party who favoured a Canadian navy, who favoured the Navy Bill presented to this House two sessions ago by my right hon. friend, in the absence of Mr. Brodeur, who was then ill. Secondly, there were those who favoured a cash contribution to the British exchequer, or a contribution in Dreadnoughts; and finally there were champions, if one may be a champion of such a cause, of a do-nothing policy.

This coalition government is composed of those who favour a cash contribution, of those who favour a contribution in Dreadnoughts, and those who advocated publicly and privately a do-nothing policy. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with the terms of the amendment submitted to you by the right hon. leader of the opposition.

Now let us refer for a moment to the history of this naval question. In spite of the three different schools of thought which I have just mentioned, everybody will admit, who is of good faith, that the parliament of Canada was committed, unanimously committed, in favour of the policy enunciated in the resolution introduced on the 29th of March, 1909.

On this subject I wish to refer to the remarks made a moment ago by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. He stated that he had voted in favour of that resolution. Pressed a little more by an interjection from the right hon. leader of the opposition, he said: at least I adhered to it. He thus intended to give a little comfort to his followers in the coalition behind him. Yet, Sir, he delivered a speech in the House of Commons on January 10, 1910, and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will refer to it. You, Mr. Speaker, and other Conservatives of the old Macdonald-Cartier school supported that motion, but a year after it had been unanimously adopted—presumably unanimously adopted—by the House, the hon. gentleman, who was then the member for Jacques Cartier, feeling that perhaps he could get some political advantage out of that naval situation in the province of Quebec came back to his seat and what did he say? He was bound, as you were bound, as we were all bound, by the policy enunciated on the 29th March, 1909, but he sneaked back—I will not use the term if it is unparliamentary—I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker—he came back to his seat a year afterwards and what did he say? He complained bitterly that such a resolution had been adopted in his absence in the House of Commons. Yet he has just said that he voted for it and that he adhered to it. Listen to his language, Mr. Speaker:

> Everything, Sir, connected with the discussion of this all-important matter seems to be a surprise. For my part, I little anticipated the turn which the discussion has taken this afternoon, and reasonably so, I think. It seems to me that, having taken the opportunity of expressing my view about this matter upon another occasion, I was entitled, in the ordinary courtesy which exists within the working of a party, to some indication that, upon this occasion, at the first reading of this measure, the party itself, as I understand it, would express its policy. I say that has been a surprise to me which, I think, I have not deserved.

And then he goes on, speaking of the famous motion of the 29th March, that to which he adhered, that for which he voted, and this is what he says:

> The moment I saw that motion upon the orders of the day I said, particularly to those who sit on this side of the House and to many of my friends on the other side, that I would not approve of that motion.

He did not approve of the motion, in 1910, but this afternoon he informs us that he went quietly to bed on the 20th March, and that is where he probably learned to approve of the motion.

Mr. CODERRE. Was not the motion moved by Mr. Foster on the 29th March, 1909, the first motion put on the Order Paper?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That was the motion of the 29th March, 1909, amended by the late government and adopted unanimously.

Mr. CODERRE. Was not the motion put on the Order Paper by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) the first motion; had not that motion long since disappeared; had it not been replaced by the motion of 1910, and was not that the motion to which the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) was alluding on that day?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Coderre) will read what took place during the debate of January 12, 1910, he will satisfy himself that we have divergent statements from the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Public Works. In this House in 1910 he declared that he was against that motion to which he declares to-day that he adhered and indeed voted for. It is a most important, indeed and invaluable admission after all we have heard during the last campaign. Sir, I wish to impress upon the House, that in the province of Quebec, when we were accused of sacrificing the autonomy of our country, of being too British, too imperialistic, we referred our opponents to the motion unanimously adopted on the 29th March, 1909, and immediately came a flat denial from our opponents that indeed Mr. Monk was not present and had never approved of it.

Sir, this motion was unanimously carried. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) moved that: Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports. The day after that Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved in amendment:

That while the House fully recognizes the duty of the Canadian people in the matter, it is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing colonies the payment of regular periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not as far as Canada is concerned be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

He proposed, therefore, to build a Canadian navy, to which everybody agreed in this House.

But, what was the attitude of the Conservative party on this question during the elections? I charge the Conservatives, I charge the coalition government, with having varied their attitude on this question according to circumstances, according to provinces. There was one policy for the great province of Ontario, and for the maritime provinces and there was a distinct policy for the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman who leads the government supported that motion by a very able speech. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce also delivered one of the most eloquent speeches which he has ever delivered on the floor of this House. But, there is more than this. The hon. gentlemen cannot say that they acted only in obedience to the sentiment of the time, or were influenced by the emergency, or the panic, or the scare which existed. No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and my hon friend the leader of the government had time to reflect, to pause and to think over the resolution which had been unanimously adopted. The hon. leader of the government went to England shortly afterwards in the summer and, speaking at the Constitutional Club, used the following language:

Some people seem to be aggrieved in the British islands owing to the fact that Canada did not by resolution or by speech from the Prime Minister vouchsafe to offer one, two or three Dreadnoughts.

He thought the resolution, in the form in which it was passed, while its terms may not upon their surface seem as significant at the moment as the offer of one or two Dreadnoughts would have done, laid down a permanent policy for the Dominion of Canada, upon which both parties united, and which would serve a more practical purpose than any such offer of Dreadnoughts. It was the outcome of conferences between himself and Sir Wilfrid Laurier entered into before the remarkable utterances of British statesmen of all parts as to the position of affairs at the moment in Europe, and was designed to show to the world Canada's unanimity of desire to take her full share if necessary in securing the safety and integrity of the empire.

Later on when he returned to Halifax he said:—

One governing principle at least should control, namely, that out of our own materials, by our own labour, and by the instructed skill of our own people, any necessary provision for our naval defence should be entered upon so far as may be reasonably possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the government having supported the motion in this House, endorsed its policy before the Constitutional Club in England and on his return to Halifax a few months afterwards. The same may be said of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster).

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden), however soon changed his bearings. What had happened in the meantime? There had been an election in the county of Drummond-Athabaska and that was the motive power which forced the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) to change his bearings. I am pleased to say that the county of Drummond-Athabaska being better informed during the last elections returned to this House a supporter of the Liberal party. The leader of the government knew that

with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) he could profit by the intense Nationalist agitation in the province of Quebec, and he began by advocating a referendum to the people and at the same time a contribution in cash or in Dreadnoughts.

Mr. SEVIGNY. Will the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. SEVIGNY. Did not the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) in 1903, send to Mr. Henri Bourassa a letter in which he stated that it would be a bad principle for Canada to help England in its wars. If that is so, then the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) is a Nationalist.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is the first occasion I have had to refute calmly and dispassionately the accusation now sent across the floor of the House. I never made such a statement. I hope that during this debate the letter which I wrote to Mr. Bourassa in 1903 will be read, not in parts but in full.

An hon. MEMBER. Read it now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not the letter before me. This is what occurred: In 1903 the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire was held in Montreal, presided over by Lord Brassey, and a resolution was presented by Mr. Drummond of Montreal, and I think seconded by Mr. Rolland, then president of the French Chamber of Commerce, and that resolution stated that it was the duty of Canada to share in the defence of the British Empire. I was invited to attend the meeting which was held in Montreal to protest against that resolution, and in the letter I stated that it was not a wise policy for Canada to embark in a scheme of such magnitude. That is from memory what I wrote at the time, and to-day I stand by the same policy and I am ready to defend it.

But, Sir, I can foresee the day—judging from the declarations, vague as they may be that were made the other evening by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—when the stern and unbending Nationalist members of the coalition government will gladly support the very policy I deprecated in 1903.

I was proceeding to say, Sir, that the leader of the government advocated both a referendum to the people and a cash contribution or a contribution in Dreadnoughts. We all remember his speech of the 12th of January, 1910, when he said: proceed cautiously but surely, appeal to the people but meanwhile send a contribution in cash or in Dreadnoughts to the mother country. May I use the expression once used by Lord Randolph Churchill, to call that a double-barrelled policy. The referendum was there to soothe the timorous Nationalists and the contribution to placate the stout imperialists. In Ontario, under that policy, Laurier could be branded as a separatist, and in Quebec he could be denounced as a traitor to the cause of autonomy; in Ontario, the Canadian navy could be ridiculed as a tin-pot navy, and a toy navy, whilst in Quebec it could be denounced as an infernal machine. And, what has happened, Sir? We French Canadians count for something in this Dominion. No Prime Minister since confederation ever evaded the electorate of the province of Quebec during a general election. Sir John Macdonald, Sir John Thompson, Sir Charles Tupper, even in the midst of strong agitation all came to Quebec to address the French Canadian electors on the public issues of the day. But, Mr. R. L. Borden, the leader of the Conservative party hardly appeared in our province. He speaks good French, and I congratulate him for having learned French since he came to this House, but he might have spoken even in English, and he might have done us the honour of appearing somewhere at least and explaining to the people his attitude on the Canadian navy. True, he spoke in Montreal (St. Lawrence) in favour of Mr. Johnston, the Conservative candidate, but he did not meet the Minister of Public Works. These two gentlemen did not appear on the same platform, and after having made this one slight appearance in Montreal one evening, we find Mr. Borden devoting himself to the eastern townships, the English speaking portion of the province.

He never went to Quebec; he never spoke to the French-Canadian electors of Montreal; he never made a public appearance with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. Sir, there were obvious reasons for that. Part of the game was to denounce the hon. leader of the government as a traitor to Canada; part of the game was to denounce any naval assistance to Great Britain; and part of the game was to denounce also the conspiracy which existed between Lord Grey, the Governor of Canada, the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition.

Sir, I say that the Nationalist party denounced the hon. leader of the government. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was present, if I mistake not, at a large gathering held at the old historic village of St. Eustache. There a resolution was adopted. One of the few exceptions who did not vote for that resolution was my hon. friend the member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). But my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was there side by side with Mr. Bourassa. The resolution there presented was adopted, and in

that resolution against the navy there was a severe indictment against the hon. leader of the opposition.

An hon. MEMBER. Read it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It can be found in the papers of the day; but it is reported in Mr. Castell Hopkins' book, the 'Annual Register of 1910, thus:

Mr. Borden was condemned as having urged a no less nefarious policy than the hon. gentleman who leads the government.

I will read the resolution. I am sure that there was a good deal more than a little difference of opinion between the leader of the government and the Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend yesterday illustrated the whole situation when he said that he could find precedents in the old English constitutional history of cabinet ministers who were not on speaking terms with each other. From what I will quote, one would surmise that there are in our day and generation cabinet ministers who are not on speaking terms:

We blame the federal government and the parliamentary majority who have imposed on Canada this new naval law, who have launched this country into the vortex of militarism previously denounced with the same energy by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who have endangered the peace of Canada and diverted to the construction of murderous engines and the preparation of bloody wars millions which were intended for the development of our agriculture and our systems of transportation. We also censure the attitude of Mr. Borden and the opposition behind him for the adoption of a policy in no way less nefarious.

Was my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works present at that meeting? I know he was present—I need not torture him by asking him that question. What policy was he denouncing then? The policy for which he had himself voted, although a year afterwards he stated in this House that he had not adhered to it.

Mr. MONK. In 1896 my hon. friend said: 'We are here and you are there.' I give the same answer now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have here the philosophy of the election. By advocating a double-barrelled policy, an imperialist policy in Ontario and a narrow Nationalist policy in Quebec, an unholy alliance has been formed, but who has made the sacrifice of his convictions? The prime minister or the Minister of Public Works? My hon. friend the member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) who interrupted me a moment ago, will, I hope, for the sake of his reputation, deny having made the statements that are reported here in the 'Annual Register' of 1910. I will read for the benefit of the House what Mr. Albert Sevigny, a Quebec advocate, said at Tingwick on October 31, 1910:

The Laurier cabinet is a cabinet of imperialists, who want to sacrifice Canada's interests and to plunge us into wars with which we have nothing to do. The Navy Bill is an attempt by Ontario and the provinces of the west to coerce Quebec and enslave our people for ever. What has England ever done for you? She has no need of your help. She is strong enough to defend herself. Laurier's idea is to make you the vassals of the majority in the west. You must protest by your votes against this slave traffic. You must protest against helping England in her wars; unless you do, conscription will come next.

The same Mr. Sevigny, who nearly sang 'God Save the King' in his speech the other day in the House, who spoke with tears in his eyes of the 'Te Deum' and the 'Domine salvum fac regem' he has heard in the old cathedral of Quebec will, I am sure, deny this other statement. Mr. Sevigny said in Arthabaska—on All Saints' Day—imagine, Mr. Speaker:

The navy belongs to His Majesty. Is that a Canadian navy? Who is His Majesty? Have we any Majesty here? As to this naval taxation, it was wanted by the Lords of England——

I wish Lord Northcliffe were here:

—who will not pay taxation there and are striving to get it out of the colonies.

That was, Sir, the tenor of Nationalist oratory in the province of Quebec. That is probably why the coalition is there and why we are here.

Sir, what were the arguments generally used in the province of Quebec, by the Nationalist allies of the Prime Minister.

The hon. gentlemen who are in the coalition government and their Nationalist supporters stated that we owed nothing to Great Britain, that Canada was protected by the Monroe Doctrine, and that we did not care for England. They urged that if this Canadian navy were adopted, it would mean conscription, that the sons of our peasantry would be taken away from their homes, embarked in the dead of night on board Dreadnoughts and cruisers and carried away to distant seas, and there disembowelled by Japanese shells, Chinese bullets—they even spoke of Austrian balls.

Sir, do I exaggerate? Not in the least. I have here a list of the various pronouncements made on this subject by the leader of the Nationalist movement. At Grand-Mère, speaking with my friend the hon. gentleman who is to become your deputy, Mr. Bourassa, on September 26, 1910, said:

You can tell Mr. Laurier, that he has no right to impose such a law as this which will take away from us and from their homes the young men of this country. He has no right to tell the old mother: I want your son, the law of 1910 gives him to me.

At Farnham, speaking to the young men, he said:

England wants men and your children will be disembowelled on the distant African coast. Laurier has no sons and Mr. Borden has no sons.

We know that the hon. gentlemen have used that argument in every constituency in the province of Quebec—and it is a most despicable argument. I have here a speech delivered by Mr. Bourassa on the 20th of January, 1910, in which he denounces Mr. Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Earl Grey and states that the man towering over all the parliament of this country is his friend Mr. Monk:

The danger is to see men like Mr. Borden go back on thirty years of the best traditions of the Conservative party, go back on Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper. When in 1878 reproach was made to Sir John A. Macdonald of the menace to the interests of the mother country involved in the adoption of a protective tariff. 'So much the worse for British connection,' was his answer.

And further:

The lesson which one must learn from the situation is that since ten years a conspiracy has existed between the two political parties. Each time that the great interests of the country are at stake, there is a conspiracy of cowardice and cupidity for office, the ones wanting to maintain themselves in office and the others to get into office.

And further:

In all that debate one man alone overtowers the House of Commons by his sincerity, by his patriotism and I have no hesitation in naming him, it is the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Sir, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) stated that he had had only a little difference some time ago with the Prime Minister. I have here an extract from 'Le Devoir,' the Nationalist organ, telling us of a meeting at Drummondville, on October 27, 1910. Mr. Monk was speaking and he said:

We are against the navy because we have something better to do with our money than to spend it in buying ships to serve the conflicts and entanglements of Great Britain.

And a voice in the audience interjected:

What about Borden?

My friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), with his cavernous though eloquent voice, answered:

Yes, my friend, I will speak of Borden. I have separated myself from Mr. Borden on that important question and I will continue to fight the battle with my friends the Nationalists as long as the battle shall not be won. We are not going to abdicate our rights and our principles for the sake of Mr. Borden.

And my hon. friend says that there was only a little difference of opinion in the coalition government!

Listen, now, to my good friend the genial Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel). Speaking on the 21st of August, 1911, just a few weeks before he joined ranks with my distinguished friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), who knows that the voice of Toronto spoke during the last election, and who will tell me if this language is the expression of Toronto's opinion. The hon. Minster of Inland Revenue, as reported in 'Le Devoir,' the book of books, said:

For my part I thought I should separate myself from Mr. Borden on that vital question and if, as I hope, I become your member once more, I intend to maintain that independent attitude that I took then.

That was, Sir, the tenor of Nationalist oratory in the province of Quebec, and my hon. friends the members of the Nationalist party were encouraged primarily and chiefly by the head of the coalition, the Minister of Public Works. One has only to refer to the ambiguous and tortuous speeches which he made in 1910, one year after having given his support to that now famous motion, to see what he had in his mind. He wanted to arouse the feelings of the habitants of Quebec against Great Britain on the naval question. I remember listening to him one day when he used, in whispering tones, a quotation from Byron, and as I am a great reader of Byron, I noted the quotation. It was on the 12th of January, 1910, when he was explaining to the House that he had not voted for the motion alluded to a moment ago:

Can we not more properly be likened to those who, from Gaul and Germania and Dacia, were brought down to Rome to enter the Roman armies and the Roman arena and who had no representation in the councils of the Roman republic. This is the condition which, I submit, this plan——

Which he had approved,

—is imposing on us and it reminds me of the man in the gladiatorial arena dying.

And then he quotes Byron:

He heard it, but he heeded not—his eyes
Were with his heart, and that was far away;
He recked not of the life he lost nor prize,
But where his rude hut by the Danube lay,
There were his young barbarians all at play.

'Our sons.'

There was their Dacian mother—he, their sire,
Butchered to make a Roman holiday——

The 'Japanese bullets' and the 'Chinese shells.'

All this rushed with his blood—shall he expire
And unavenged? Arise, ye Goths, and glut your ire.

Byronic oratory. But give me the Nationalist oratory of the province of Quebec. Addressing myself to you, Mr. Speaker, an honest and convinced imperialist, I have no hesitation in saying that in Quebec if the coalition won any seats, they won them through duplicity, demagogy and sectionalism. Though there were losses on our side, yet Quebec was not all stampeded. There were a few redeeming features—Rouville, for instance.

In contrast with all this, what was the attitude of the Liberal party in our province on this naval question First, we opposed the referendum. On what grounds? We said this was not the British method of solving a difficulty. We accepted the language of the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain:

The word and the thing are utterly unfamiliar in this country. We live under representative government. The electors control both policy and legislation by choosing members to represent them in the House of Commons, to whom is left the duty, not only of settling the scheme and clauses of a Bill, but also of keeping in or driving out the ministers of the Crown. The referendum, in any of its numerous varieties, means that a direct question is to be put to the electorate over the head of its representatives. It supersedes representative government so far as it is adopted. How far, will depend upon the variety you choose.

Sir, we stood by the British constitutional doctrine. Then, we stood united in favour of a Canadian navy as set forth in the resolution unanimously adopted by the House of Commons in 1909. We have suffered a few losses; but we still adhere to the principle of a Canadian navy to serve in co-operation with the British navy in case the supremacy of Great Britain is endangered. In our judgment, this Canadian navy means the creation ot a new national institution, responsive to the demands of the future: it means the placing on our own shoulders of the burden of national defence; it means the development of our national life on these lines and of self-government within the empire which has brought us liberty and peace; it means the expenditure of money in our own way; it means the employment of our own sailors and of our own mechanics; it means the opening of new channels for the activity the ambitions, the enthusiasm of our young men.

This was, in concrete form the policy voted upon and adhered to by the House, and maintained by the Liberal party during the elections. It was also the policy to which adhesion was given by hon. gentlemen opposite, but not adhered to by them during the electoral campaign. What has happened since? My hon. frriend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is not what we call in French un naïf. But I must tell him he is very indiscreet. He asked my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) what were the terms of the coalition. Sir, we had that hon. gentleman's answer this afternoon: You are there, and we are here. Let me remind my hon. friend of an episode. There are coalitions and alliances, which like marriage, are based on love, friendship and affection. But there are coalitions and alliances also that are based on common hatred and common ambition. Has my hon. friend read—I am sure he has read—of the incident of the meeting of Napoleon I. with the Czar Alexander on the Niemen. Does he recollect that every historian has expressed surprise that Napoleon, the son of the revolution, should have attempted to make an alliance with that autocrat and descendant of autocrats, the Czar of Russia? But it is all explained when one reads the accounts of that meeting. It is said that as they met Alexander rushed up to Napoleon, and embracing him shouted, 'Sir, I hate England as much as you do.' And Napoleon's rejoinder was, 'Then, peace exists between us.' Sir, one can surmise that, after the election, when the hon. Minister of Public Works representing the revolutionary Nationalists of Quebec met at Ottawa the new leader of the government who represented the old traditions of sound imperialism and sturdy Toryism, the leader of the government must have told the Minister of Public Works, 'Yes, I hate Laurier as much as you do—and I love power as much as you do.' And one can imagine what was the rejoinder of the Minister of Public Works, 'Then peace exists between us.'

Sir, they speak of mergers. This is the acme of mergering. They have merged common hatreds, they have merged common ambition, aye and principles too.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) stated the other day—referring, I suppose to the last Order in Council which I signed in my very short career as Minister of Marine and Fisheries—that this plan of a Canadian navy would be obsolete and expensive, and that he was going to consult the Admiralty and would bring back a policy which would commend itself not only to Canada, but to the British Empire. I feel quite sure that the Nationalist leaders will accept any policy which will be propounded by that most loyal of loyalists, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he comes back from England. But they must realize if they are true to themselves, that the Canadian navy as submitted to the electors of Canada has also been submitted to the British

Admiralty, that the autonomous principle of that navy had been accepted by the British authorities, and that we had made a step forward in our nationhood. And if what I surmise happens, if we are called upon to contribute in cash or Dreadnoughts some people will regret their debasing alliance.

Sir, if, instead of a Canadian navy, we are called upon to contribute cash or Dreadnoughts, it will not be a step forward but will be a step backward in the history of our country.

My hon. friend has passed judgment on the Canadian naval plan. He has had no time, I am sure, to study it during the few weeks he has been in office. Let me remind him that experienced naval architects like Sir William White have passed judgment on such schemes as ours. I will not weary the House in reading the opinion of Sir William White, but I will send it over to my hon. friend, and he will see that the chief naval architect of the British Admiralty favours the plan which the late government had adopted. So my hon. friend was rather hasty when he said the other evening that our proposed navy would be expensive to construct and obsolete when completed. Moreover, let me refer my hon. friend to the last conference held in London in the month of June, 1911. At this conference the Canadian naval scheme of the late government was accepted by the British Admiralty and by the British government. Sir, it is our pride to know that we, who have been accused and denounced for being anti-British, anti-imperialists, are at one with the Prime Minister of Great Britain. In his speech the other day at the Guildhall dinner, Mr. Asquith stated that before the coronation he had had an opportunity of consulting the Prime Ministers and various other ministers of the empire, and that they had adopted a common policy in matters of defence, a policy of co-operation, not of concentration. His statement was only a paraphrase of the words spoken by the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the opposition, at a previous conference, I think in 1907, when he stated that true imperial unity was based altogether on local autonomy. This is the policy which guides the Liberal party in Canada, this is the ideal of the Liberal party, not only in Canada but in Great Britain, and in every self-governing colony.

My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) stated in beginning his remarks that the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition was morose, and in very bad humour. Well, if I compare the speeches, and the attitudes of the two gentlemen who delivered them I should say that my hon. friend who was so fervid, so definite and so unfaltering in his defence of Nationalist principles during the elections, gave a very poor exhibition of himself this afternoon in the House. Let me say that when he accuses the leader of the Liberal party of having always incited passions and prejudices in the minds of his fellow countrymen, he did not speak the truth, Mr. Speaker,—I do not mean in any unparliamentary sense, I mean to say that he knows better. If you examine the career of the right hon. gentleman you will find that ever since boyhood, ever since he entered the political arena, he has been an advocate of tolerance, between the various races of this Dominion. Who has not read the speech delivered by the right hon. gentleman on political Liberalism, in 1877, when he addressed his fellow countrymen? He told them that in trying to form a party based on racial and religious lines they became the worst enemies of themselves and of their country. He said:

> You wish to organize a Catholic party. But have you not considered that if you have the misfortune to succeed, you will draw down upon your country calamities of which it is impossible to foresee the consequences.
>
> You wish to organize all the Catholics into one party, without other bond, without other basis, than a common religion; but have you not reflected that, by the very fact, you will organize the Protestant population as a single party and that then, instead of the peace and harmony now prevailing between the different elements of the Canadian population, you throw open the door to war, a religious war, the most terrible of all wars?

Mr. Speaker, you are probably not aware of what occurred during the last election in the province of Quebec, you were too busy in your own constituency. But we were told that this Nationalist party was to form in the House of Commons a Catholic centre, with a Herr Windthorst for leader, and that the leader of that Catholic party would be my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, assisted by the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel). They were going to hold the balance of power between the two parties. Sir, there are good, honest and pious souls in the province of Quebec this day who expect that to-morrow, after this address has presumably been adopted, the hon. gentlemen who are now installed in our seats, will repeal the Autonomy Bill of 1905. Yes, they will repeal clause 16, and give to the Northwest a system of separate schools as we have in Quebec. Sir, in the province of Quebec, there are good, honest and pious souls, who earnestly believe

that the Manitoba school question will be revised by our genial friend the Minister of the Interior; there are good and pious souls who believe that we, who have taken away from the French Canadians of the Northwest their mother tongue, are at last supplanted by men who to-morrow, or the day after to-morrow, will reinstate in the constitutional instrument of 1905 a clause by which the French Canadian minority will be given the official use of the French language. Time and again during the last campaign they made those promises, and I commend their appeals to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. Sir, this is how we suffered some reverses, some losses. But we are not discouraged, we still stand by our policy, and above all we adhere to our ideals and our aspirations. Opposition with its duties, is a nobler occupation than the exercises of power with its interests.

The aims of Liberalism are far higher and far nobler than those that power and patronage can proffer or give them.

Mr. Speaker, we stand by our policy and I can predict that the day is not far distant when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will rise from his seat in the House and, inspired by that stout imperialism that is his, will denounce the very men who to-day have formed a coalition with him. He will find that, having sown the seed of trouble, there will be germinated in this country a war of races, a war of aggression and defence.

An hon. MEMBER. No sir.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know whereof I speak. I have quoted the speeches delivered by the alliance—the unholy alliance—in the province of Quebec, and I can foresee the day when that very alliance will have, I will not say imperilled, the country which we inhabit, in which we live, but will surely have shattered to pieces the present combination.

Mr. A. A. MONDOU (Yamaska). Mr. Speaker, I would claim the indulgence which is usually granted by the House to an hon. member addressing it for the first time. I beg hon. members to excuse me if I make use of any unparliamentary language during the course of my speech, but I can assure you that I will always be ready to withdraw anything that I should not say. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), has just explained to the House some of the defeats that this party has suffered during the last fifteen years and he says that he is happier than we are because his party never lost one election. But, it did lose one on the 21st of September, and I can sympathize with hon. gentlemen opposite because I suffered four defeats in the interest of a cause that I am going to explain to you in the few minutes that I propose to address this House. In 1896 I delivered addresses on the hustings all through the province of Quebec. In 1891 I took part in the election campaign of that year. In 1897 I was elected in the local House at Quebec, suffered defeat on Nov. 22, 1897, on Dec. 16 of the same year I ran for the Federal House in 1900 and I suffered defeat. The principle which the Liberal party is putting forth to-day is one to which the Liberal-Conservative party of the Cartier-Macdonald school would never give adherence because it is well known to us all that those great leaders ever stood for equality and liberty in this country. The first racial cry that was ever raised in the province of Quebec was on this same Manitoba school question that the hon. member for Rouville has just made allusion to. If I do speak perhaps without sufficient preparation it is to thank the thirty-three members who, in 1896, upheld the principles of Cartier and Macdonald, by voting for the Remedial Bill and who suffered defeat in Ontario and other provinces of Canada for the stand which they took. They had to fight the double-faced policy of their opponents. When we look at the foundation of that policy we see where it originated. If I am well informed there was a caucus at the Russell House in 1896 of the leaders of the Opposition at that time over the Remedial Bill which was then before the House. They were discussing the question of introducing a motion in amendment to the Bill. A very shrewd man from our province, and who at one time occupied the position of Minister of Public Works in this country, went into the caucus and said: What are you doing here? They said: We are preparing an amendment to be moved to the Remedial Bill and we propose to move the six months hoist. He said: Why, the six months hoist? They said: That is very easy; we will go to the province of Quebec and say the Bill does not give enough to the French Canadians and we will go to Ontario and say that it gives too much. Well, we were in the game and we were forced to stay there for fifteen years. I wish I could explain to this House the opposition that was offered to the Conservative party by reason of these appeals in the province of Quebec, because if I could, I have no doubt but that hon. gentlemen would stand side by side with the young people from the province of Quebec who have suffered defeat so often for the sake of the principles for which we have contended, and who are now looking for that honest administration that we hope the business men sitting in the ministers' seats will give to this country for many years to come.

There is one point that I want to put before this House, and I am going right in

to follow the hon. member for Rouville. I see that I have something interesting to say to this House because I am pleased to observe that my hon. friends are in their places in the House. We will go over every matter that has been discussed by the hon. member for Rouville, and first of all I will state one fact. If you ever saw the hon. member who is addressing the House now on a political platform side by side with Henri Bourassa, or if Henri Bourassa ever came into his constituency, well, I am a dead man. If you can prove that I ever addressed a public meeting at which Henri Bourassa was present, except as an opponent, I will acknowledge that I am in the wrong. When Mr. Bourassa was assisting the Liberal party in 1893, in the by-election in the county of Soulanges in which Mr. Bain was elected, he was present in the interest of the Liberal party, and I was there for the Conservative party. That is the only time that we were ever on the same platform together. Now, I give you this explanation purposely because I can judge Mr. Bourassa frankly, and openly and give the House the real opinion I shall pass upon him without being accused of partiality. You are looking at the source of the prosperity that this country has had the opportunity to enjoy for the last fifteen years.

I have put this question to my opponents on the hustings in the province of Quebec, and I never yet have received a business answer. I do not go in for oratory in my speeches; my business is banking, insurance and commerce; I have no time to spare for fine phrases and rhetoric; I have left that branch of literature alone since I was in the seminary. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) commenced his speech by talking of the price of this and the price of that commodity, and he claimed that the Laurier government was responsible for the enhanced prices, but there was a little purchase, the last made by the Laurier administration which had not been explained yet, and that is the purchase of Mr. Leduc in the Quebec East election campaign. I suppose we will get an explanation of that some day. Let me ask hon. gentlemen to look at the condition this country was in 1878, as compared with its prosperous condition in 1911. In 1878 business was bad and the country was passing through a financial crisis. Who saved the country then and started it on the career of prosperity? It was the government of Sir John Macdonald, and the prosperity of to-day is due to the protectionist policy introduced by him. True, the ministers of the Conservative government sought to make commercial arrangements at Washington which would be beneficial to Canada, but they never yet pretended that they would take down the wall of protection that existed between the two countries. When the Liberals came to power they found the policy of protection inaugurated by Sir John Macdonald in force, and thanks to the fact that they continued that policy the prosperity of the country continued. I am ready to praise the right hon. leader of the opposition when he deserves praise ; I have always taken personal gratification in recognizing his integrity and his honour, but I must say that before he can be placed amongst the roll of Canadian statesmen he has got to show that he did something in power which he advocated when in opposition. I am afraid the right hon. gentleman will have to admit that during his fifteen years as leader of the government of this country, his consistent course was to carry out the measures of his Conservative predecessors which he denounced before he attained power. I cannot believe, Sir, that such a man is a statesman in the proper sense of the word. And, as to prosperity, there is no doubt that the butter and cheese industry in the province of Quebec is in a prosperous condition, a fact which has been taken hold of by the Liberal orators to tell the people that the increased price of these commodities was due to the Laurier government. Well, the process of making butter and cheese is just the same process as it was fifteen years ago and the increased price is because of educational methods adopted by the government of the province of Quebec when the government of that province was led by Conservative ministers. These hon. gentlemen opposite when in power did not want the people to be consulted on the question of reciprocity just as they did not want to consult the people on the naval question. They told us that there was no necessity for consulting the people on the reciprocity measure that the people were in favour of it, but when they were forced to appeal to the people they got a big surprise. I believe they will get a similar surprise when the people come to pronounce on the naval question. And, Sir, I would tell my hon. friend from Rouville that the ideas of the Nationalist party in Quebec on the navy question are not peculiar to them. I will tell my hon. friend that the members from the province of Quebec supporting the government are not afraid of our fellow members from the other provinces sitting side by side with us, and as to the opinion held on the navy by other than the Quebec Nationalists, I might quote from an English paper, the Winnipeg 'Saturday Post,' in its issue of October 14th.

At 6 o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MONDOU. Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I believe that, in view of the condition of the electric light, *it would be preferable for the House to adjourn, and I would move accordingly.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 8.05 p.m.

* Owing to an accident in the electric power during the recess, all the lights in the building went out, so that at the hour for resuming the sitting the Chamber was in complete darkness.—Debates Reporter.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, November 24, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yesterday, at my request, the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) withdrew his Bill to amend the Canada Shipping Act in order that I should consider a little more fully the question as to whether the same should not be introduced upon a resolution in Committee of the Whole.

Rule 50 is well understood:

No Bill relating to trade or the alteration of the laws concerning trade is to be brought into the House until the same shall have been considered in Committee of the Whole.

Bourinot, 3rd edition p. 635, states as follows:

Bills regulating harbours, pilotage and shipping. . . have always been based on resolutions passed in committee.

References are made to the journals of 1873, 1874 and 1878 in confirmation of this principle. All the cases in these notes fully bear out the practice I have indicated as being the correct one. I wish, therefore, to be understood as ruling accordingly.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MEIGHEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is the Bill which I introduced in the last session of the late parliament, but which, owing to amendments to the Railway Act brought forward by the late government to affect a similar result, did not reach its second reading. The purpose of the Bill is to remedy a grievance of many years' standing particularly in western Canada in regard to the killing and injuring of animals at large. The present state of the law leaves the burden of relief, in the event of animals being killed or injured, on the railway companies, but it leaves that burden in so light a form that the companies in practically every instance are able to escape liability. The burden of proof now resting on the railway companies is simply to show that an animal killed or injured on their right of way got at large in the first instance through the negligence or wilful act of the owner. That provision, I believe, has proved very satisfactory in the east where the running at large of animals is strictly circumscribed, but in the further west it has proved utterly inadequate, because in practically all cases animals that meet with death or injury in this way are in the first instance allowed at large by wilful act of the owners, and necessarily so. The Act which I now introduce leaves the burden on the company still, but it places the burden in a different form, and compels the railway company in order to escape liability, to show not that the animal got at large through the wilful act of the owner, but that it got upon their right of way without any neglect or omission on the part of the railway company. It leaves the burden where it is, but alters the character of the burden.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN MISSIONARIES IN CHINA.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). In respect to the matter brought to my attention by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) yesterday in reference to the safety of missionaries, in the disturbed district in China, I find on inquiry that on the 18th instant a telegram was sent by the Governor General's secretary, at the request of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in consequence of representations received from a gentleman in Toronto, asking the foreign office to obtain all information possible respecting the murder of a Canadian missionary. I find further that late yesterday afternoon a telegram was received by His Royal Highness the Governor General, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the effect that His Majesty's minister at Pekin had not been able to obtain any confirmation of the report of the murder of any Canadian missionary.

FRENCH EDITION OF 'HANSARD.'

Mr. ETHIER. I wish to bring before the government a matter deserving the most urgent consideration with regard to the publication of the French edition of 'Hansard.'

Last year the Debates Committee adopted regulations and made arrangements with the Printing Bureau to have the French translation of the debates reach the members not later than forty-eight hours after the delivery of the speeches. This morning the French 'Hansard' distributed was dated only November 20, four days late. I am informed by the chief translator that the translation has been made day by day, and the report of the Printing Bureau reached the chief translator this morning for Wednesday although it has not been distributed here. There may be something wrong at the distribution office at the Printing Bureau. I do not complain of the French translators, who are now translating yesterday's debate, and have kept the translation up from day to day, but I hope the government will see that the arrangements made last year are carried out so that we shall receive the French version not more than forty-eight hours after the delivery of the speeches.

Mr. BORDEN. I have no knowledge of this matter. The debates are entirely under the charge of the House, and I suppose this matter is one for the consideration of the Debates Committee. That committee has not been constituted, as the committees are not usually struck until after the conclusion of the debate on the address. However, I shall make inquiry of the officers of the House as to the cause of the difficulty and ask if it is possible to provide some remedy. This is not the first time the same difficulty has been brought to the attention of the House; I recollect that the matter was raised in much the same way during several previous sessions. If the hon. gentleman has any suggestions to make as to how the difficulty may be obviated, I would be very glad if he would make them to me privately.

LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE IN MONTREAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) in his place, but I suppose in his absence the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) might answer my question in regard to the longshoremen's strike in Montreal. I notice by the newspapers that the strike has been settled, and I would like to know whether the longshoremen have accepted only a temporary settlement, and if they have applied to the Department of Labour for an investigation.

Mr. MONK. I am not in a position to answer my hon. friend's question. I will communicate with the Minister of Labour.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett (Calgary): For an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. A. A. MONDOU (Yamaska). When my remarks yesterday were interrupted by the six o'clock recess, I was about to quote an article from the Winnipeg 'Saturday Post' showing that the Nationalists of Quebec were not the only people in this country who entertained some doubt about the Laurier naval policy. I will read this article from the Winnipeg 'Saturday Post' of the 14th of October last:

> It had been predicted that the new premier would be quite incapable of dealing with the Nationalist following of Mr. Bourassa, and at the same time retain the loyal support of certain ultra-British sections of the country. The cabinet as sworn in by Earl Grey as his last official act in this country indicates that this prediction was wrong. One or two men—very able men by the way—who were more or less closely associated with the Nationalists during the campaign have been taken into the government. This is a clear indication that they have become reconciled with Mr. Borden's policy—for it would be absurd to believe that he had taken a step in their direction, in view of the fact that he has a very substantial majority even without the Nationalist support. So far as the naval question is concerned, up to a certain point there is practically no difference between the policy of the Nationalists and the policy of Mr. Borden. The Nationalists do not believe in a navy at all, but they have recognized the fact all along that if the people of Canada vote for a navy that navy will have to be built. Mr. Borden, as leader of the opposition, argued that the building of a Canadian navy was a mistake—he favoured assistance in the upbuilding of the British navy—but he, like the Nationalists, made his chief fight against the Laurier government's naval policy on the ground that no such radical undertaking should be proceeded with until the voice of the people had been heard concerning it. Now that Mr. Borden is at the head of the government in Canada he has the opportunity to refer the whole question to the people—when Conservatives, Liberals, and Nationalists alike will have the opportunity to express their opinion on this one subject without other questions being introduced to its confusion. If the Canadian people should support the naval policy, then all legitimate reason for Nationalist agitation will logically vanish. This makes it evident that the Nationalist problem is no such terrible question as some would have us believe.

This article proves conclusively that this naval question is not so enormously important as our hon. friends sitting on your left would have us believe. Let me say here that I intend to speak briefly, and the House will realize the difficulty under which I am labouring in addressing this House for the first time in the language of the majority. During the last campaign

in the province of Quebec, I attended many meetings where Mr. Bourassa and his friends addressed the people, and notably I was present at the famous meeting at St. Hyacinthe, also at important meetings in Fraserville and Three Rivers, and I assert on my responsibility as a member of this House, that on no occasion were the speeches of Mr. Bourassa and his friends such as could not be repeated in any part of this country, whether in Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal, Halifax, or any other place. We must deal with all these questions without prejudice, openly and aboveboard; and I say there is not a member of this House who can state from the records of this parliament during the last session that the Prime Minister of this country and the Minister of Public Works ever differed on the naval question. They differed on the question of urgency, and they did differ when they were then speaking from the opposition benches. They did not differ at all on the wisdom of consulting the people of this country before embarking on such an important matter as the building of a navy. Let me call your attention to what was said by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) in 1903. He wrote a letter to Mr. Bourassa in which he stated that the very important question of our future relations with the British Empire must be carefully dealt with, and after due consideration, because it was one of the most important problems this country would ever have to solve for many years to come.

But the great question before the electors in the last campaign was reciprocity. The House had sat here for nine months, and the Liberal organs throughout the country were complaining that the opposition was wasting the people's money without cause. But what was the result? Some say that in the last election in Quebec the navy question was the most important one, others say that the question of reciprocity and protection was the main issue, and still others say that in the other provinces of this country reciprocity was the main issue. However, the people in those provinces condemned the late government. The members sitting to the right of the Chair are those who have always advocated and applied the principles of the Liberal Conservative party in this country, and they will give very careful consideration to these matters. We come from the people. We have not been fifteen years in power and believe that this country is ours. We still believe in the great voice of the people. They spoke eloquently on September 21 last, and they can speak again to-morrow on the policy that the Liberal Conservative party will adopt on the naval question if it is necessary. Hon. gentlemen opposite try to create disunion among the members sitting at the right of the Speaker by introducing questions in regard to Nationalists, Bourassa and the like, but I can assure them that they are wasting their own time and that of this House by such tactics. This navy question, this question of the Nationalists and of Bourassa, is not the all-important question they believe it is, because, as I have already stated, there is not a French Canadian in this country who will not be ready to accept the verdict of the majority of the people whether it be for or against the proposal which may be placed before them regarding the naval question. I do not say this because Mr. Bourassa came into my constituency to help me, and am, therefore, most kindly disposed towards him, but the fact is that in many cases his statements have been grossly misrepresented. I hope and trust that opportunities will be afforded Mr. Bourassa of addressing the people of Canada from Vancouver to Halifax if necessary on this important question because his statements in many instances have been falsified and wrongly interpreted.

This Nationalist movement, let me tell the House was first started in the province of Quebec in 1896. My hon. friends opposite will remember the great noise and trouble they raised in that province over the purchase of a million dollars worth of rifles to equip the Canadian militia. I suppose they will all remember the inflamed appeals that they made to the French Canadians there, stating that the purchase of these rifles was to enable the government of that day to give rifles to every one of the children of the French Canadian people that they might go and fight for England over the seas. For proof of that I will refer you to the French Liberal organs of the province of Quebec. I do not want to deal at any great length with these matters, but I might recall the fact that when the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) undertook to quote an article from a Nationalist paper, it was discovered that the paper from which he proposed to quote was 'Le Canada. We absolutely understand in the province of Quebec that every citizen of this country is entitled to express his opinion on a matter of this kind affecting our future relations with the motherland, and we realize that we must submit to the vote of the people properly expressed upon this subject. That is what every man in the province of Quebec, belonging to the Liberal-Conservative party, or to the Nationalist party, if such exists, is prepared to do. They talk about the Nationalist party, but it must be remembered that Mr. Bourassa never claimed to be a party man, either Liberal-Conservative or Nationalist. He has a right to his opinion and the opinion of Mr. Bour-

assa calls for serious consideration. He is a high-minded man, he is well educated, he has had the honour to occupy a seat in this House and, therefore, I say his opinion is worthy of consideration. It has been my good fortune to travel through the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, since last session, and to have become acquainted with public opinion upon the navy question, and I have no hesitation in saying that the opinion as I heard it expressed in those provinces absolutely conforms to the principles that were laid down by the Prime Minister when he was sitting on the opposition benches. There was a motion made in this House asking for a plebiscite on this question, emanating from the opposition benches, and I feel sure that the Liberal-Conservative party will settle this matter in a satisfactory manner after an opportunity has been given to the people to express their views upon it.

What was the trouble that caused Mr. Bourassa to leave the Liberal party? He was a Liberal and he is still a Liberal. In 1896 the right hon. leader of the opposition had stated to the people of Quebec that if returned to power he would give full and complete justice to Catholics and French Canadians of Manitoba. When the right hon. gentleman was returned to power, the right hon. Sir Charles Tupper came back as leader of the opposition and said to the then Prime Minister: Bring back the Remedial Bill before this House and I am willing to take the same stand that I took with regard to it when I was Prime Minister. It was then that Mr. Bourassa began to lose confidence in his leader. Later on, when the question of the schools in the Northwest and the use of the French language in the legislatures of the new provinces came up in connection with a law that was recognized as right by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, what happened? There was another volte face by the leader of the opposition and Mr. Bourassa's confidence in his leader was further shaken.

Mr. Bourassa has confidence that the party of Cartier, of Macdonald, and of the present Prime Minister will solve the important problems before our nation; he believes that the principles of these great Canadians must prevail in this Dominion of ours. The present government has the confidence of the Nationalist party; it has the confidence of all the Conservatives of Canada; it has the confidence of all Canadians who desire peace and harmony to prevail and who want to kill for ever the evils of disunion, discord, race cries and appeals to religious prejudices. The people of Canada voted against the late administration for, among other reasons, the scandals of mal-administration they were guilty of during the last seven or eight years. Look at the Quebec bridge affair, look at the little paint business of Mr. Lanctot the late member for Richelieu, look at the McGillicuddy-Oliver affair. The people of the province of Quebec wanted to know something about that matter, although it occurred in the far west, and they were deprived of knowing the particulars of it by the dissolution of parliament. Sir, the late government had been too long in power; they had arrived at that stage when the people of Canada thought it time to put them in opposition where I hope they will remain for a long time and where, judging by their appeals to religious prejudices and their efforts to sow disunion between the two great races of the country, they will remain for a long time. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) stated yesterday that I was sitting to the right of the Speaker on false pretenses so far as reciprocity is concerned. Well, I am the manager of the Quebec and Western Canada Land Syndicate, Limited, which owns and farms some lands at Wainwright, Alberta, in the constituency of the hon. member for Strathcona. We grow wheat there and I had to look closely into the question as to whether the Fielding-Patterson pact would benefit us. I have no doubt and I never had any doubt that the policy which should prevail in Canada is the policy adopted in 1878 by the Conservative party. I told my electors of Yamaska that I would study carefully this important question, and in my study of it I saw that one day the late Minister of Marine (Mr. Lemieux) told the people of Farnham that under reciprocity the farmers would sell their products at a higher price, while on the same day the ex-Secretary of State (Hon. Chas. Murphy) was telling the workingmen of his constituency that under reciprocity the workingmen would get the farm products they consumed at cheaper prices. This caused me to pause. Yamaska is a hay-growing country and there is a duty of $4 a ton on hay entering the United States, and I told the farmers that their interests were identical with mine because on flaxseed grown in Western Canada, there was a duty of ten cents a bushel when sold in Duluth or Minneapolis and hay sold at $12 or $14 a ton and flaxseed at $2 or $2.25 a bushel. I told my electors that if as manager of the Quebec and Western Canada Land Syndicate I was obliged to take a position antagonistic to what I considered the general welfare of Canada I would step out of the management of that Company. Well, what happened. The railway companies thinking that the reciprocity pact would go through raised the freight rates on hay from Canada to the United States by $1 per ton, and I was startled to see that the benefit which the

farmers might get was to be absorbed by the railway companies. I have no hesitation in saying now that in my opinion the question of reciprocity with the United States will never succeed in this country from a national point of view. Twice in 40 years, in 1878 and again in 1911 the people of Canada pronounced against it, and if the Liberal party still sticks to it they will get some more kicks when they again come before the electors. In my opinion, Sir, on all great national issues of the day, the Liberal-Conservatives of this country have the full confidence of the manufacturers; they have as well the full confidence of the farming community, and the endorsation of the whole Dominion. It is not correct to say that the present government is sustained by the mergers, the trusts, and the corporations. Sir, the present government has the support and sympathy of the farming constituencies of this country just as it has the support of the cities. Racial and religious appeals have never succeeded in this country, and never will succeed no matter how much gentlemen to the left of the Speaker may try to make them prevail. The Liberal-Conservative party based on the principles of Cartier and Macdonald, principles which are dear to the present Prime Minister, stands for equity, stands for justice, and stands for equal rights to the people of all Canada, whether they live in the east or in the west.

To emphasize that fact, I may say that although living sixty-five miles east of Montreal I have not been afraid to go to western Canada and start a farm there; and I am pleased to say that in the syndicate for that purpose with me are the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) and the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), and we are farming together in the large and prosperous province of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I hope that before long all we poor farmers will come to the same idea, that we had better develop our home market without bringing competition from elsewhere, and make this country great and prosperous. I have heard with great pleasure the speeches which have been delivered here by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett). They have the western optimism. If the people of eastern Canada would go oftener to the west, better relations between the east and the west would naturally prevail. I would like to see more French Canadians from my province go and see those great prairie provinces, and become citizens of them and help their development. I would like to see in every part of this Dominion people who, while speaking their different languages and practising their different religions, would unite together to make this great Dominion as prosperous as the great Republic to the south. What has made it the great Republic it is, if it is not protection? The Americans wanted our natural resources, they wanted our fertile soil, they wanted our prairie provinces, as their soil has lost its fertility. They have a large population, and they wanted this great and fertile Canada. For my part, as long as I live, I shall always, whether in this House or elsewhere, stand for Canada and Canadians. In closing my speech, I beg the indulgence of the House for the imperfect way in which I have addressed it in the English language; but I do not want to close without saying that the motto of every Canadian whether he is English, French or nay other nationality should be, 'a Canadina I was born and a Canadian I will die.'

(Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not wish to end this speech which I have just made in the English language, without addressing a few words to the House in the language which is dear to me, in the language which I speak every day.

I had not time to prepare my speech upon a subject so important as is the address in answer to the speech from the Throne. Nevertheless, I desired to explain before this House and before the country the stand which I have taken during the last campaign. I think I have defined my position, in a clear and satisfactory manner.

The remarks from the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) about me, when he insinuated that I had sympathies for, and that even I had declared myself in favour of, the reciprocity pact, rendered it necessary that I should define my position as regards that policy. I do not wish to be called a politician sailing under false colours, nor being the victom of false representations.

I know that the speech I just delivered in the English language will be translated into French, and it will be easy for everyone to see that I have explained my position clearly and to the best of my ability.

I will have during this parliament some other occasion to speak before this House upon the questions which may be brought by the hon. members opposite, and I will do it in such a way that no doubt can be left as to my position in this House.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). Mr. Speaker, I wish to occupy the time of this House in this debate, for a short time only. I was rather surprised that the speech from the Throne contained not a single word with regard to labour. The reason for this omission I am not able to state; but it seems to me that there should have been in that speech some reference to that subject. Mr. Speaker, I am not going in detail into many matters. It is not my intention to try the Nationalist party, neither is it my intention

to defend them; that is not my mission. I want to discuss two of the points which have been raised in this debate. At the outset let me say that I do not believe that the present government has a right to boast of its success any more than the present opposition has a right to mourn over its defeat. I believe, and I think I am correct in saying, that the change means the success of the trusts over the masses of the people of the country. Members on the other side of the House, and even members on this side, may not agree with me in that; but I will explain briefly some of the work of the trusts in the last campaign. I have heard a good deal here about waving the flag and about Canada for Canadians. I do not believe that people who talk so much about their loyalty are really sincere. It seems to me that there is something else to do besides protesting constantly one's love for the flag and one's loyalty to His Majesty. During the last campaign there was a good deal of misrepresentation. The trusts may be well satisfied with their work, and they are probably well represented in the present government. While they are in power they can take the advantage which it is their disposition to take, because I do not believe that they will have the same power in the near future. The masses of the people in this country are commencing to understand that great conglomerations of capital against the interests of the masses of the people have to come to an end; and if they do come to an end, it will only be through the strong pressure of the masses.

During the late campaign a great point was made by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they ridiculed the statement that if we had reciprocity our farmers would get more for their goods than they do at present, and at the same time our consumers would pay less. But those hon. gentlemen carefully left out of sight the fact that there is a third party in the case, apart from the farmers and the consumers, and that party is the trusts. The trusts stood between the farmers and the consumers, and reaped an immense profit by forcing the farmer to take what prices they chose to give, and forcing the latter to pay what prices they chose to exact. For instance during the last campaign our farmers had to sell their pork at $6 per hundred pounds, and yet at the same time our consumers had to pay for that same pork from 14 to 15 cents per pound. Somebody must have made the difference, and as there are some members of the pork trust in this House, no doubt they could let the public into the secret. But I do not think it requires much penetration to find out where this immense profit went, since we know that the pork trust was not at all scrupulous about declaring a dividend of 125 per cent. It is into the pockets of that trust that the difference went between the price of six cents per pound paid the farmers, and of 14 and 15 cents per pound charged the consumers.

Mr. BEST. When were the farmers getting $6 per hundred pounds and the consumers paying 14 cents per pound?

Mr. VERVILLE. Not more than three weeks ago. If my hon. friend has any later information, let him give it to the House. We also have a sugar trust in this country. That trust took a very active part in the last election. During that campaign, we found the price of sugar increased one and a half cents per pound. How much did that increase take out of the pockets of the consumers? Well, in the city of Montreal alone, there is a consumption of 300,000 pounds of sugar per week. At one and a half cents per pound, that increased price amounted to $45,000 per week. And I do not think I am at all exaggerating when I say that the sugar trust has taken out of the pockets of the consumer $45,000 per week in the city of Montreal alone, and no doubt put that money into the campaign fund to fight reciprocity. What I claim is that our people did not realize what reciprocity meant. They did not understand it. They did not realize what advantages they would gain from it, but I have no doubt that in time they will become educated; and to those who cry out that reciprocity is dead, I say it is only just born.

We have had protection advocated in opposition to reciprocity, and the United States have been held up to us time and again as an example of the benefits of protection. True there is probably no country in the world which has a higher protective tariff than the United States, but at the same time there is no country in the world which has made millionaires so fast. Since the formation in 1877 of the sugar trust in that country, the American consumers have paid $600,000,000 more for their sugar than they would have, had they been able to buy in the open market. I have read a good deal about these trusts, and all I have read has convinced me that they are a canker eating out the heart of the nation. Some years ago, when the famous steel trust of the United States issued a manifesto asking the great financiers of that country to invest their capital in it, they pointed out that they were employing 67,000 hands, and were paying out $113,000,000 per year, but the most important point of all was their statement that they were making a clear profit of $120,000,000 per year. This was the first time in history when so large an amount of profit was made in comparison with the amount of wages paid. I might go further into details regarding the operations of these trusts, but I do not wish to take up too much time. Besides the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) last session gave this House statistics showing what some of these trusts were doing in our own city

of Montreal; and I am sure that while he is in the cabinet, he will not allow these combines to continue crushing the people as they have done in the past. But that, of course, is their own concern. If you will study the question, you will find that the gospel of these trusts, which have made so active a fight against reciprocity, is high protection, monopolies, and the creation of millionaires. The present government, I believe, are under the jurisdiction and control of these trusts. In that belief, I hope that I am mistaken, but the future will tell. But when I found that no mention was made in the address regarding these trusts, I could not help thinking that there was good foundation for the charge that they controlled the policy of this government. There can be no doubt that the present cabinet is highly protective. In the newspapers we find the statement that there are seven millionaires in it.

Something has been said in this debate about the North Atlantic Trading Company. I do not propose to hark back to that matter because hon. members know the attitude I took on it in the past; but still, for the benefit of those who were not then in the House, I might point out the contrast between the attitude taken by the opposition then and that taken by them since they have attained power. At that time they made a concerted attack on an hon. gentleman whose name I may mention, Mr. Sifton. He was then their great bugbear; but if Mr. Sifton was so very bad then, in their opinion how comes it that he is such a saint in their eyes to-day?

When that gentleman was probably as poor as I am, he was in favour of reciprocity, but when he got to be probably fifteen times a millionaire he was against it. He now cries 'Canada for the Canadians.' During the last campaign we heard men like Sir William Van Horne who were opposing reciprocity, shouting 'Canada for Canadians.' Sir Wm. Van Horne is not satisfied with that, he made up his mind at one time to place some capital in the United States, but he found that was not far enough away, and he went to Mexico and placed his capital there. Even that was not far enough away and he went to Cuba and placed capital there. Why do capitalists cry Canada for Canadians? Has capital any nation, any country? No, the capitalist will place his money wherever he can get the biggest dividend. Capital has no heart. It has no conscience and I am sorry to say that the managers of the large mergers are becoming as bad as the capitalists, they have no conscience.

We may boast about the prosperity of our country, but at the same time we must realize that about every 12 years there is a period of depression. We in Canada have suffered very little from depression of late years. The last depression did not affect Canada very much but I am afraid that the next one will. These periods of depression usually come from a surplus of production. We have now a surplus of production, and I believed when reciprocity was proposed that it was the best possible means to prevent the occurrence of the depression that might come over this country in the near future, that it would certainly be preferable to protection. I hear the trusts asking for protection on everything they manufacture, but I would like to see the member of a trust or the member of a large institution who is willing to have protection on labour. His cry is: Free labour at all cost, but give me all the protection you can on the goods I have to sell. That is what has been asked in the past and I am very much afraid that the cry will become stronger and stronger.

There is a certain amount of discontent among the masses of the country. In what I am about to say I am speaking on my own responsibility and do not wish to hold the present opposition responsible for my utterance. There is a certain amount of discontent among the masses of the people of this country to-day and, if the trusts and mergers keep up their work as they have done in the past, the Crown in Canada will be in danger inside of ten years. It may seem strange to members of this House that I should utter such words as these, but there are signs of discontent among the people in all parts of Canada. We see similar discontent all over the world. Look at Germany for example. After the next election in Germany we will undoubtedly see a great change in that country, and what will cause the change there is the constant oppression of the people by the large institutions called mergers. What has happened in other countries is likely to happen here. The population of Canada is composed of all classes of society, and I claim that in the public interest the trusts should not get any higher protection than the masses of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite will realize to their sorrow in two or three years the strength of the current of feeling among the people in favour of such movements as reciprocity which tend to give the masses of the people a chance to buy goods in a better market at a cheaper rate perhaps to the detriment of the trust. That movement is growing rapidly and hon. gentlemen opposite will probably see in the near future a strong element crying out against the present administration if they do not place some restriction on the work of the different trusts in Canada. I claim to-day that the question of reciprocity was not explained before the people in its economic aspects in the last campaign. My opponent certainly did not do so. In one part of the riding my opponent said that his policy

was the policy of Mr. Monk and Mr. Bourassa, but in the English part of the riding he declared himself in favour of Mr. Borden's policy. In this perhaps he did not make a mistake, as according to these hon. gentlemen it is but the one policy. Yesterday was the first time I heard that it was a question of power, when the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) said: You are there and we are here. It seemed to me that there was something beyond that question of : You are there and I am here, instead of saying that there is a great question and a certain policy at stake. Although the policy of reciprocity has been defeated I for one shall not cease in the effort to educate my fellowmen to the belief that it was the best policy ever presented by any Democratic government in any country of the world. I know that there is at present a vigorous movement to prevent labour men from entering this House—this I can prove whenever it is necessary. I will state here publicly, to the members of the government that if anyone should in the future be guilty of trying by all possible means to prevent me or other labour men entering this House, they are making the greatest mistake of their lives. I will even invite some hon. members opposite to endeavour to prevent labour men from entering the House and then probably we will see in the near future more men in this House who will be ready to present radical legislation. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) spoke well in reference to the investigation of mergers. I am sorry to say I cannot say as much for the St. Jean Baptiste speech made by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) At the same time I hope my hon. friend from Calgary will pursue that line of policy. He may rest assured that whenever he brings before the House any measure looking towards that end, he will receive my hearty support.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver). I had not intended to take any part in this debate until I noticed, as it proceeded, that the great province from which I come, had scarcely received mention from any member who has participated in the debate. I represent a constituency which comprises some 150,000, good loyal Canadian citizens, and I think consequently I may be allowed to take part in this debate. The subject of the cabinet appointees, or the colleagues which the Prime Minister has chosen to act with him, seems to have taken precedence over every other subject. I think that is a matter for regret, because I understand that we are sent here for the purpose of discussing the larger questions relating to the affairs and administration of this Dominion, and not for the purpose of making personal attacks upon individuals. I want to congratulate the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Verville) upon one or two points which he mentioned, and which I think prove conclusively the wisdom of the position taken by the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada on reciprocity. He spent considerable time criticising the trusts, and he argued in favour of reciprocity as a means of preventing the inroads that the trusts are making upon the consumers of this country. In my opinion, to open the markets of Canada freely to the ingress of the trusts of the United States would certainly not benefit the consumers of this country, according to his own argument. He also made reference to the protection of labour, and in this I am heartily in accord with him. But I was surprised to hear the criticisms he made, being, as he is, a supporter of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, and who so lately led the government of this country for fifteen years I am reminded that there is on the statute books of Canada an Alien Labour Act, which was especially designed for the labouring men of this country. Now, what did we find a short time ago on the Pacific coast of Canada? We found that the authorities of the Dominion, under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman, were deliberately violating the Alien Labour Act, acting in direct contravention to its provisions. They have been for over a year conniving with certain individuals for the importation of foreign labour into Canada in direct contravention of that Act. The government officials at Victoria and at Seattle, where foreigners take the boat for British Columbia ports, were instructed that they could admit foreigners into Canada in direct contravention of that Act. Now, Sir, how the hon. gentleman who claims to be the special representative of the labouring people of Canada, can be a supporter of a government, of an administration, which has perpetrated a crime of that kind, is beyond my comprehension. The hon. gentleman said that he felt convinced that the reciprocity agreement had not been well explained to the people of Canada. Well, all I can say is that he could not have attended any Conservative meetings during the last campaign, because so far as I could learn from the press, and according to my own personal observations, in every constituency the Liberal-Conservative party sought to give a full and complete explanation of this important measure. In the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition we find this clause:

> We respectfully submit to your Royal Highness that it is a fundamental principle of constitutional government that the advisers of the Crown shall be heartily in accord on all important questions of public policy.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite are making strong objection because they imagine that there is a difference of opinion between members of the present government on what should be Canada's naval policy. Now can we not offer a similar criticism on the personnel of the members of the opposition? Can you imagine a more direct contradiction of opinion, for instance, than that which exists between the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), and the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition? The hon. member for Red Deer is a hearty hale, bluff John Bull, an ultra-imperialist, according to his own statement, a man who is an avowed free-trader; and yet he sits side by side on the same political bench with the refined and cultured leader of the opposition, who is an avowed protectionist, whose administration has ever pursued a protectionist policy, a gentleman who introduced that famous resolution into the late Imperial Conference which cast a wet blanket, as was stated by the press, over the whole proceedings of that conference. I say, can you imagine a more direct opposition than exists between these two gentlemen? And yet they appear to be working in perfect harmony. Well, why should they not differ in opinion if they like, and why should not hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have the same privilege of holding a manly difference of opinion in details, so long as they are agreed on the essentials of a national policy? Because my opinion may differ from that of a gentleman sitting beside me on matters of detail, is no reason why we should divide on matters of national policy, and fight over it like Kilkenny cats. I think it is only requisite that we should agree on the essential principles of the administration, while being allowed to express frankly and openly our minds on any minor question that may arise. When I entered this House I came with certain opinions of my own, but I am willing to hear and consider the opinions of my fellow members who may differ from my own, and leave it to a vote of the House to determine which set of opinions shall prevail. I cannot imagine how we can decide a public question in any other way.

Now, Sir, I wish to deal briefly with some of the measures referred to in the speech from the Throne. Several hon. members opposite have presumed to say there was very little in the speech from the Throne, but even that little has been ignored by them for the purpose of making an attack on the ministerial benches. There has been practically no discussion of those important matters which are referred to in the speech. I submit that there are measures referred to in that document of sufficient importance to keep this House in session for several months. If they would apply their reason and their intelligence to a discussion of these measures, I believe it would result in some good to the country. In the first place, we have an allusion to the subject of good roads. This has been a subject of some ridicule on the part of our hon. friends opposite. The hon. member for St. John city and county (Mr. Pugsley), the late Minister of Public Works, says that this is a matter that will present insuperable difficulties.

He could not understand how they were going to make a division of these funds which would be satisfactory to everbyody. Sir, from his standpoint, and from the standpoint of the late administration, I can readily understand how it would be difficult to make a division of the spoils, but, under the administration that we have at the present time and with the application of the intelligence of the members of the whole House, I believe that this question can be solved amicably and justly to all concerned. I consider it a question of the most supreme importance. There is no greater colonizing influence than good roads. I believe that a highway through the country is of more value to the settling up of the community than a railway or a tram line. I believe that the Dominion and provincial governments should co-operate in the extension of the highways throughout the country. I am here to say this, that according to the records of our own province, the provincial government of British Columbia are spending this year $3,000,000 on the extension of the highways and this has been hailed by the people as a highly commendable piece of administration. We welcomed the assistance of the Dominion government in extending the highways through our province. There is an illustration of the value of this policy that I might give the House. For instance, there is the Alberta-British Columbia highway. This is a highway that we hope to join up. At present I understand that you can take an automobile or a carriage and drive practically all the way from Winnipeg right through to the Rocky mountains. We wish to extend our highways eastward and join them up so as to make a highway clean across the continent. Some hon. gentleman the other day rather ridiculed this idea, but to my mind, and I repeat it here, it is a highly commendable piece of administration to extend the highways of the country.

There is another point upon which I wish to dwell for a moment and that is as to the question of immigration. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), in his eloquent and witty address, which I enjoyed very much, made reference to this subject. By the way, I might just say that the hon. member for Red Deer visited British Columbia and preached his free trade policy

and we returned seven solid, Conservative members. He is still persistent in believing that he is on the right track. However, I have no quarrel with the hon. gentleman, he is a gentleman for whom I have a great deal of respect, and I listened with great interest to his exposition of the theory of free trade notwithstanding the fact of its impracticability. He made some reference to immigration and that is a subject in which British Columbia, and the west as a whole are deeply interested. I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to an investigation which was held in the city of Vancouver into the Chinese immigration frauds. Here are the Sessional Papers which have never been printed under the direct instruction of the late government, and why? Simply because there were facts contained in those Sessional Papers that the public would like to know and which would have been very prejudicial to the late administration. I have been through these Sessional Papers, I am thoroughly acquainted with the situation in British Columbia connected with these Chinese frauds, and I have supplemented my investigations there with a perusal of these papers. What is the situation? The Chinese are admitted into the Dominion of Canada, according to statute under a $500 head tax. There are certain exceptions. Merchants, Chinese who have returned to China and come back within one year, and the wives and children of merchants in the country are admitted free. We found that there was a syndicate or company organized, with the connivance and knowledge of officials of the late administration, who were working together and bringing in, by a system of frauds, hundreds of Chinese without paying the head tax. This was accomplished by this method. A number of Chinamen would come in on a boat and the interpreter who would question them, being a member of the syndicate, would give answers to the English officials which were positively false in every detail. The result was that these men would be passed free. This is the administration which an hon. gentleman spoke of a moment ago as being in favour of the policy of the labour element in this country. I want to draw your attention to a few references in connection with the investigation which was made by Mr. Justice Murphy just to substantiate my statement. He said:

Ample opportunity has existed at Vancouver for illegal entry of Chinese into Canada.

Then he goes on:

A system of direct fraud to secure illegal entry of Chinese into Canada as merchants and exempts has flourished at Vancouver.

Then he goes on further and recommends that:

A digest be forwarded to the Minister of Justice for advice re prosecution of Yip On and Yip Sue, interpreters.

How could these things flourish unless they were connived at by the administration? They were known in Vancouver by those who were the official employees of the government. The interpreters were working hand in hand with those who were benefiting by those frauds. Just to illustrate that, I want to tell you what happened a few weeks ago. Two Chinamen came into my office and offered me $500 if I would secure them the appointment of interpreter telling me that it was an exceedingly valuable office. That indicates the way in which these interpreters secured their positions formerly and the methods that were being pursued by this department in Vancouver. The immigration policy of the Dominion government during the past fifteen years has bequeathed to this present government a racial problem in comparison with which the negro problem in the south fades into insignificance. The Pacific coast is flooded with Asiatics who have entered the country by fraud.

I want to come now to the Japanese situation. I again refer to the fact that hon. members opposite have claimed that we have an immigration policy which has been satisfactory and for which we should congratulate ourselves, according to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). Ten years ago there were a thousand Japanese on the Pacific coast; to-day, I have not been able to secure the exact figures, but I venture to say that there are upwards of 25,000 Japanese on the Pacific coast. Ten years ago I do not think there was a single Japanese engaged in the fishing business, or there were very few; to-day there are 10,500 Japanese engaged in the fishing business. Ten years ago that business was in the hands of white men; to-day it is entirely in the hands of Japanese or almost so. These are facts which, I think, speak for themselves. How has this come about? The provincial government of British Columbia repeatedly passed Acts seeking to stop this immigration of Asiatics into Canada. They were continuously passed, and as often as they were passed they were disallowed by the Dominion government. They were disallowed, probably legally and properly, but the policy that was followed was against the advice of the imperial authorities. I refer you to the Sessional Papers of 1898 and 1900, should any hon. member desire to verify my statements. There he can find reference after reference, telegram after telegram, letter after letter, from Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, speaking for the imperial authorities, advising the Dominion parliament to pass an Act along the lines of the Natal Act. This was refused by the Dominion government, the Acts of the prov-

ince were disallowed and the result is that to-day you have a race problem on the Pacific coast in comparison with which I repeat, the negro problem of the south fades into insignificance, because you not only have the presence of the Asiatics on the coast and in your country, but you also are face to face with the fact that they are protected by their own countries which are highly civilized and powerful nations. This is a problem that must be taken up and dealt with by the Dominion House.

Under this new administration I am looking forward to some measure which will assist us to keep British Columbia as a white man's country, and not as a field to be exploited by Asiatics. Reference is made in the speech from the Throne to a proposed reform in the terminal elevator system, and to the development of agriculture, and our friends opposite rather ridiculed these proposals.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is mistaken as to that. I was not in the House when any member on this side ridiculed the idea of the government controlling terminal elevators. I spoke of the elevators myself, but I did not criticise the policy of the government.

Mr. STEVENS. The hon. member may not have been in the House, but I am distinctly under the impression——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mention any member who criticised that policy.

Mr. STEVENS. I am distinctly under the impression, and reference to 'Hansard' will I think prove my statement, that the general tone of all the members on the other side was to ridicule the proposals in the speech from the Throne.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. STEVENS. The proposal of this government with regard to terminal elevators is most progressive and advanced legislation, and any man who has the welfare of this Dominion at heart must say that such legislation is in the interests of the masses of the people of Canada. We were told by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the other evening that 66 per cent of our people lived by agriculture, and yet, so far as I have been able to find out, $750,000 only was the amount that the Liberal government could afford to spend last year for the promotion of agriculture. Our agricultural industry comprises 49 per cent of the total trade of the Dominion, and if you include transportation, which lives by agriculture, and the agricultural implement industry, which is also dependent on it, then, you can easily say that 75 per cent of the total industry of Canada is agricultural. Sixty-six per cent of our people live directly by agricultural pursuits, and although our revenue last year was about $115,000,000, we spent less than 1 per cent of it on the fostering of this great industry. Such a condition as that is absurd, and I submit that the time has arrived when the Federal government should spend a much larger sum for the development of agriculture.

Let me give you a few facts. France, which is a very small country compared with Canada, spends annually $9,000,000 in the interests of agriculture; Austria spends annually nine millions, Hungary nine and a half millions; the little empire of Japan, which you could bury in one of our inland gulfs on the Pacific coast, spends three and a half millions; and the United States spends annually ten millions on agriculture; and yet, notwithstanding that Canada is essentially a new agricultural country requiring great assistance for its development, the late government could only afford a sum of less than one million dollars last year on agriculture. The proposal of the new government, as I understand it, is to provide facilities for the establishment of agricultural colleges and experimental farms so that immigrants coming to this country, not experienced in agriculture, may obtain that experience here which will enable them to settle on the land and become prosperous and successful farmers. The immigration policy of the late administration tended to bring to our shores, hordes from southern France, to encourage the Japanese and the Chinese to flood this country, and to, as far as possible, provide $5 per head for the coffers of the North Atlantic Trading Company and other such institutions. Hardly a city in this Dominion but has to face the problem of what to do with these southern Europeans. Ontario has had to pass an Act to prevent these people carrying concealed weapons and using them to the danger of life, in the slums of our cities where they congregate. Instead of bringing immigrants to this country who would settle on the farms, the policy of the late government was to bring to our cities hordes of these undesirables. What we want now is a policy which will enable immigrants when they arrive in Canada to become acquainted with our customs so that they may be useful citizens of Canada and successful settlers of our vacant farm lands. The hon. gentleman from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) spoke about trusts, and as I understand it the condition which prevails in the Northwest in the matter of our terminal elevators is that there is danger of certain companies corralling the elevator business there, and so the government proposes to regulate these elevators in such a manner as to give the farmers—whom we may classify as the backbone of the citizenship of the country—facilities to store

their grain under favourable and equitable conditions, and to market it to advantage, so that they may secure a fair profit as the result of their toil and industry. That is legislation which ought to receive the endorsement of every member in this House. True, there are problems in connection with the scheme, but never has there been a departure from the ordinary routine that did not present problems. The details must be worked out, and if hon. gentlemen on the other side are interested in the development of the country, then, instead of casting ridicule upon the project they can, by offering judicious criticism, assist the government in carrying it to a successful issue. Another thing touched upon in the speech from the Throne was the appointment of a tariff commission, and I submit that this proposal offers an eminently intelligent solution for many of our present difficulties. I repudiate the assertion of hon. gentlemen on the other side that the party now in power represents the trusts. The truth is that we represent the whole people of Canada and not any particular class, and so, the tariff commission will be able to hear from all classes of the community and to decide what is best to be done for the general welfare of the Dominion. When the two gentlemen went from Ottawa to Washington last year—and I say this in spite of the statement that Washington came to Ottawa—in connection with the reciprocity agreement, they met the tariff experts of the United States who had at their fingers' ends facts and statistics to sustain their side of the case. I submit, Sir, that a minister of the Crown, with the multiplicity of duties he has to perform and the tremendous pressure of business on him, could not be expected to be an expert on such a question.

You cannot expect any human being who has such a diversity of duties to be an expert on any one of them. So that when these gentlemen went to Washington they met the expert tariff commission of the United States, by whom, I am credibly informed, $300,000 was spent in gathering facts for the purposes of this agreement. How, I ask how, in the name of commonsense could any man who is not an expert, I care not how intelligent he may be, meet men of this calibre, who are intimately informed on this subject, and expect to make an agreement that was entirely equitable? The thing was impossible. What we expect from the announcement in the speech from the Throne is that the present administration will organize here a tariff commission similar to what they have in the United States, non-political in its complexion. So far as I am concerned, I would oppose any scheme of this kind with a political stripe. The commission must be a scientific, non-political organization, and with such an organization I can see that we shall have an equitable tariff schedule in the future.

Now, I wish to deal for a moment with the fisheries question. I have intimated already that the fisheries on the Pacific coast are almost exclusively in the hands of Japanese. This is a matter of very great significance to this House. It is difficult for hon. gentlemen living in the eastern part of the Dominion, with many local problems pressing upon them for solution every day, to become interested in what is happening at the other extremity of the country. But this is more than a local problem for British Columbia; it is a problem which affects the whole Dominion of Canada, and I will briefly show how. These Japanese fishermen on the Pacific coast are not merely ordinary fishermen, but to a large extent they are reservists of the Japanese navy. They are experts in navigation. They have draughted complete charts of every hole and corner of the Pacific coast, and have photographs of the whole coastline. I venture to say there are in the archives at Tokio complete charts of our navigable waters. To illustrate that, I may state that a few weeks ago one of our coasting boats going on its usual run wanted to call at a certain inlet. Some of these inlets run up into the land for 30 or 40 or 50 miles. The captain had no chart, in fact there was no chart of that particular inlet; and having looked up the chart he had he said, 'I cannot take the risk.' When he was faced with this difficulty, a Japanese fisherman produced from his pocket a complete and perfect chart of that inlet, and the captain was able to sail up many miles by that chart. The problem on the Pacific coast in this regard is a serious one, and merits the attention of this House. Moreover, the method followed up to the present time of granting fishing licenses on the Pacific coast is something nefarious. Licenses have been granted to individuals whose only recommendation was that they were political heelers, and these licenses have been farmed out to Japanese and others. Fishing licenses which have been secured for $50 have been sold to Japanese for from $1,000 to $1,500.

While speaking on this subject I want to make a practical suggestion which I hope will be taken into consideration by the administration. On the Labrador coast there are a large number of fishermen who would make excellent settlers and citizens on the Pacific coast. At present these fishermen are disfranchised, because there is no representative in this House from the Labrador coast, and I am informed that Dr. Grenfel, who has done a great deal for the people of that part of the

country, is interested in the transfer of some of these fishermen to the Pacific coast. I believe it is up to the Dominion administration to arrange its immigration laws in such a way as to conserve and protect the resources of this country so that they will not pass into the hands of aliens, and I believe that the transfer of some of these Labrador fishermen to the Pacific coast would be a splendid solution of the difficulty, because it would give us expert fishermen and relieve us from the necessity of employing Japanese.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the number of Japanese fishermen materially increased during the last two or three years?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, most materially. The hon. member is referring, I have no doubt, to his little jaunt to Japan a few years ago; but, while I presume the hon. member did his best and his intentions were all right, that arrangement does not meet the case in any sense. What we in British Columbia contend is that there should be passed by the Dominion authorities, as was suggested by Joseph Chamberlain himself, an Act similar to the Natal Act; but the Dominion government of that time absolutely refused to pass such an Act. I go farther. When the treaty with Japan was under negotiation, the late administration were asked by the Imperial authorities if they wanted to come in as a party without reservation, or if they wanted to reserve their rights with regard to immigration, and they told the Imperial authorities that they would come in without any reservation whatever. The result is that if we attempt to interfere with Japanese immigration in any way, we are met with the difficulty of an objection from the Emperor of Japan. It is not an easy question to solve, but the late administration neglected the question entirely, instead of attempting to deal with it. It is a question that requires large men to deal with, but if it is not grappled with, you are going to be faced with a race problem that you will have to reckon with in the near future.

Now, I want to proceed to the navy question. It has been stated by some hon. members that in the recent campaign prominence was not given to the navy question, while other hon. members stated that it was the sole question discussed. As far as British Columbia is concerned, this naval question is of vital importance. If you will permit me, I will read again the clause referring to that in the proposed amendment of the right hon. leader of the opposition:

> That with regard to that policy, as well as to the whole question of naval defence, there is in the present cabinet a flagrant conflict of opinion.

On the Pacific coast there is no conflict of opinion, but there is an opinion that is directly antagonistic to the policy of the late administration. What have we got to-day? The Atlantic squadron the other day went on a political junketing tour in express opposition to the orders of the naval authorities, and the result was that the 'Niobe' was piled up on a rock. The Pacific squadron went to Comox harbour and dropped anchor, and had not men enough to raise the anchor. That is the kind of Canadian navy you have to-day. Now, was it the intention of the late administration to man their navy with Japanese? because that is what it apparently was leading to. The whole fishing industry on the Pacific coast, on which you must depend for men to man your merchant marine and navy, was in the hands of Japanese, and no one who has looked into the question carefully could fail to see what result would follow from the naval policy of the late administration. That policy was simply suicidal in every sense of the term, not only so far as the poor 'Niobe' was concerned, but from beginning to end. I have formed a judgment on the navy question and have no hesitation in stating it. We have been told that there is a conflict of opinion among members of the cabinet on this question, but we ought to be sufficiently broad-minded to give members of the cabinet the right to their own opinions with regard to any public policy, but if there be any difference it has simply been concerning the direful effects bound to follow the policy of the late government.

This question is one which should be approached as a business proposition and not with a view of utilizing it so as to throw out sops of patronage to particular parts of the country. What is the condition at present? We have a certain trade on the high seas, and it is just as essential that we should have protection to our trade on the high seas as police protection in the cities. The question is not one of simply bolstering up imperial ideas. It is a commercial one more than anything else. We are proud to boast that the British Empire controls over half the carrying trade of the whole world. We are proud to boast of our supremacy of the high seas. Well, in my opinion what is required is an imperial board of defence on which the overseas dominions should be given representation. I am convinced that a board of that kind would remove the last vestige of objection in this country to a direct contribution to a navy under the control of the imperial authorities. But I may be asked how we are going to decide the proportion which each of the overseas dominions should contribute. Well as I have said, the proposi-

tion is a business one. There is a certain amount of traffic throughout the empire. Let us, for the sake of argument, say that the gross amount of traffic throughout the empire amounts to one billion dollars and that the portion contributed by the Dominion amounts to $100,000,000. In my view the proportion which the Dominion should contribute to the support of the navy would be pro rata to the proportion which her traffic bears to that of the whole. Suppose, for instance, that one billion dollars represents the whole traffic of the empire, and $100,000,000 that of the Dominion, the proportion of our contribution would be one-tenth. If such a course as I have indicated were pursued I believe it would result in removing the objections which at present obtain against our contributing to the maintenance of an imperial navy. A good many people are opposed to any such contribution unless we have representation in the councils of the nation. I myself am a firm believer in the autonomy of this Dominion, and while I believe in a direct contribution I am equally convinced that we should have our say regarding how that contribution should be spent. If then, we be given imperial representation, I see no objection to our contributing to an imperial navy. For 100 years Canada has enjoyed the protection of the imperial navy and has not given a cent towards the cost of that protection. That, I consider, is a disgrace to Canada. I consider it a disgrace to this country that we should allow the taxpayers of Britain to be burdened with the whole responsibility of the heavy tax required to protect our overseas trade. The time has come when we should bear our just proportion to protect our own trade. On the basis I have pointed out and on being given direct representation in the councils of the empire, I believe the last vestige of objection to a naval policy would be removed.

I have not much more to add, but I wish to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Kings, Nova Scotia (Mr. Foster), the baby member of this House. Let me congratulate him on the excellent speech he made on the address, but when he alluded to the unlimited resources of Nova Scotia, while I have no fault to find with my hon. friend's enthusiasm regarding his own native province, I find I am at a loss how to describe the resources of the province I have the honour to represent. We have in that province a coast line of 7,000 miles and an area of some 238,000,000 acres. When the late Sir John Macdonald and his noble colleague proposed to span this continent with two bands of steel, their policy was ridiculed by the Liberal party of that day. In fact, Sir Richard Cartwright described British Columbia as a sea of mountains and declared that the railway would not pay for its axle-grease. Well, we have great mountain peaks, of which we are justly proud. Those peaks are so high that I do not believe the mentality of those engaged in this debate could surmount them, and certainly they tower high above the mentality of those who criticise the statesmen-like policy of Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues which has made this country what it is to-day. But between those great mountain peaks we have fertile valleys in which you could place Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and I believe the province of Ontario as well. Let me now draw attention to a few of our resources. Our output of coal last year was 2,000,000 tons and our output of other minerals amounted to some $24,500,000, almost one-half the total production of minerals in Canada. Our salmon fisheries canned over 1,000,000 cases of salmon. I am not drawing attention to these facts in a boastful manner, but simply to show that British Columbia is a great province and belongs to the Dominion of Canada as a whole and not to the people of British Columbia alone, and for the purpose of pointing out to the people of the east the great territory we have on the Pacific coast. When legislation is passed by this House, it should be based on the broad idea of developing the whole country from the Atlantic to the Pacific and not of benefiting any one particular section. I might point out further that in Vancouver alone during the last ten years we have contributed to the Dominion treasury some $35,000,000 in customs and postal returns and this year the amount is likely to reach $8,000,000. But what I wish particularly to emphasize is the fact that we ought to turn our attention to the development of this Dominion regardless of race, religious and creed differences. What do I care about anybody's views on transubstantiation or any other religious doctrine? Though born in the old country, I am a Canadian in sentiment, my first love is Canada, and I believe the time has come when we should bury these petty differences and work in common for the development of our common country. The other day I had a conversation with one of my colleagues from the province of Quebec who told me he had property in the west and had travelled considerably throughout that country and had thus obtained an idea of the vast heritage belonging to this Dominion and he came to this House prepared to deal with every public question from the standpoint of the country as a whole and not from any sectional point of view. I agree with my hon. friend. I believe that we should for ever banish these petty differences of creed and race and unite with one object, namely, the development of this great Dominion of ours in the interests of all classes and all sections.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation.) I have followed attentively the debate which has been going on for a few days, and especially the academical and patriotic utterances of the member for Dorchester (Mr. Sévigny), the bilingual utterances of the member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou), and the fretful and timid speech of the Minister of Public works (Mr. Monk). After listening to such an out and out repudiation of principles which these gentlemen had advocated previous to the 21st of September last, I considered it was part of my duty to give expression in this House to my humble views regarding the present state of things and the men to whose care the future of the country is now entrusted.

It would have been to me pleasant to think, Mr. Speaker, that you were in a position to follow the remarks which I am about to make to the House. However, I am satisfied that by taking some pains and drawing on your well-known resources, you will by the end of this parliament have mastered our beautiful French language and be able to appreciate its wealth of expression. Just here, I may be allowed a short digression: while listening at the opening of the session to the reading of the speech from the Throne, which was given in French by His Royal Highness the Governor General, I was unable to repress a feeling of pride at hearing my mother tongue spoken with such fine accent by a member of the British Royal family. And I said to myself. What a lesson for those ultra-loyalists, for those Ontario Tories who clamour for the abolition of the French language and the closing of our bilingual schools to the detriment of the younger generation. May such a lesson profit to those whom it concerns.

Mr. Speaker, following on the bitter warfare waged against the Laurier government in the course of the last electoral campaign, wherein prejudice fought hand in hand with falsehoods and misrepresentations, wherein nationalism and Toryism joined forces towards securing a common end, the overthrow of Laurier, we expected there would be formed a strong and united government having a definite, frank and overt policy. But what have we been witnessing ever since the overthrow of the late government? In the first place an army of hungry office seekers, besieging the Prime Minister, in the hope of satisfying an appetite maddened by fifteen years' waiting in the cold shades of opposition. And if the report of some newspapers is to be credited, I might use the very words of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), who, it appears, stated he was ashamed of his colleagues, and of some defeated Conservative candidates as well, seeing them so eager to press their claims and to secure a minister's portfolio.

What has been going on under our eyes in connection with the making up of the cabinet? And what are we to think of those who are to run the business of the country for the next four or five years? I am not a confident of the Prime Minister, but if any stock is to be taken in current gossip and rumor, he had a rather hard time of it before he succeeded in recruiting his full quota of ministers.

In the first place, he had to find a Minister of Finance to whom he could confide that surplus of thirty millions left over from the late administration. An honest, worthy, reliable man, a man above reproach, was required for such a position. Did he cast his eyes on his former colleagues in this House from 1896 to 1911? Did he find a single one of them worthy of such a trust, whether in this or in any other province of Canada? No. He had to confide that fund to a new Conservative, to a Liberal of yesterday, who even never had voted for the Conservative party, and he appointed the Hon. Mr. White as Minister of Finance.

In filling that position he might have recalled the hon. member for North Toronto, but I imagine he was scared by the remembrance of what occurred in connection with the Independent Order of Foresters. Before calling on him to fill that office, no doubt the Prime Minister was made uneasy by the thought of what happened to his predecessor, through the wire-pulling of the man who holds the portfolio of Trade and Commerce, and of what Sir Mackenzie Bowell termed the 'nest of traitors,' and he made up his mind to relegate him to the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Casting an eye over those who surround the Prime Minister, and endeavouring to find out what reasons dictated his selection of the Quebec representatives in the cabinet, we, as representatives of that province in this House, can well wonder at seeing the hon. members for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk), Quebec county (Mr. Pelletier), and Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel), sitting at the council board, although, previous to September 21st, they repudiated and reviled the Hon. Prime Minister. If the memory of what happened to Sir Mackenzie Bowell must have recurred to him when he selected his present Minister of Trade and Commerce, the shades of Mercier and of the year 1892 must have appeared to him when he appointed his present Postmaster General.

What special qualifications exhibited by the member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) can have induced the Prime Minister to appoint him Minister of Inland Revenue. I am personally acquainted with him, and I

congratulate him on the promotion he has secured preferably to a number of his fellow-members. One thing I am sure of, and it is that he has not secured his appointment with the consent of the hon. member for Charlevoix and Montmorency (Mr. Forget). As to that, I would be willing to wager. But no, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw what I have just said, knowing that the hon. minister will have nothing to do with betting, especially when he is the loser, witness his $1,000 wager with Mr. Prévost and 'l'Avenir du Nord,' of St. Jerome, which has been pending for several years back.

We have reason to be surprised at the appointment of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) as Minister of Militia and the Nationalist element in the province of Quebec have still greater cause for surprise. While occupying seats alongside their colleague, surely these hon. gentleman do not entertain in regard to him the view held by Mr. Henri Bourassa, the political adviser of the present Prime Minister, and who, if newspaper reports are to be relied on, was retained here for two days, in order to express an opinion, as to the policy to be propounded before the country.

Have they had and have they still before them the sizing up of the new Minister of Militia, which appeared in 'Le Devoir' in the month of August last, when Mr. Bourassa wrote as follows:

> Yes, Sam Hughes, the imperialist, the 'orangeman,' the 'tory,' the 'hater of religion,' the arch enemy of the French language, whose name has so often been hurled as an insult by government henchmen. Well, he has been selected by Messrs. Laurier, Borden and Lemieux to lay down the terms under which Canada will participate in the wars of the empire.

Has the hon. Minister of Public Works before his eyes that picture, the work of his leader, Mr. Bourassa?

And after viewing that picture, have we not good reason to be surprised at this incoherent assemblage making up that government already termed a coalition government, but which I would term 'heterogeneous', comprising as it does men whose views on the most important questions of Canadian poltics are radically at variance.

The hon. Minister of Public Works, in closing his speech, yesterday, stated that he was proud to see the Speaker of the House occupying that post of honour. No doubt the facts the right hon. leader of the opposition had recalled to his memory in such scathing terms at the time of the Speaker's election had already been dismissed from his mind.

In making that selection, the hon. Prime Minister no doubt recalled his defeat in Halifax in 1904, and by appointing you, Sir, to fill that important position, he was anxious to show his gratitude towards the electors of Carleton who returned him in 1904. But enough on that chapter; the Laurier governement was defeated on September 21st. Great as he was in victory, Laurier is still greater and more to be feared in defeat.

A government supporter would have said that the leader of the opposition had met his Waterloo on September 21st.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) He said so himself.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I am not aware of that, but at any rate, that statement was made quite recently. And in connection with that defeat, never was there uttered nobler and loftier thoughts by the leader of a defeated party and for the information of the hon. member for L'Islet, I shall quote the very words:

> I prefer defeat, when suffered for the sake of justice, to power obtained through the betrayal of principles advocated for many years. I feel healthier and stronger than ever, and if the Liberal party continue to abide by me, I shall remain their leader until my strength fails me, or God takes my life.

I may say to the hon. member for L'Islet that with Laurier as leader of the opposition, victory is assured to that party, and that he and this government will meet their Waterloo earlier than they expect.

The speech from the Throne as well as the addresses of hon. gentlemen who have preceded me contains references to the country's prosperity. It outlines a policy of aid to agriculture, of assistance towards the good roads movement and announces the establishment of a tariff commission.

All are agreed in saying, Liberal and Conservative alike, and even the Nationalists could not gainsay that the prosperity of this, country has kept on increasing since 1896. The old administration should be given credit for it. On what ground can the hon. gentleman opposite claim credit for that prosperity, when compared with the state of things that existed before 1896? This whole paragraph is a slap in the face of the hon. gentlemen opposite, because the credit for that prosperity belongs to the old administration. The Laurier government has gone down to defeat, it is true, but it has fallen in a noble cause, without any stigma of infamy for having dilapidated the public exchequer attaching to its record. Thanks be to God, during their adminstration of fifteen years here has been no dilapidation of public funds and in the ranks of the Liberal party men are not to be found like those who brought disrgace upon the Conservative party. To quote the very words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, it was by standing up for principles that we endeavoured to make of Canada a great and prosperous country. With

such experience as we have gained and under the ægis of Laurier, the Liberal party is already threatening the position of that heterogeneous administration which is afraid of putting its programme before the House on the important issues which are of interest to the public in general

The old administration, as I said, has left in the public exchequer, in addition to the gigantic work it has achieved, a surplus of thirty million dollars. What did our opponents say during the last elections? 'Let well enough alone. Why should we seek to better our condition?' To this the Laurier government replied: 'We want to make the country still more prosperous; we wish to better the position of the farming community. Let the farmer have his turn.' That is the reason why the Laurier government had made a new departure in its fiscal policy by offering us freer trade in natural products with the neighbouring republic.

Besides exploiting the race and religious prejudices in Ontario, our opponents have also raised the annexation cry, taking as a pretext the Taft-Fielding convention, in the province of Quebec. And in the matter of annexation, it is true that a few isolated words—which I could call imprudent—uttered at around some festive boards in the United States had fallen from the lips of Mr. Champ Clarke and President Taft. At once the Tories, in search of any pretext whatever which might be grasped as a weapon for battering in the Liberal policy, seized upon these statements and used them as a war cry to disturb the public mind and befool the electors into believing in annexation as a probable consequence of the proposed pact of commercial reciprocity. Sir, the meaning of the proposed agreement has been strained and I could give the House no better illustration of the awkward predicament in which the Conservative party have placed themselves than by quoting the opinion of an impartial and honest witness, a man who is well acquainted with our country, having spent here several years of his life, I refer to that distinguished publicist, Mr. Kleczkowski, formerly French consul at Montreal and plenipotentiary minister. The article I am going to read appeared in the review, 'France-Canada' of November, under the following heading, 'Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Reciprocity':

As our readers have been aware for some time, the general elections held in the Dominion of Canada, on the 21st of last month, turned against the Liberal party, that is to say against Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government. The Conservatives did carry the country in a decisive manner, having obtained a majority of 47 votes in a House which numbers 221 members.

It was on the question of reciprocity with the United States that the battle was fought. Through the initiative of the American government, negotiations have been entered into, last year, at Washington. They resulted, in January last, into a project of commercial reciprocity. The opposition, in the Canadian parliament, proved radically opposed to the pact, indulged in obstruction and challenged the Prime Minister to appeal to the people on the issue. Sir Wilfrid Laurier took up the challenge. Parliament was dissolved. It had been three years in existence, and under the provisions of the British North America Act, it was not bound to be dissolved before the lapse of two years more. The Liberal party, which had carried the country and come off with flying colours from the electoral contests of 1896, 1900, 1904 and 1908 have suffered defeat this time. The reciprocity issue was the stumbling block against which, for a time, the fortunes of the party were dashed to pieces.

Then, what is reciprocity? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to make a distinction here. Reciprocity, such as proposed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to the Canadian electorate was not the integral and theoretical reciprocity which has met with such a flat refusal from the country.

The proposed pact negotiated by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Fielding, and the Minister of Customs, Mr. Paterson, and which was later on covered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier's high authority involved fiscal modifications affecting natural products only. Manufactured articles were excluded, with one single exception: reductions lowering the duty from 20 to 15, or from 17½ to 15 per cent, according to the case, were agreed upon as to agricultural implements.

Under this arrangement, the Dominion of Canada obtained free entry into the United States, and granted the same privilege to her neighbors on her own territory, for all agricultural products: living animals, wheat, Indian corn, straw, hay, vegetables and fruits of all kind; butter, milk, cream, poultry, &c.; for the products of fisheries, fish, lobsters, oyster, fish oil, cod liver oil, &c., and for another series of products such as timber of all kinds, wood pulp included, for products of the mines, mica, asbestos, coke, &c.

All the reductions of duties stipulated in the agreement and agreed to by Canada were to be extended to all countries enjoying within the Dominion, the most favoured nation treatment.

According to the figures given by the Minister of Finance, if one takes as a basis the trade between the two countries in 1910 for the various products mentioned in the agreement that is to say, supposing such an increase of commercial activity as hoped for were not to result, from the new regime, Canadian exports to the United States would have benefited by reductions of duties equivalent to a sum of $2,260,000, or about 11,700,000 francs.

The proposed agreement, curiously enough, contained no clause as to duration and as a consequence, no clause reserving to the two contracting parties the right of denunciation. The two governments merely undertook to amend their respective customs tariffs so as to make them harmonize with the stipulations upon which the agreement had been reached. The agreement resulted from letters exchanged between the Canadian negotiators at

Washington (Messrs. Fielding and Paterson) and the American Secretary of State, Mr. P. C. Knox.

Those who have opposed the arrangement, some because they looked upon it as too dangerous an experiment, others because they aimed at striking a blow, through the pact, at the administration in office, have singularly stretched the purport of the arrangement. The agreement was a partial one, a limited one. All the details have been lost sight of; the word 'reciprocity' alone, has remained. In the eyes of the anxious elector, it has appeared as a threat and a peril; the elector has pronounced himself against a tendency to a far greater extent than he has voted on a reality.

Following up his argument, Mr. Kleczkowski refers to the intervention on the reciprocity campaign of Sir William Van Horne, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway and he remarks that when a man of that character sounds the alarm throughout the country, no wonder that the alarm should have such an echo among the electors and he goes on :

Under the inspiration of such a cry, the electors lost even sight of the government project, the narrow limits and the restricted purport of which were mentioned at the beginning of this article. They saw but one thing, namely, that willing or unwilling, the country was being entangled by this pact into a new departure, the issue of which was altogether unknown and which might lead to unforeseen consequences. Canada is on the crest of a wave of prosperity. Wherefore a change of policy? 'Let well enough alone.' Such remarks were freely made and heard here and there in Canada, when I visited the country; in August. And yet nobody then, even among the out and out opponents of reciprocity, could foresee that the elections would take such a turn, so great was the prestige attaching to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's personality. For fifteen years at the head of affairs, he had kept on growing in office, as a statesman and the country had grown with him. He had represented Canada with such an unusual distinction at the jubilee of Queen Victoria in 1897, at the crowning of King Edward in 1902 and at the crowning of King George in June last. On three different occasions he had participated in the colonial conferences that had been held in London in 1902, 1907 and 1911. His clear and correct views of political questions, his high intellects, ever soaring above small things, had won for him a real ascendency over the ministers representing the other British colonies who were sitting with him. Those of our fellow countrymen who saw Sir Wilfrid Laurier and who heard him on his two short visits to Paris, have never forgotten him. They admired his distinguished countenance, his courteous and gentlemanly bearing and still more, the loftiness of the sentiments, and ideas expressed by him, ever served by a fascinating and broad eloquence.

The whole Dominion was proud of Laurier. Under his administration and without the strength of the ties which bind Canada to the British crown being in the least impaired, Canada has more and more assumed the form and countenance of a real state, thoroughly organized, while preserving its primeval economy and charming originality. With Laurier at her head Canada, while remaining a colony, has gradually evolved into a 'nation' in the loftiest acceptation of the word, a nation which plays and will play a part more and more considerable in the great family of peoples, having the greatest vitality and with the most promising future before them.

Those are real services, the effect of which extends far beyond the moment when he who has rendered them goes out of office, after defeat at the polls. Laurier's name has already its place in Canadian history; it will have its place in the world history. Why not add here that Laurier's name owing to its French consonance and the origin of which it is the sign, is most particularly sweet to our ears? It will quite naturally be inscribed on the marble on which are engraved illustrious names which remind us—who can forget it—that France has behind her in America a glorious record. The good seed she has sown in that virgin soil is still springing up, and the race which she has transplanted there is not on the point of dying out.

Now, we may ask ourselves, from a philosophical viewpoint so to say, whether, when he proposed the mitigated reciprocity agreement which has just been condemned by the popular vote, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, accomplished statesman as he is, could have made such a blunder as he is credited with, in all sincerity by those who have so hotly battled with him? The Canadian confederation has the United States as a neighbor alongside a frontier of over 3,000 kilometres. Geography has its laws, its logic and its exigencies. Apart from any reciprocity agreement, in spite of very high tariff walls on each side of the customs frontier, the trade carried on between the two countries represents, within a trifle, for the Dominion one half of its trade with the whole world (313 millions of dollars out of 693).

The trade of Canada with the United Kingdom amounted to $245,000,000, of which $149,000,000 were exports, whereas her exports to the United States represent $233,000,000 worth of goods. These figures afford food for reflection. Would it be too rash to infer therefrom that the last word has not yet been said about reciprocity? The bogey of a possible annexation of Canada to the United States was dangled before the electors; it hovered like a grim spectre over the last elections. Annexation! nobody in Canada has it in mind; nobody cares for it. Very few people in the United States think of it, and its advocates are without any authority. Perhaps one of the useful results of the elections of the 21st September will be to have settled the matter once for all. Under the British Crown, as we said before, Canada is evolving more and more into a 'nation.' Let reciprocity, defeated yesterday, reappear to-morrow and insinuate itself more or less deeply into the economic relations of the two countries, Canada as a 'nation' would not be affected thereby. Her historical individuality is already too well established, and determined by tried political institutions as also by the continuous progress implied in those institutions to allow anything to alter it and still less destroy it. It is a complete organism, possessing autonomous life, perfectly able to work out its own destiny; an organism that means to live and which will live.

Such, Sir, is the impartial judgment of a great economist who has spent many years in our midst and who knows our fiscal policy as also the trend of our affairs. It is the most eloquent compliment that could be paid, coming as it does from across the sea, to the great Canadian who, as I said a little while ago, is still greater in defeat than in victory. The other day, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) said that he was astonished to hear it stated that this reciprocity policy was not a new departure. On all the hustings throughout the province of Quebec and even in Ontario, to my own personal knowledge, they kept on repeating: 'It is a new policy offering great danger to Canada and which may lead us to annexation and absorption by the neighbouring republic.'

A new policy! And it is the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who dares say so! Let me quote his opinion on that point and that of one of his leaders, Sir Leonard Tilley who in 1882 spoke as follows :

The House has not forgotten that when the hon. leader of the opposition, last session, brought down resolutions aiming at reducing taxation, I set forth on behalf of the administration the reason on account of which we were not then ready to ask parliament for such reduction of taxation. I added that petitions had been sent from Massachusetts, Maine and New York to the Congress at Washington, asking the latter to create a commission with a view to consulting with another commission appointed by the Imperial government on the matter of reciprocity.

Further on, he adds:

But, as I said before, should the United States come and tell us to-day or later on, that they desire to come back to the reciprocity treaty of 1854, under which the natural products of both countries were freely exchanged, we should be quite willing to agree to it.

But what is more, in 1891 the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) when he was Minister of Finance in the Conservative government, spoke in his budget speech, on the same reciprocity issue, as follows :

The people of Canada knew that when, in 1866, the old reciprocity treaty was abrogated, that abrogation took place, not at the desire of Canada, but at the express instance of the United States, and they knew that, from that time up to the present, time and again, Canada has made advances, in a fair and honourable spirit, for the resumption of the old or the inauguration of new relations upon some fair and equitable basis.

Suffice it for me to say at the present moment that on an invitation given by Mr. Secretary Blaine, the delegates from Canada went to Washington for the purpose of having an informal conversation with Mr. Blaine, and talking over the possibilities of trade relations between their country and ours. They went there, and at the expressed desire of the United States, and, for their convenience and not for ours, the President of the United States asked us to postpone that informal conference which was appointed at that time, and to meet on his own invitation in a formal conference to be held in Washington in the month of October next. But I may say this, that the government holds itself ready, as the Liberal-Conservative governments have always done, to meet the United States on a fair and equitable basis and with the sincere and earnest desire to remove all differences that exist and to give the greatest freedom of trade compatible with the best interests of this country in its relations with the United States of America. I do not despair that, when our conference takes place in October, if disturbing conditions are not injected which might bring about a defeat, it may be found possible for relations to be formed which will place our intercourse with the United States on a more satisfactory footing than it is to-day.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was the same gentleman who sought to fool the people into believing that it was a new departure and spelling danger to the country.

If ever the Conservative party did have a plank in its platform, it was surely reciprocity, but now they even refrain from referring to that issue in the speech from the Throne.

While the annexation bogey was being dangled over the heads of the electors in Ontario, the most dangerous appeals were made to race and religious prejudices against the distinguished leader of the government of the day.

I wish to place before the House and before the country a few extracts from newspapers, so that the public may know that I am not indulging in mere suppositions, but that I am referring to facts which really took place in Ontario. I wish to put on record here what the 'Sentinel,' the organ of the Orange lodges, said in a vitriolic editorial published on the 27th July last last under the following heading: 'The punishment of Laurier is due,' and which was spread broadcast among the English Protestants and Tories of Ontario, in order to draw a herring across the track and divert public attention from Laurier's sound and progressive policy. That paper said:—

The people of Canada have, during the past few months, had their eyes opened to see the hand of Rome manipulating the governement of the Dominion. Mr. Bourassa has written a lengthly article in 'Le Devoir' giving the facts of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's surrender to Mgr. Sbaretti on the school clauses in the Autonomy Bills of 1905. Bourassa says he was the intermediary between Laurier and Sbaretti. Consequently he knows all about it.

Mgr. Sbaretti's name reminds me of an incident which transpired a few years ago in this country, and I suppose the hon. Minister of the Interior and his colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Works, also remember that incident which will be handed down to history as the 'Rogers-

Campbell-Sbaretti incident.' No doubt the hon, the Minister of the Interior owes his portfolio to that incident, and that may explain why the hon. the Minister of Public Works appears to be so proud of it. The article continues:

This exposure reveals Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the position of an obedient son of the church chaining the two western provinces to a system of separate schools at the dictation of the Pope's delegate. What a descent from 1896! When he was appealing to Ontario to elect him and prevent the coercion of Manitoba he was a fine figure in the political life of the country. Ontario helped him to defeat the ultramontane wing of his church. But no sooner was he settled securely in power than he began trading the principles he had professed, and for which his party had stood for years, for the votes controlled by the Roman hierarchy. He has descended to the lowest depths of servitude to the Papal authority. What further concessions are contemplated no man knows. The clerical party play the game with almost absolute secrecy.

But can Laurier be trusted with the affairs of this Dominion any longer?

There are many people who hold that it is impossible for a man to be a loyal citizen of the British empire and a devout Romanist. They say that the Pope demands their civil obedience as well as their submission in spiritual matters. Those who hold this view are supported by the syllabus of 1870, and by Papal doctrines. Can a man serve two masters?

Leaving that aspect of the question aside, and judging Sir Wilfrid Laurier by his acts, how can Protestant electors continue to support him? He has become the tool of the ultramontanes. He fastened separate schools on the west at their dictation. He allowed the officers of the state to prostrate the civil authority before the prelates at the Eucharistic Congress. He uttered no protest when the military paraded as a guard of honor to the visiting cardinals. In fact he has played the Papal game from beginning to end.

And to cap it all he rendered futile the efforts of those who tried to advance the Imperial idea at the conference of colonial premiers in London. He did so in order to catch the votes of French Nationalists, who form a part of the Papal machine. Laurierism and Papalism go hand in hand in the government of this country. As we view the growing arrogance of the Roman church, as exhibited in the Ne Temere decree; as we see the priests breaking up happy homes; while they are breeding such fierce sectarian strife that it leads to murder (as at Lancaster); are not the Protestant voters of Canada warranted in saying that they will no longer continue in the office a premier who has given so many proofs of his readiness to put the government of the Dominion under the thumb of the Papal delegate?

I leave it to the House to properly appreciate such a fanatical denunciation which ought to be well pondered by public men whose duty it is, under the circumstances, to preserve and foster those feelings of peace and harmony which Laurier has succeeded in implanting among the various ethnical elements or our community and which some are trying to eradicate from their hearts, in the province of Quebec and elsewhere.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Would the hon. gentleman allow me as ask him a question? Before he proceeds further, I should like to ask him if he is aware that in the three elections which I had to go through in the county of L'Islet, my opponents never failed to tell my constituents to vote against Doctor Paquet, because the leader of the Conservative party was an English Protestant?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I do not know the nature of the objections raised against the candidature of the hon. member for L'Islet during the three last elections; but I know that the gentlemen alongside of whom he is now sitting on the other side are the authors of that infamous article. Is he going to repudiate it or accept it?

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Does the hon. gentleman approve of the stand of my opponents?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) As to that question, I leave it to my hon. friend to deal with. After all, he cannot be dissatisfied as he has succeeded in obtaining a seat here and he is now sitting on the government side.

But, what is more, during the last campaign, a remarkable poem in the form of printed sheet, was circulated throughout the province of Ontario, and I recommend that poetical effusion to the pious consideration of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. That lyrical effusion consists in two sections, the former of which is entitled 'Special orders from His Holiness the Pope,' and the other 'Canada's Reply to the Pope of Rome.'

Here are a few verses translated into French prose which the hon. the Minister of Public Works might hand over to his colleagues for their own edification.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Shame! shame! how dreadful!

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Yes, how dreadful, indeed! The hon. the Minister of Public Works is quite right in crying out: 'For shame!' Shame on the fanatics of Ontario, the colleagues of the hon. minister:

Down on your knees, Ontario! and make obeisance low,
To me, your sovereign Lord and King, as Canada shall know.
Too long your recreant Protestants have scorned my holy plans,
But now your haughty populace must bow to my commands.
Down on your knees, Ontario! grovel and lick the dust,

Your sons and daughters fair are mine, by all that's good and just.
I own your bodies, souls and minds, as well as all your cash,
And to the lowest depths of hell, your proud ones I will dash.
Close up your schools, Ontario! and I will teach your young,
You English cannot be compared with the old latin tongue
You educate them far too well; you make them sharp and wise
And what you call the sins of Rome you keep before their eyes.

There are five stanzas in the same vein Here is the last.

Down on your knees proud Canada! my word must be obeyed
I hold the keys, I rule the state and though I have delayed
To exercise my royal will—my day has come at last,
And Canada is mine—for sure I will hold her fast.

The second, as will readily understand, is in response to this fictitious order of the Pope. Here is the first portion :

Ye Protestants of Canada arise in all your might.
Your liberties are threatened, grave dangers are in sight.
The sky is dark, the clouds are black, and soon the thunder's roar
Will echo loud when lightnings flash from distant shore to shore.
The storm blows straight from Rome.

The third stanza is quite remarkable:

Will he succeed? Shall we submit to be the slaves of Rome?
Shall we allow her priests and nuns to regulate the home?
To part asunder man and wife and let the children go?
Ten thousand voices cry aloud emphatically: No.
We will not bow to Rome!

Such are all these stanzas, such the vile and infamous literature circulated in Ontaro to defeat the Laurier government. Then there was an alliance with the Nationalists of the province of Quebec on the ground that the end justifies the means.

Six o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

Eight o'clock.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) While the campaign that I have described and explained was being carried on in Ontario, what was going on in the old French province of Quebec? Denounced as an annexationist and a papist in Ontario, Laurier was accused of being an imperialist and a traitor to his race and religion in Quebec. We find everywhere the doublefaced policy by which the Conservative party was able to climb to the treasury benches and grasp power. To achieve that end, the Conservative party did not fear to enter into an alliance with a party, the offspring of hatred, vengeance, pride, spite, ambition and jealousy. I have named the Nationalist party. And that hybrid alliance unfortunately resulted in the destruction of the work of fifteen years devoted to cementing the union of races, to the re-establishment of union and concord in the country threatened with civil war in 1896. God only knows how threatening and terrible for the future will be the consequences of that infamous policy preached by the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec particularly but also throughout the country.

I think that it is proper to show how this Nationalist policy really appears to thinking men who followed the electoral campaign in the province of Quebec. I read the other day an article which appears to me to describe accurately the Nationalist party as it actually stands, as well as its aims and the consequences of its action. Allow me to quote a few extracts. Their insertion in the Debate may afford food for reflection to those who, in good faith or otherwise, have adhered to that collection of antagonistic ideas to a party which they have denounced and ridiculed but which they now support against all comers. Here are a few extracts from the article :

Every public policy and all that is done for the government of society should de devised in view of the common and general good. The plans and efforts of true statesmen are distinguished by lucidity, utility and justice.

The weakness and incapacity of politicians are revealed by the obscurity, the inopportunity and the danger of their conceptions.

It is thus found that the former have intelligence, foresight and judgment whereas the latter lack the necessary guiding light; the first secure our confidence, the second do not. In the first case, we have men who know where they are going, in the second men groping in the dark.

Is it not thus that men and their works are naturally and wisely judged every day?

Let us now submit Nationalism to this test and see the result.

Where will their flag lead us?

That is the first question to be solved, as their flag is the emblem of a new and most serious state work to be undertaken.

The Nationalists are therefore men who devote themselves to the interests of their country, nation and race. So far, well.

But what must they do to prove their interest? That is the question.

They must overthrow two governments in their country, the federal and the provincial; they must trample under foot the men who form part of them, be they guilty or not. They must join in, if necessary, with their dangerous opponents, with men of false principles, in order to succeed.

This being done, what will happen for the common good of the nation? Will it even be possible to accomplish and complete this great work of upheaval?

They cannot tell; but at least in so doing they and they alone will be Nationalists!

As for those who do not think and act as they do, they are convicted beforehand of not loving their country; much more, they are cowards, traitors and even reptiles.

Such is Nationalism; such the monster.

We put it to reasonable and thinking men, is that a sensible political programme? Were those who conceived it, inasmuch as they were swayed by intelligence and not merely by sentiment, of that quality of well balanced mind and judgment which marks the leaders? Is there any national advantage to be discovered in such a project? Is it not rather an aberration, an enterprise calculated to accumulate ruins and nothing else?

Which is the true friend of his country? Is it he who screams and foams out his patriotism, who slanders his civic superiors, who foments popular and demagogic commotions? Is it not rather he who accomplishes faithfully and quietly the duties of his station, who does not cease his regular labours except when regularly called upon by his superiors, and who, in all matters, works efficiently for the good of his countrymen?

According to the Nationalists, all the citizens devoted to their duties, respectful towards their superiors, enemies of dangerous agitations, are not the friends of their country or true patriots!

It is thus that the true idea of patriotism, a sacred sentiment which should be respected and carefully fostered, is distorted and destroyed; it is made the plaything of cabal; the deepest feelings and the most fundamental principles of the people are being shamefully deceived.

This is something very bad and exceedingly dangerous. Every man wants to show his love of country, but it is leading men into grave error to represent to them as patriotic service that which may lead to their ruin.

Let us leave its true significance to the sacred expression of duty. Let us not raise a false standard under pretense of defending the country.

In the second place, is it serving the country to proclaim, under the flag, a race war in Canada, an entirely political war if you like? We say that it is not and we believe that it is very imprudent to attempt any such thing.

We have already explained that Nationalism is politically imprudent and very dangerous to the French nationality in arraying the representatives of the different races against one another, in contesting civil rights in the federal parliament, when we are the weaker party in confederation.

What should we not say if it were true that Nationalism tended to push the races in the direction of a social conflict, in organized and disciplined bodies? It is evident that we would then be on the eve of civil war.

It may be said: there can be no question of any such thing; no one desires to go so far.

We reply without hesitation: at the rate things have been going this year, we are not far from it.

What is necessary to bring on civil war? Two things only: To excite the minds and the blood of the people and to discredit the leaders. History tells us that it is thus that all such calamities have begun.

Nothing is easier than to excite men by playing upon their national and religious feelings, particularly when races are antagonistic in their origin, as is the case in Canada. The English are firm, the Scotch steadfast, the Irish violent, and the French-Canadians hot blooded. Could better elements be found for a dangerous war?

Unfortunately, when people are excited they will not hear reason and nobody can tell how far they will be carried away by passions.

No, Nationalism is not a wise method of defence under the circumstances; we declare that it is the worst of all methods.

Is that a true description of what the Nationalist press has been during the year preceding the 21st September last? But you will say: Things have changed since then. Those gentlemen have changed their programme, it is true. It is not to be wondered at, for that party, like the chameleon, changes its colour with the seasons. In opposition they proclaim their adherence to a certain programme, which they give up having attained power. The representatives of that party now sit beside the hon. the Prime Minister whom they had renounced and denounced before the country.

Mr. Speaker, Nationalism being clearly defined, I return to the policy which these gentlemen upheld in the province of Quebec. Before recess, we examined together the work done by the Conservative party in Ontario, from the point of view of reciprocity and of race and religious war.

Let us now turn to Quebec and see what was done to further the programme of the Conservative and Nationalist party. In the province of Quebec, reciprocity was one of the principal battle cries.

Hon. Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) Hear, hear!

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) The Postmaster General cries, hear, hear. Why?

Hon. Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) Because the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) declared the contrary yesterday.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) If the hon. Postmaster General will hear what I have to say, he will find that there is no difference of opinion between the hon. member for Rouville and myself. Conservatives in the province of Quebec were divided as to reciprocity. Their common leader, Mr. Henri Bourassa, declared himself favourable to it before the opening of the campaign. How is it that they are burning to-day what they adored yesterday? Why do they now renounce reciprocity?

I have before me a pamphlet of which the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) spoke yesterday when he said that Mr. Henri Bourassa had favoured reciprocity. I will quote from an article which first appeared in 'Le Devoir' of the 7th

Februray last, and which concludes on page 4 of the same pamphlet. It will show whether Mr. Bourassa was for or against reciprocity, and the question may then be asked why he has altered his views since the 21st September last. This is what Mr. Bourassa said on page 4:

It would be unfair, to my mind, to charge Mr. Fielding and Mr. Paterson with having sacrificed the general interest to local or personal interests in thus reducing the duties on imports of agricultural products.

And elsewhere he wrote as follows:

And now, to conclude, should the proposals be rejected or agreed to?

I give herewith in a nutshell the main objections urged against the proposals, and proceed by way of rejection.

Does the mere principle of reciprocity endanger the economic system and national unity of Canada? No.

Do the proposals imply any danger as regards Canadian industries? No.

Do they imply any danger as regards our Canadian transportation system? No, especially if the Georgian Bay canal is built.

Do they imply any danger as regards imperial interests? No.—'Le Devoir', February 7, 1911.

And in conclusion he added:

But what cannot be gainsaid, to my mind, is this: the proposals embody a very large measure of reciprocity, which, all things considered, will tend to develop agricultural production, and consequently be beneficial to the great majority of the Canadian people.

In answer to the Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Mr. Bourassa expressed himself as follows:

Mr. Lemieux who has so closely kept in touch with all my whereabouts in 1904, should be aware that in 1911 I am still in favour of reciprocity, and so much so that I have on several occasions refused to publish in my paper manifestos of the anti-reciprocity league, whose money he charges me with accepting. I have stated and re-stated many a time, I am in favour of the opening up of the United States market for the disposal of our surplus natural products.

Thus, did Mr. Bourassa write and speak in the early part of 1911 and in the course of the last campaign; while some of his friends avoided the issue to suit the conditions of the various localities.

I was surprised to hear the member for Yamaska state this afternoon under his responsibility as member of this House, that he had not agreed to support reciprocity. He muttered some explanations to the effect that he was president or manager of a farmers' syndicate in the west, and that before taking a stand on such an important question, it was necessary to make a study of it. Is it likely he found time to do so since the 21st of September last, when the government themselves have not managed as yet to take a definite stand on the question, or had the courage to put such a plank in their platform.

I shall say something now in respect to the hon. member for Yamaska. When the time came for selecting a candidate in opposition to Mr. Gladu, the former member for the county, the Conservative party thought of former Judge Ouimet, a state pensioner. That gentleman was outspoken in his opposition to reciprocity, but the Conservative electors of Yamaska were of a different frame of mind, and they refused to accept him. Then it was that the candidature was offered to Mr. Mondou, who had been defeated on four previous occasions, as he stated to us yesterday, and who, in order to secure the farmers' votes came out against the navy, but in favour of reciprocity. That was how he succeeded in juggling away his election.

Hon. Mr. PELLETIER. There are other ways of juggling away an election.

Mr ETHIER. (Translation.) Has the hon. gentleman any experience in this connection? As for me, I have none.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) In this matter of reciprocity, did not Mr. Bourassa like the rest of us, favour an appeal to the people, the great principle for the recognition of which we fought throughout the last election?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) On no occasion did I hear Mr. Bourassa lay down such a principle on the hustings in the course of the last campaign. I had the pleasure of meeting him at St. Scholastique—and he knows it—and never did he propound such a view. The circumstance would have been an exceptional one, since there were four thousand people gathered there, and I challenge my hon. friend to quote a single statement made by Mr. Bourassa during the last campaign in the sense which he indicates.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) He so stated in the editorials which he published in reference to reciprocity.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Such is the double-faced policy advocated in the province of Quebec; but then that policy has two cutting edges, as the hon. gentlemen on the other side may find out to their discomfiture one of these days.

There is another question out of which capital has been made in our province. I would not have referred to it, had not the hon. Minister of Public Works done so himself on a previous occasion. I mean the Manitoba school question. What have we seen and heard in connection with this matter, especially in the county of L'Assomption? Have we not seen a former Conservative Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, to-day postmaster in Montreal,

going from door to door, as a common canvasser, in the back country, to inform the farmers that the school question was not settled, but that it would be if the Conservatives were returned to power. No doubt it was as a reward for his zeal that he was given the place which he now occupies. May I now inquire from the Prime Minister, whom I now see at his seat, whether he intends to take up once more that question and to implement the pledges given by a former colleague of his fellow ministers? For the last fifteen years the fellow citizens. If he does not think the question into the political fray, with a view to working on the religious feelings of my fellow-citizens. If he does not think he can settle the question himself, let him in any case bring his influence to bear on his colleagues from the other provinces to secure its settlement. Let him impress on the Ontario prime minister, Mr. Whitney, the desirability of putting an end to the persecution of which the French Canadians are the victims on his part in Ontario, and of maintaining the bilingual schools in that province. He will thus bring credit to those who have defended him in the province of Quebec.

I now pass on to another subject, that of the navy. In Quebec the Liberal candidates have all come out openly and frankly, every one of them, in support of the Navy Bill voted by the House and based on the resolutions of March 29, 1910. Not one of them wobbled, not a single one of them went counter to the principle embodied in that resolution. We had before us on the one hand the Laurier Act, on the other, two proposals from various members of the opposition. One of these emanated from the then leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), providing for the building of Dreadnoughts and the payment of a contribution of $25,000,000. The other emanated from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), and refused to make any contribution at all or to build any Dreadnoughts towards the defence of the empire, in other words advocated the statu quo. What happened? We witnessed the coming to St. Eustache, at the opening of the Nationalist campaign in 1910, of Mr. Bourassa, followed by Mr. Monk, to denounce the Navy Bill, and that, right in front of the old historic church of that village. Mr. Bourassa cried out: 'You members of parliament who have supported that infamous, damnable Navy Bill, you will be accursed by your children in the next generation and the Hon. Mr. Monk applauded with both hands that statement of Mr. Bourassa.

Mr. RAINVILLE (Chambly-Vercheres). (Translation.) Did not the Liberals in 1896 particularly hold out similar opinions regarding the purchase of rifles by the Hon. Mr. Desjardins?

Hon. Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Hear, hear.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I think the hon. member for Chambly must have forgotten the discussion which took place in 1896 in regard to the purchase of rifles. The opposition did not take exception to such purchase, but deprecated the purchase of useless rifles of a type which had been discarded by the British authorities as valueless.

Mr. RAINVILLE. (Translation.) I may point out to the hon. member that the rifles purchase in 1896 were Lee-Enfields, a type of rifle which is in use in the British army and elsewhere.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I am not going to discuss the question of the purchase of those rifles; it has been settled long ago.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Did not the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, in 1896, under the circumstances referred to by the hon. member for Two Mountains, take a stand against any proposal to have Canada assist Great Britain in her wars?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Since the conference of 1902, that principle has always been defended by the former Prime Minister, while insisting at the same time that Canada's autonomy should be maintained, a matter about which the party supported by the hon. member for L'Islet do not concern themselves very much.

I referred to some resolutions voted at the St. Eustache meeting, and to which the hon. Minister of Public Works adhered with all his might. Well, a year later, at a meeting which was held at the Ontario street skating rink, in Montreal, the same resolutions were proposed, if not in the very same words at least in pretty much the same language. The hon. Minister of Public Works, was present at that meeting. He was even escorted there by young men armed with brooms and who were to acclaim him, as well as Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne, who were opposed to Mr. Borden's proposal for a direct contribution and the building of Dreadnoughts. If all these gentlemen were of one mind, how is it that in the course of the last campaign, on the occasion of the official visit of the Conservative leader in Montreal, in the course of the meeting held at His Majesty's theatre, the hon. Minister of Public Works did not dare appear in company with his present leader? Where were then Messrs. Bourassa, Monk and Lavergne? Where were then the hon. member for Terrebonne, and the hon. member for Quebec county? However, there were present

some old Conservatives, no dissemblers, no hypocrites those, and I shall mention only one, Mr. Maréchal, who, for one, was not ashamed to appear publicly at Mr. Borden's side, and to assert in public his adherence to his programme, that is to say, the direct payment of a contribution and the building of Dreadnoughts.

What proposal is now before us? Are we to understand that the hon. ministers representing the province of Quebec are now in favour of a direct contribution and of the building of warships? Were they sincere in giving their approval to the resolution of March 29, and particularly that clause included at the suggestion of the present Prime Minister 'the speedy organization of the navy?'

Well, how comes it that to-day they dare not repeat what they stated at the time? How is it that they shrink from the idea of forcing their leader the Prime Minister and his colleagues to make known to the electorate the policy they propose to follow in connection with the navy and which they claim to be useless and inefficient?

We are then left with the policy of the Prime Minister propounded when he was still in opposition, as it is not likely that he has since modified that policy which consisted, as I have just said, in granting a direct subsidy and in building Dreadnoughts. Otherwise we would be entitled to know what pledges have been given to the opponents of the navy scheme. What is the nature of the compromise which made possible their acceptance of portfolios?

But we are told a plebiscite is to take place. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that before setting down the plebiscite issue, the government are in duty bound to state what will be the question asked. Moreover, why should we have recourse to a plebiscite under the circumstances? The government as constituted has a majority of 47, why should they shrink from assuming responsibility for their action? I have always understood that responsibility to the people was of the very essence of constitutional government. The people elect representatives who are to decide on a policy to follow, the soundness of which they have to answer for before their constituents. The hon. Minister of Public Works cut, to my mind, a very poor figure and showed revolting cynicism when in an endeavour to vindicate his false position and explain his change of face, he replied to the member for Rouville: 'We are here and you are there.' Of course, you are there, but you may remain there only a very short time, before long we will occupy your places.

Mr. RAINVILLE. (Translation.) That is not yet an accomplished fact.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) It will be presently, although I must admit, not while recourse is had to such a policy of side stepping and dodging of issues.

The hon. Minister of Public Works tried to explain away his vote on the motion of March 29, 1910. When we stated on the hustings of the province of Quebec that he had voted in support of that motion, our opponents offered to bet, as was done at St. Thérèse de Blainville, on September 18 last, in the presence of the member for Terrebonne, that Mr. Monk had not supported the resolution. But is it not a fact, we answered, that he accepted the resolution and the principle it embodies? Here is the explanation the now Minister of Public Works gave at Lachine in this connection:

> In 1909, a war panic broke out in England, war seemed to be on the point of being declared with Germany, and it was important to show to the world that the colonies are in close union with old England. A resolution was voted by the House stating in the face of the whole world that the overseas Dominions are unfailing in their loyalty to the mother country.
>
> Mr. Monk explains that he has been taken to task for having supported that motion. He has done so, he answers, for the sole object of showing to foreign nations that the overseas dominions are in sympathy with England.

Such is the explanation given by a minister of the Crown to justify himself for supporting the basic principle of an enactment providing for the establishment of a navy and which the same minister disapproved of later on.

In some previous speeches, reference was made to the bye election in Drummond and Arthabaska. That constituency has vindicated its good name in the meantime, the electors having found out that they had been hoodwinked in the previous contest. What the Nationalist leaders had stated at the time, they dared not repeat in 1911. The House will, no doubt, be interested by a recital of some of the circumstances under which that election in Drummond and Arthabaska was secured in 1910. It is an easy matter to explain how we suffered defeat, and to show up the shameful methods which were resorted to in that election. What were the statements made by Messrs. Bourassa, Blondin , Tancrède Marcil and Bourassa, Blondin, Tancrède Marcil and 'Hansard.' Here are excerpts from some of their speeches:

> Mr. Bourassa: In harvest time, the agent of that paternal government will knock at the door and notify the still robust father and all his sons to quit their home, as England, or else a group of speculators, require the sacrifice of their flesh and blood to extend their dominions or to promote some undertaking.
>
> Mr. Blondin: Those who butchered your forefathers on the plains of Abraham ask today that you sacrifice your lives for their sake. We have had enough of England and the British.

The Same: Our liberties, we have wrested them from England, and we owe her nothing.

Mr. Tancrède Marcil: We must avenge the death of the patriots slain by the British at St. Eustache.

The same: At St. Eustache the British made use of the sacred vase to water their horses, and it is for their sake that we are asked to build a navy.

Mr. Armand Lavergne: Do not expect French Canadians to go and get their backs broken for the British.

Mr. RAINVILLE. (Translation.) What paper are you reading there?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) It is an extract from a paper of which I have not the name.

Mr. RAINVILLE. (Translation.) I am sorry.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Those are the words used by your leader and by the man who is to-day Deputy Speaker of the House, and in that capacity represents here His Majesty the King.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Has not the hon. member for Champlain denied in this House having used such words?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) If he has so denied them, I shall charge him anew with having made use of them.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) You did not have the courage to go to Drummond.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) My hon. friend from L'Islet has been kept too busy at home to be able to assist his friend, Mr. Gilbert, and he was defeated at the last election.

Mr. RAINVILLE. (Translation.) What paper have you been reading?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Those extracts are taken from a paper dated October 10, 1910.

Mr. RAINVILLE. (Translation.) I ask that question simply because on a previous occasion extracts were read in this House which purported to be from 'Le Devoir,' while they were taken from 'Le Canada.' That may be the case again to-day.

Mr. ETHEIR. (Translation.) Let us speak of Mr. Armand Lavergne, Mr. Bourassa's lieutenant, that opponent of militarism who, during the military conference held lately in Ottawa, paraded in these very corridors in his brilliant military attire, at the request of Mr. Sam. Hughes, Minister of Militia. What did he say previous to September 21, concerning these same Britons whom he adores to-day: The French Canadians are not going to have their backs broken for the sake of these Englishmen.

That is, Mr. Speaker, a specimen of that class of politician making up the Nationalist party, and whom we find in company with the Minister of Public Works. The House is now in a position to judge what can be expected from such a hotch-potch.

Sir, I believe, I have set before your eyes a true picture of the manner in which the electoral campaign was carried on in Ontario and Quebec; and in the presence of that picture as well as of the cabinet whose policy remains a mystery for us, I must say with the fabulist Lafontaine: 'Ce bloc enfariné ne me dit rien qui vaille.' For the reason above given I shall support the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough). Mr. Speaker, I do not know what we can do to bring any consolation to our friends of the opposition. We have been debating this address for a whole week and the position taken by the government has been fully explained, and explained in such a way as to give satisfaction to every sensible man. However, this does not seem to satisfy our friends of the opposition. It is, as was said by the most eloquent member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), a case of the government having been put in power and their having been put on your left. We have listened with little less than rapture to the eloquent words of the member who has just sat down. He is an ornament to his race, a race equal to the most illustrious in the history of the world, a race which has distinguished itself by a sense of justice, and a love of liberty that has drawn the admiration of all the peoples of the earth. I would gladly, as the hon. member suggested, follow him in French, but beyond giving us to understand that he has a yearning, a noble yearning which attracts our sympathy, for the government benches, I cannot say that there is anything in what he said that requires attention.

The gentlemen of the opposition have, with a rare eloquence and irritation, been looking and searching for the reasons of their defeat. They did not understand the policies, if I may be allowed to say so, that they laid before the country, but the people did. Not understanding these various policies, they are unable to account for their defeat. I may, perhaps, be able to suggest some few things to them which, at least in our part of the country, occasioned their downfall. One of these is a little measure to which I refer as a typical measure. Let there be no misunderstanding or misconception, unintentional or otherwise, with respect to my reference to Ne Temere; I am considering that measure as typical of all attacks upon the laws of this country, whether made by Protestant or Catholic, Jew or Gentile, bond or free. The question involved is: Are we married or are we not,

when the law of the country says we are? If we are married, then how does anybody dare say that we are not, and if people do say we are not, then we are entitled to the protection of the laws of this country and more than that those people who endeavour to bring about defiance of the law or the setting of the law at naught, are punishable in other cases, and why should they not be punishable in this? You will understand that it was the government's position with regard to this plain and simple question that occasioned in the minds of a great many people the idea that they were unworthy to stay in office because they were afraid to give a straight answer to a straight question. Questions were put to them in the House at various times. They were asked by Mr. Taylor (Leeds):

Has the Dominion government power to legalize or validate any or every marriage solemnized anywhere in Canada?

To this the government replied:

The government does not consider that it possesses any such power.

The consequence is that although, by the British North America Act, they are given power with respect to marriage and divorce, although in them lies all the power except the right to solemnize the marriage, the mere process of entering into that contract, yet they answer the question by saying they do not know whether they possess the power or not. Is it any wonder that the people of this country lost faith in a government that had such a wretched conception of their duty to the people of this country?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Would the hon. member state what power, in his opinion, the government have to deal with that question?

Mr. BURNHAM. They have the power at any rate of answering questions with respect to it.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is begging the question.

Mr. BURNHAM. I will explain. If the government are asked a question whether they have power to enforce the laws of this country, then they should say yes, if they think they have; if they think they have not, they should cause an inquiry to be made as to why they have not.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax). Give us your explanation of the whole thing.

Mr. BURNHAM. The hon. member desires to draw me into a side issue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that in his part of Ontario the Ne Temere decree was used against the late government?

Mr. BURNHAM. It most distinctly was.

Mr. OLIVER. It was.

Mr. BURNHAM. And I shall show you to a certain extent why. In a pamphlet just issued by no less a gentleman than Sir Richard Scott, Senator, by way of confutation of the statement that the Ne Temere decree had nothing to do with the laws of this country, occurs this sentence taken from 'The Tablet,' the organ of the Catholic Church in England:

The Catholic church, though she does not acknowledge that the state has any right to determine what marriage shall be null or void, has no power to change the civil law of marriage.

It does not want to have anything to do with the civil law of marriage but it denies to it the right to say what law is null or valid. If that is not bringing in the question of the validity or otherwise of a marriage, I would like to know what does. To show that this question has not been sprung upon us but has been brought forward deliberately I shall quote from the last issue of the 'Catholic Register.'

In spite of the Church's constant warfare on these (mixed) marriages, the number is much larger than we would wish to see it.

You have there the causa causans of the whole trouble, but it does not matter whether it is the Catholic Church or any other church, the people of this country ought to be free and under the protection of the laws of this country, and when any doubt is raised as there has been raised in this case, a general doubt—and you must acknowledge there is general doubt, because the various conferences, presbyteries, synods, &c., have expressed in very strong resolutions their opinion—it is the duty of a government that is a strong and willing government, not to evade the question by refusing to answer questions and declining to say whether it has power or not, but to say that they are able and willing to enforce the laws of the country.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Was it a very important part of the campaign in Ontario?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. member is interrupting. He is entitled to ask a question, but not to carry on a conversation when the rest of the House cannot hear him.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member asked the hon. gentleman who had the floor a question and he is entitled to an answer?

Mr. MONK. He has no right to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is the right of the hon. member who has the floor to give way and have a question asked if he desires.

If he refuses to give way he has a right to keep the floor.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). If the hon. gentlemen will permit me to ask a question, would he say whether, in his judgment, this Ne Temere decree played a very important part in the province of Ontario, and if so what proportion did it play in the issues of that campaign?

Mr. BURNHAM. It certainly played an important part.

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM. The cowardice of the government in respect of the matters to which I referred has played a very important part.

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM. Because the measure was taken as a typical measure, and how were we to know that perhaps in a short time another body, perhaps the 'Orange Sentinel,' would not come forward with an equal right to trespass on the laws of this country. The laws of this country must be vindicated and the people must be protected.

We have heard a great deal of the naval policy of the late government, and when we study the naval policy, or the naval apology as you might call it, we can quite understand how it is that it was so generally attacked. If to be opposed to the naval policy of the late government, if to despise it, if to wish to reject it as nothing but a burden on this country without rhyme or reason, is to be a Nationalist, then I am a Nationalist.

We find, Mr. Speaker, in the resolution of the 9th of May, 1907, in the report of the proceedings of the Colonial Conference in England, this item under the head 'Naval Defence,' which that learned and august body was then considering:

Dr. Smartt——

I believe he hails from South Africa.

Would I be in order in moving this naval resolution after the discussion yesterday? I do not think it will take any time because it is a resolution which requires no remarks to make it acceptable to the conference?

Then follows the resolution:

That this conference recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contributions towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty, and as would best accord with the varying circumstances.

You would think that that was broad enough for anybody to endorse. But what did Sir Wilfrid Laurier say, the right hon. leader of the opposition, one of the most distinguished men in the world?

I am sorry to say that, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in that respect in that country before committing ourselves to a general claim. The government of Canada has done a great deal in that respect. Our action was not understood, but I was glad to see that the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted we had done much more than he was aware of. It is impossible, in my humble opinion, to have a uniform policy on this matter; the disproportion is too great between the mother country and the colonies. We have too much to do otherwise; in the mother country, you must remember, they have no expenses to incur with regard to public works; whereas, in most of the colonies, certainly in Canada, we have to tax ourselves to the utmost of our resources in the development of our country, and we could not contribute, or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

It is that sort of thing that brought about, in Ontario, the defeat of the government. Surely there was a straight, square and definite resolution, proposing different ways in which the local legislatures might help the mother country, and might affirm their solidarity, and show a certain unity. But no, it was necessary in the eyes of the leader of the present opposition, after a whole volume of reports and proceedings, to decline to have anything to do with such a broad and really splendid resolution as that. But in order to satisfy a certain section of people in this country it was necessary for him to have a substitute naval policy, and out of that substitute naval policy was born this infernal policy they call a Canadian navy, which has no right or title in reason to that name.

Now, I will touch upon one more point. Hon. gentlemen of the opposition have rung the changes on the surpluses rolled up by the late government, as they pretend, year after year. But let me ask you, Sir, who paid those surpluses? The people of Canada. The people of this country took the money out of one pocket and put it into the other, and we are told that by that magical process the late government had conferred enormous benefits upon the people. If there had been some satisfaction in the process I could have understood it. If the taxes had been paid upon goods manufactured in this country we could have understood it. But the goods were manufactured in other countries upon which those taxes were paid, and we had

to hand out our money for the development of industries in other countries, in paying taxes upon goods manufactured in other countries. While we were paying out these taxes we had been deluded into believing that we were doing it as a result of the magnificent administration of the late government. When we understood that, we said, away with the economic policy of such a government, and what, with one thing and another, the old government fell down, and they have a fitting if too splendid monument in the wreck of the Quebec bridge.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). I must compliment my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) on the vigorous speech he has just made. My hon. friend complains of the naval policy of the late government as not being sufficiently definite and clear for his approval. I trust that my hon. friend is satisfied with the policy of his leader, or rather with the variety of conflicting policies that he has heretofore brought before the country with regard to the navy. Now, Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to make any further remarks, I wish to be permitted to congratulate the Prime Minister on his elevation to the most important post in the gift of the Canadian people. I have had the pleasure of his acquaintance for a good many years, and whilst we have not always been able to see eye to eye on public questions, that is his fault rather than mine. We were at one time on the same side, but he strayed away from the fold, and I remained in it. At the same time, if we are to have a Conservative administration in this country, there is no man in the ranks of my hon. friends opposite whom I would prefer to see holding the chief seat than my hon. friend the present Prime Minister. I would also like to be permitted to compliment the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). He fought very vigorously for his party during the past fifteen years, and I suppose there was no man in the party who had more claims on the rewards of victory than my hon. friend. Many of us on this side of the House expected that when his party again attained power he would be promoted to his old post as Finance Minister. But that did not take place. I do not know whether he is aggrieved at what has happened or not, but he has no more reason to be aggrieved than all the other Conservatives throughout the country. It would appear that the Prime Minister was not able to find a man in the Conservative party from Cape Breton to Vancouver to entrust with the people's money, and he had to come to our side to find one.

I am also glad to see my good friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), sitting in the front row. My personal relations with him during the years I have had the honour of a seat in this House, were very pleasant indeed. I have watched his course for some years, and on many questions I was able to agree with him. My chief regret was to see him drifting towards Nationalism during recent years. I was sorry to see that. For my own part, I do not think there is any place for a so-called Nationalist party in the public life of this country. I read a long speech delivered by one of the leaders of the Nationalist party delivered in one of the cities of Ontario recently, explaining what the Nationalist party stood for, and I felt that if those belonging to the other races throughout this country were to adopt a policy of that kind, with the object of securing the advantage of any particular race, we would require a great many of them, and it would not redound to the advantage of the public life of this country. I have the honour myself to belong to that gallant and warlike race that was bred among the hills and glens of old Scotland. What would you say, Mr. Speaker, if we were to organize a national Scotch party for the purpose of seeing that the Scotchman got a fair share of what was going, and that, whenever a new cabinet was formed, there was a fair sprinkling of Presbyterians in it? Some hon. gentlemen are laughing at that. But it is just as reasonable as the organization of this so-called Nationalist party in the province of Quebec.

There is no desire on this side unnecessarily to prolong this debate. But there is a desire among hon. members on this side of the House to expose the methods by which the victorious party won the election on the 21st of September I will venture to say that there never was an election contest in this country in which so many crooked and indirect methods were resorted to as in the recent election. We provide in the Criminal Code for the prosecution of a man who obtains money or goods by false pretences, but we have not any effective statute to punish the man who obtains the votes of the people by similar methods. But there they are with the stolen goods in their possession, and the only thing that we can do is to expose them in so far as we can to the gaze of the public, and of the people whom they have deceived.

In the recent election the Conservative party claimed that they were the only loyal party in this country. That seemed to be the claim that was set up by that party on every platform where I happened to be during the course of this election. They waved the old flag everywhere and strained their windpipes singing 'Rule Brit-

annia.' You would, from their own presentation of the case, think that they were really the party that was keeping the old flag flying in this country. I do not say that the Conservative party are a disloyal party, but I say that they protest too much about their loyalty. When a woman gets on the housetop and begins to shout to the public that she is a virtuous woman we are very apt to think that there is something the matter.

Suppose we examined the record of the Conservative party on this question of loyalty. I will not go back to the days when they burned the parliament buildings in the city of Montreal and stoned the King's representative. That was a generation ago, but from the experience that I have had in attending public meetings in the city of Montreal not many months ago as a looker-on, I would say that the Tory of Montreal to-day is a lineal descendant of the men who did that. Let us look at one or two incidents of a more recent date. There was one that was referred to during the course of the present debate. At the time that the late Sir John Macdonald, who was the greatest leader that was ever produced by the Conservative party, was framing his National Policy, it was drawn to his attention that the high tariff against British goods might interfere with or imperil British connection and his answer was: 'So much the worse for British connection.' So, he placed the tariff against British goods just as high as against American goods or goods from any other country. That is incident No. 1. Take another. In 1885 Sir John Macdonald was at the height of his power. He had a strong majority at his back and I suppose that if there ever was any period in his history in which he and his party were able to control the affairs of this country it was about that period. It was during that year that the heroic Gordon was besieged in Khartoum and the news when it reached the British dominions throughout the world, created a thrill everywhere. At that time General Laurie was the member in this House for the county of Shelburne, Nova Scotia. General Laurie pressed upon Sir John Macdonald that he should send a Canadian contingent to the relief of General Gordon in the Soudan. Sir John refused to do anything of the kind. Mr. Blake, who was at that time in the House, asked a question and this is Sir John's reply:

No offer has been made by the government to equip and send a military contingent to the Soudan at the cost of Canada or of individual Canadians.

The British government noticed the attitude of the Canadian government and a few days after that, on the 10th February, 1885, Lord Derby, who was then Colonial Secretary, cabled to Lord Lansdowne, the Governor General, as follows:

General Laurie and Col. Williams propose enroll and command regiment Canadian volunteers. Before further considering these offers Her Majesty's government wish to know whether they are sanctioned or recommended by Dominion government.

The answer came back:

Permitting Laurie to recruit volunteers.

But ending with the following significant words:

Entire cost would fall on the imperial exchequer.

So there you have it; General Laurie may get Canadian soldiers to go to the Soudan if he can but we wash our hands of the whole business, and not a cent or a dollar shall we pay. This was the attitude of this flag-flapping party on the only occasion during their eighteen years of power when they were asked by the imperial government to do anything for the defence of the flag at home or abroad. Let us take a couple of incidents of a similar kind in the history of the Liberal party, and contrast them with those I have just mentioned. When the present right hon. leader of the opposition was enacting his tariff in 1897 the same question arose. It was asked: What will you do in regard to Great Britain?—and the present leader of the opposition acknowledged frankly that Great Britain had special claims upon the Dominion of Canada, with the result that when the tariff was brought down there was incorporated in it a provision which gave British goods a preference of 25 per cent over the goods of any other country. If I remember rightly, Sir, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) were at that time members of this House and both of them spoke and voted against that resolution. Take another instance. Everybody remembers the prompt action of the late government in the case of the South African war. Why, Sir, the declaration of war was not more than three or four weeks old when a transport was making its way down the St. Lawrence with Canadian soldiers to fight for the British flag in that distant part of the empire. These men were not recruited by General Laurie in his private capacity or by any other citizen of Canada, but by the Minister of Militia under the authority of the late government, and that government provided a large sum of money to pay the expenses. That is the difference between the attitude of the Liberal party and the Conservative party on this question of standing by the old flag. I submit that it does not entitle hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to claim that

they are the only loyal party in this country. I have said that the election was won to a large extent by false pretences. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Burnham) has admitted that in the province of Ontario the great question was the Ne Temere decree, some decree that was passed by the Roman Catholic church, with which the government of Canada has nothing whatever to do, and in regard to which it can have no responsibility. But, it appears that there is nothing that these people will not bring up at the time of an election if they think that they can deceive foolish people and obtain their votes. In the province of Nova Scotia the great question was the danger of annexation. That was the question on which they tried to frighten the people of Nova Scotia.

The statement was that if we allowed our people to trade in natural products with the United States it would bring on annexation. Now, Sir, we have at present an enormous trade with the United States, and that trade has been growing year after year, until it has become the largest trade of this country, and at the present moment it amounts to one million dollars a day. Our trade with the United States has been going on for one hundred years, and if it has any tendency towards annexation, how is it that that trade has not produced a single annexationist in Canada during a whole century. And, if it is wrong for us to trade with the United States, who are the chief offenders. We bought from the United States fifty million dollars worth of coal last year, and eight million dollars worth of raw cotton, and who bought the coal and who bought the raw cotton if not the manufacturers and railway magnates of this country who are the friends of the government in power? It was from these people that gentlemen opposite got their campaign funds. The very men who are putting up their money to prevent the farmer and the fisherman from trading with the United States are the very men who are themselves trading with that country on an enormous scale. If the Prime Minister was sincere, that it was a dangerous thing to carry on this trade with the United States, then his first duty on taking office was to take measures to stop it, a thing which so far he has not done. The leader of the government might appeal to his Finance Minister, and he might ask him to influence his friends, the corporations, to buy Canadian coal in place of Yankee coal, and that would have the double effect on the one hand of keeping the friends of the Minister of Finance loyal, and on the other hand of developing the Canadian coal mines. But we on this side of the House did not believe in that theory; we think we can carry on any amount of trade with the United States without affecting our loyalty in the slightest degree. Our doctrine is that our loyalty is not so cheap as to be thrown in the scale with a barrel of fish or a bundle of shingles. Then we were told by the Conservative campaigners that if we introduced reciprocity the American trusts would come across the border and swallow up everything in Canada. Well, everybody who knows anything at all about political economy knows that trusts flourish under protection and wither under free trade. Every one who deals with the question honestly will admit that if you broke down the tariff wall between the United States and Canada it would be almost impossible for the trusts to exist on this continent. There is, however, one thing certain, and it is that the present administration will not carry on a very severe war against the trusts; they are too friendly with them. The trusts have had much to do with putting these gentlemen where they are, and I have no doubt they will stand loyally by their friends. It was also attempted in Nova Scotia by Conservative speakers, and the Conservative press to frighten the fishermen with the story that if reciprocity were brought about it would mean the end of the Canadian fishing bounty, and added to this absurdity was the equally absurd statement that the Yankee fishermen would be permitted to fish within the three-mile limit. Of course there was not the slightest foundation for either of these statements, but they were diligently published throughout the country during the whole campaign, and I have no doubt they had an effect on the votes of some people along our coast. Then, as most of you know, there was an attempt made to buy out all the newspapers of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. The 'Globe.'

Mr. SINCLAIR. There was that kind of patriotism that we have in the city of Montreal where they sell it by the yard, An association in that city made offers to the newspapers that for every line they would print opposed to reciprocity they would be paid for at a liberal rate. Some of the Liberal newspapers, and the Conservative newspapers which were in favour of reciprocity, indignantly refused, and while others printed these articles and marked them 'advertisement,' some of them put them in as editorial matter, and took the silver and betrayed the country. What, Mr. Speaker, do you think of men who gained their seats by such means as that? Looking over the speech from the Throne there is very little I have to find fault with. I thoroughly approve of the proposals to develop the great agricultural industry and to spend public money in improving the roads of this country. My criticism of the speech

is that it is flat and commonplace. There is nothing in it to touch the imagination or awaken the enthusiasm of the Canadian people. The proposal for a tariff commission I regard as unsound and I am opposed to it. I am surprised that a government which is so very cautious in matters regarding the United States should go to Washington for a model in that respect. It is an un-British idea. The men who ought to deal with the tariff are the representatives of the people. You can turn over to a commission the construction of a railway and the fixing of railway rates and matters of that kind, but when it comes to a question of the taxation of the people that should be dealt with directly by the representatives of the people, and should not be farmed out to anybody. This is the position I take with regard to that matter and I think my position is sound. And if this tariff commission becomes part of the machinery of the law of this country, mark my word that it will be a commission for keeping up taxes; it will be a commission which will be used in the interests of the manufacturers and the millionaires to fleece the common people. That is what I believe it is intended for, and that is how it will work. I was disappointed that in the speech no mention was made of the fishing industry on the coasts of this country. It will not be denied that the verdict of the 21st of September was a serious blow to the fishing industry, because everybody will admit that if reciprocity had passed it would have opened up a large and new market for our fish. Our home market is all right as far as it goes, but our home market is not large enough to consume the fish we are now catching, and if confined to that market it would be impossible for us to expand our business. Why, if we depended on our home market for the sale of our live lobsters, nine-tenths of our fishermen in the maritime provinces would have to pull up their traps and go out of business. Nearly all that product goes to the United States and the United States is the only market we have for it. The same may be said in reference to our salt mackerel and other varieties.

This proposal to open up the American market for fish was the first ray of hope that our fishermen had for many years, and the Prime Minister has not made any proposal to compensate them for what they lost in that respect on the 21st of September. But while the speech was altogether silent on that point, I have been able to find that my hon. friend did not ignore it altogether. It is referred to in a manifesto which he issued during the election campaign in the county of Halifax, and this is what he said:

> The fishing industry, so important to our province, is carried on largely by boat fishermen. The conditions governing boat fishing have changed greatly of late years. Fishing is now frequently carried on many miles outside our territorial waters and during the entire year. The boats employed are more expensive, better equipped and more costly to operate than those in general use some years ago. Thus, boat fishing has become largely a permanent employment, and those engaged in it are in reality seamen. This change is advantageous to the industry, because it ensures a regular supply throughout the year, which is essential in order to retain our hold on the markets. The Liberal-Conservative party has adopted and will carry out the policy of extending to the boat fishermen the same free medical aid and attendance afforded to those employed on Canadian vessels in the deep sea fisheries.

My hon. friend does not seem to realize at all the requirements of the fishing industry of this country. There are a great many things that the fishermen in Canada are asking for. They are asking for better transportation facilities; they are asking for branch railways to fishing points like Canso, Country Harbour, Cheticamp and other ports in the maritime provinces; they are asking for the abolition of the steam trawler, outside Canadian waters, which threatens the existence of the fisheries along the coasts of the maritime provinces; they are asking for lower express rates so that they may be able to reach the home market. It is very difficult at present to sell our fish in the province of Ontario. The late government has been trying to do something in that direction; it has being paying part of the express rates for sending fish to Ontario in the effort to coax the Ontario people to consume some of our fish. But there is no large market, I am sorry to say, in the province of Ontario for our fish. It is increasing somewhat, but not much. The late government spent the large sum of $35,000 last year in paying part of the express rates to aid in sending our fish to different points in the western part of Canada, but the effort has not been very successful. Our fishermen are asking for better transportation facilities, lower express rates and better markets, and all that the Prime Minister proposes in his manifesto to give them is free medicine. They are not promised any branch railways or better transportation facilities or the abolition of steam trawlers or better express rates. The only thing the Prime Minister offers them is pills. I want to say to the Prime Minister that he is very much mistaken if he thinks he can satisfy the fishermen of this country with the promise of pills or castor oil. I would like to know from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when we may expect to have the regulations made for furnishing free medicine to the boat fishermen on the coasts of this country.

Mr. HAZEN. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell me when and where the Prime Minister made that statement?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have just read from the manifesto which he issued to the electors of the county of Halifax, dated the 31st day of August, 1911.

Mr. HAZEN. I may say to my hon. friend that I am satisfied that any promise the Prime Minister has made will be carried out in the best of good faith.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is estimated that we have about 40,000 fishermen on the coasts of this country, and with their families I suppose they would number 200,000 people; and if my hon. friend intends to provide free medicine and free medical attendance for these 200,000 people, I for my part would support the proposal as a small compensation to the fishermen for what they lost on the 21st of September as the result of the defeat of reciprocity.

Mr. STANFIELD. They are not worrying over it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I presume the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not aware until I mentioned it here that there was such a promise made by the Prime Minister. One of the other questions that I missed any mention of in the bill of fare is the question of branch line railways in connection with the Intercolonial railway. I would like the Prime Minister to inform the House in his reply what policy he intends to adopt in that regard. This is one of the most important questions in the maritime provinces. The Prime Minister, in his address to the electors of Halifax, refers to that important matter in the following terms:

Railway extension through the eastern part of the county has for many years been urgent. For fifteen years the federal government with abounding revenues has remained indifferent and inactive. During the past session, while both federal and provincial governments were trifling with the question, I took the ground in parliament that the road should be built as a part of the Intercolonial railway and without delay. As a result of this the federal government has apaprently been awakened to a momentary sense of its duty, and an item of $1,000,000 has been inserted in this year's estimates for the commencement of the work.

I submit that the hon. the First Minister claimed in that manifesto credit which he is not entitled to. Every hon. gentleman who has sat in the House, as I have, during the last eight years knows that during all that time he took no leading part in the agitation for branch lines on the Intercolonial. Every hon. member, who was in the House during these years knows that resolutions were moved at different times by members supporting the late government urging on it the necessity of doing something, and that my hon. friend took no leading part in the discussions on these resolutions. The pioneer in this important question was my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). He took the matter up and made forcible speeches upon it, and persuaded some of us that we ought to move in the matter and it was pressed on the government year after year. The resolution which brought the matter to a focus so that the government dealt with it was moved by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton and seconded by your humble servant; and after a number of members on the government side had spoken on the question, the then leader of the opposition, who is now Prime Minister, said a few words in criticism of the course of the government and, in order to press the Minister of Railways to make some declaration, he said that at that time he approved of what we were proposing. But surely that does not entitle him to make the statement which he has made in this manifesto, in which he says:

I took the ground in parliament—without referring to anybody else—that the road should be built as a part of the Intercolonial railway without delay, and accordingly the government agreed to build it and voted $1,000,000 for that purpose.

But if it was so easy for my hon. friend to get this done why did he hold his easy seat for fifteen years before asking for it? Why did he not ask for it a little earlier? He seems to have got it simply for the asking—seventy miles of railway through his county and an appropriation of one million dollars to commence the work. That is his own statement, and I give it to show that the Prime Minister claimed a good deal more than he is entitled to when he made that statement over his own signature in his manifesto to the electors of Halifax.

Referring for a moment to the amendment moved by the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I was very much struck with the reply of the Prime Minister a few days ago. He failed altogether to make clear what his own naval policy is, and that is what the people of this country want to know. They want information as to what the policy of this government is to be in regard to that important matter. In answer to the challenge thrown out to him by the leader of the opposition, the Prime Minister read a paragraph from a manifesto that was issued by him in the province of Quebec about the time of the elections. Here is the paragraph:

Sinc the last general election the government has entered upon a new line of policy in regard to naval affairs, which is of far-reaching importance. The policy adopted was

not debated before the people during the election, and it bears all the earmarks of a hasty and ill-considered scheme. In my judgment our duty to the empire cannot be properly or effectively fulfilled by such a measure. I hold that the plan of the government contemplates the creation of a naval force that will be absolutely useless in time of war, and therefore of no practical benefit to Canada or to the empire. It will cost immense sums of money to build, equip and maintain. It will probably result in time of war in the useless sacrifice of many valuable lives, and it will not add one iota to the fighting strength of the empire. The more it is considered, the more does it become evident that the whole naval plan of the government is an unfortunate blunder.

In that paragraph the Prime Minister condemns the policy of the present administration, but he fails to make plain his own policy. Evidently, however, that manifesto, with that paragraph in it, was not issued for that purpose. To my mind it was issued for a very different purpose —for the purpose of inflaming the people of Quebec against any naval policy whatever. Proof of that statement I find in the very paragraph itself. Why does my hon. friend refer in that paragraph to the loss of many valuable lives in the event of our adopting the policy recommended by the Admiralty in England? Does he think we can carry on a naval warfare and not hurt anybody? Does he think that when this Armageddon comes, about which he told us two years ago, no valuable lives will be lost? Just look for a moment at the circumstances under which this manifesto was issued. The whole province of Quebec was in a turmoil at that time over this naval question. Mr. Bourassa was making speeches on many platforms, wherever he could get a hearing; and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), and other gentlemen were assisting him. The people of the province of Quebec were told that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had given himself over to the imperialists of England, that he had betrayed his own province, and that if this proposal were carried out their sons would be torn from their homes and made food for powder. With that agitation going on in the province of Quebec, the Prime Minister comes out with this manifesto which was circulated largely in that province, in which he tells the people that if the naval policy of the late government be adopted, it will probably result in the loss of many valuable lives. I submit, therefore, that the evidence of my charge that this manifesto was issued for the purpose of inflaming the people of Quebec against any naval policy whatever is contained in the manifesto itself. It is said that the late government should not have embarked on this naval policy at all—that nobody ever asked it, that it was an improper thing for them to embark in. Any man who says that is not familiar with the history of this affair, because from year to year, for many years, this matter was brought urgently to the attention of the Canadian government by the imperial authorities. Time and again they did not hesitate to put this matter before the colonial authorities, and were urging an answer. As far back as 1897, reading from the report of the Imperial Conference of that year, I find that the Home Secretary of that day, addressing the delegates from the overseas dominions at that conference, made the following statement. Referring to the British navy, he said:

This gigantic navy, and the military forces of the United Kingdom, are maintained, as you know, at heavy cost. I think the charge upon the exchequer is at the present time something like 35 millions sterling per annum, and it constitutes more than one-third of the total income of the country. Now, these fleets, and this military armament, are not maintained exclusively, or even mainly, for the benefit of the United Kingdom or for the defence of home interests. They are still more maintained as a necessity of empire, for the maintenance and protection of imperial trade and of imperial interests all over the world, and if you will for a moment consider the history of this country during, say, the present century, or, I would say, during the present reign, you will find that every war, great or small, in which we have been engaged has had at the bottom a colonial interest, the interest, that is to say, either of a colony, or of a great dependency like India. That is absolutely true and is likely to be true to the end of the chapter. If we had no empire there is no doubt whatever that our military and our naval resources would not require to be maintained at anything like their present level.

Now, I venture to say that that must necessarily be the case in the future. Look at the condition of the colonies. Assume,—although I am almost ashamed to assume it, even for the purpose of argument,—assume that these colonies were separated from the mother country; what would be the position of the great Dominion of Canada? The Dominion of Canada is bordered for 3,000 miles by a most powerful neighbour, whose potentialities are infinitely greater than her actual resources. She comes into conflict in regard to the most important interests with the rising power of Japan, and even in regard to some of her interests with the great empire of Russia. Now, let it not be supposed for a moment that I suggest as probable—I hardly like to think that it is even possible—that there should be a war between Canada, or on behalf of Canada, either with the United States of America or with any of the other powers with which she may come into contact but what I do say is this, that if Canada had not behind her today, and does not continue to have behind her this great military and naval power of Great Britain, she would have to make concessions to her neighbours and to accept views which might be extremely distasteful to her in order

to remain permanently on good terms with them. She would not be able to, it would be impossible that she should, herself control all the details of her own destiny; she would be, to a greater or less extent, in spite of the bravery of her population and the patriotism of her people, she would be still, to a great extent, a dependent country. . . .

What, then, I want to urge upon you is, and in doing so, I think I am speaking to those who are already converted, that we have a common interest in this matter, and certainly it has been a great pleasure to us, a great pride to us, that Australia, in the first instance, offered voluntarily a contribution in aid of the British navy besides taking her full share of her own military defences. Now we have to recognize that the Cape Colony has followed in that patriotic course. I do not know upon what conditions these gifts may be offered or continued, but, at all events, the spirit in which they have been made is most heartily reciprocated in this country. The amount, of course, is at the present time, absolutely trifling, but that is not the point. We are looking to the colonies as still children, but rapidly approaching manhood. In the lifetime, perhaps, of some of us, we shall see the population doubled, and certainly in the lifetime of our descendants there will be great nations where now there are comparatively sparse populations; and to establish in the early days this principle of mutual support and of a truly imperial patriotism, is a great thing of which our colonial statesmen may well be proud.

That is a straight appeal from the highest authority in Great Britain to the government of Canada that the time has come when they ought to do something. When the country was new, and the population sparse and revenue small, nothing was said. The British government for 100 years protected the commerce of this country and the British taxpayers paid the bill, but when we have a population of seven millions and a revenue of one hundred millions, it is said that the time has come when we ought to take some action ourselves, and this is an appeal that a proud people like the people of Canada cannot very well ignore; so it cannot be said that any mistake was made when the government of Canada undertook to do something in regard to naval defence. I should have been disappointed myself if my leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had not taken some action in that way, and I would say to the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) that there are thousands of men in this country who voted for him and his party who will be ashamed that they did so if he capitulates to the views of the Nationalists in regard to this important question.

A few weeks ago I came across a speech made by the leader of the Nationalist party at North Bay in this province. I would like to be permitted to read a short extract from it. Mr. Bourassa says:

Mr. SINCLAIR.

I often hear that this is a British country, and that the majority should rule. When you tell me that this is a British country let me tell you that if this is true, that if the British flag floats to-day from sea to sea on the northern half of this continent it is because of the action of the French Canadians of this country one time when it was their will and power to join hands with the Anglo-Saxons to the south against your King,——

Mark, Mr. Speaker, 'your King'.

—against your flag, against your constitution. Had they done this, there would not have been one inch of the province of Quebec under the British flag to-day.

The part of that paragraph that I wish to emphasize is the reference to 'your King, and your flag, and your constitution.' This high authority in the Tory party, this man who has put himself in the position of godfather to the Prime Minister, this man who makes and unmakes cabinets in this country, does not acknowledge King George V. as his King, he does not acknowledge that flag that floats day by day over this building as his flag, does not acknowledge the constitution under which we live. In talking to a public audience in Ontario, he says 'your King, and your flag, and your constitution'. What does the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) think of that? I would like to know. What do you think of it yourself, Mr. Speaker? I have had the honour of sitting with you in this House for the last eight years, and I have always regarded you as a staunch supporter of British connection, and of the British flag, and I would like to know what you think of Mr. Bourassa? I would like to know what the loyal Orange lodges of Ontario think. What do the Daughters of the Empire, those fine ladies who met day after day and drank tea, and wore ribbons, and talked for the Tory party, think? What does the Rev. George Frederick Scott, of the city of Quebec, that man who burst out into poetry, and called on the Lord of Hosts to save us from the consequences of selling our hay and shingles to the Yankees—what does he think? What do the 'British-born' think of that language from a man so prominent in the Conservative party? Is it any wonder that the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have demanded an explanation from the Prime Minister as to how far he has committed the affairs of this country to the care of men who are acknowledged followers of this man who openly infers at a public meeting that he refuses to acknowledge our King, and our flag, and our constitution?

On motion of Mr. Rainville, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10 o'clock p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BURNHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said : The object of this Bill is to abolish the requirement of a deposit by the candidate in a Dominion election.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett (Calgary): For an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. J. H. RAINVILLE (Chambly-Verchères). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, during the last few days, the debate upon the speech from the Throne seems to have taken a very extraordinary turn. I had thought that in the discussion of the speech from the Throne, it was customary to consider the matters mentioned in that speech, and that we attached ourselves principally to the amendment submitted to the House, when there was one.

Well, I notice since the beginning of this debate, that instead of being limited to these different questions, we have spoken of all sorts of things of the past, and that the aim has been to laud one party and villify the other. This evidently has nothing whatever to do with the speech from the Throne and the amendment before the House, because the policy of the government is not discussed at all, and I confess that I have been somewhat surprised.

In taking part in this debate, I will endeavour not to go astray from the questions upon which our attention is called, as some of my colleagues have done, that is to say to confine myself to what is contained in the speech from the Throne, and principally to the amendment before the House.

Much has been said about the prosperity which Canada enjoys. It is true that that prosperity is great, but there is one thing which our friends opposite have taken great care not to forget, no more here than durin the last campaign, it is to assert that the author of that prosperity is the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If we would believe them, he is the sole maker of that prosperity.

From their speeches one would believe that he is even the creator of the prosperity in England, in France, in Germany and in the United States. However extraordinary this assertion might seem, to my mind, it is not any more extraordinary than to assert that he is the sole author of Canadian prosperity. The contention is just as ridiculous in one case as it is in the other. There is no more truth in this than to say, for example, that the ex-Posmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), is to be credited with the military successes of Japan against Russia. No, Canada is only having her share of the general and universal prosperity.

The question we have to decide is this: Have we simply used, or rather have we abused of that prosperity with which Canada has been gratified by Providence. Is it in the name of that prosperity that the Transcontinental which, as was contended by the ex-government would cost only $13,000,000, being the interest during seven years upon $50,000,000, has cost, up to the present, 188 millions, the road not being even completed?

Is it in the name of this same prosperity that was established the system of assisted immigration, a system which has been in existence during too long a time, and which has developed into the North Atlantic Trading Company, a company without a president, with no directors, no shareholders, no secretaries, a company belonging to the order of myths, a company which has made enormous profits, and instead of having brought our population to 8,000,000, as it was expected, leaves Canada with a little over 7,000,000, a great difference, proving that assisted immigration at $5 per head has served to nothing else than to bring into this country undesirable immigrants who, after all, crossed to the United States or went to other places?

Is it in the name of this same prosperity that we have been given in the western prairies large grants of lands at ridiculous prices to some speculators and favoured friends of the government, and also to private companies such as the Canadian Northern, transactions in which a minister of the ex-government has been mixed, in an affair of $69,000, which was to be investigated during the last session, and which has contributed to the defeat of the ex-member for the county of Chambly-Vercheres, a county which during the last fifty years had always been faithful to the Liberal party?

Is it also in the name of this prosperity that the ex-government in the disastrous affair of the Quebec bridge has reimbursed to its favoured friends, the shareholders of the company, the sum of one hundred thou-

sand dollars with interest and a bonus of ten per cent, leaving the widows and orphans, victims of this sad accident, to the mercy of an insolvent company and without any recourse whatever?

My conclusion in this question of prosperity, Mr. Speaker, is that the ex-government has deeply and often abused it.

The speech from the Throne contains a very important paragraph intended to develop the agricultural interest of the country in giving good roads. This is a very effective way of aiding agriculture and rural traffic, in saving to our agriculturists and merchants much time and fatigue, in permitting to the tourists to travel easily across our country and becoming better acquainted with it. This, I hope, will be the means to increase the population of the country, which, unfortunately, has been deserting into the cities, which is a great evil, because the more our agricultural lands are deserted the worse it is for the country. In fact, national prosperity depends in great part upon the prosperity of the farmer who supports the whole nation.

We must aid the farmer in other ways. We must give him wise laws and teach him practical and modern methods, and I think it is the intention of the government to do so. These laws must be of such a nature that they will not create, but instead would prevent such conflicts between the producer and the consumer as the reciprocity bill would have unfortunately brought, in opposing the interest of the labourers and manufacturers to those of the farmers, as was attempted in saying that it was the farmer's turn. I would like, after being fifteen years in power, that the government would be in a position, speaking of what was done for agriculture, to say more than they had put at the head of the Department of Agriculture a practical farmer; I would like that they would leave to the farmers permanent laws, practical and modern methods which would make sure their prosperity and facilitate the exchange of their products.

In this affair of the 'farmer's turn,' skilfully invented for the circumstance, after fifteen years of power, the principal object of this cry was to hide some acts of the ex-government, such as those which I mentioned, the North Atlantic Trading Company, the Quebec bridge, the Transcontinental, and also bring the people to forget that the expenses of the Militia Department which, in 1896, were of a million and a half, a figure which was already a scandal, from the Liberal party's contention, and which, in 1910 increased to the figure of seven millions of dollars, when there was not in any way amelioration in the service, as says in his report General French, who has not minced his opinion upon the efficacity of our militia. It is also undoubtedly to hide the paint affair of Sorel, and the government materials given away to private parties.

It is no doubt also for the purpose of having those good farmers, especially in the province of Quebec, forget that under so-called Liberal government, our country's constitution has been shamefully torn to pieces to the detriment of what is dearest to them, at the time of the establishment of the two new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Again, no doubt, the object is to relegate into oblivion the war navy, the establishment of which, according to the statement made by the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in 1902, was paramount to a crime and to national suicide.

For all these reasons and many others, that enticing by-word 'the farmer's turn,' was put in circulation, and to give effect to it, reciprocity was offered. Now, what does reciprocity consist in? Reciprocity with the United States, condemned, if I am not mistaken, by the hon. leader of the opposition in 1908, rejected as well by all our manufacturers, amounted practically to the opening of our market to the products and the awful competition of a people of 90 millions, the results of which could only be disastrous to us. The people realized that reciprocity could not be of any advantage to them. Neither the manufacturers nor the farmers were long in finding that out, for in my constituency, at the very opening of the campaign, I openly took a stand against reciprocity, and the farmers gave me generous support. I may state here that it was not so much the votes of townspeoples which ensured my return, but those of electors in the old county of Vercheres, which has sided with the Liberal party for fifty years back, and is made up entirely of farmers; that is where I took a majority of over 150 votes.

Mr. Speaker, instead of that reciprocity regime, the government proposes to establish a tariff commission, and I approve with all my heart such a policy as will ensure to our country that fiscal stability which many a time has been imperilled in the past under the pressure of purely partisan and selfish interests. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the business men who are to make up the commission will strive to restore to the industrial world that confidence which is so necessary to the general welfare. For it should not be forgotten that several important industries have suffered very much of late years, and that a large number of workingmen having lost their jobs, emigrated to the United States, there to secure the wages which they could no longer obtain in Canada. Take, for instance, Mr. Speaker, the woollen industry. Out of a total of eighty factories in exist-

ence about twelve years ago, scarcely ten remain to-day, and that at the price of great sacrifices and disinterestedness on the part of the owners. Among these I am glad to point out the important Willett mills, of Chambly Canton, which for the last fifty years have supported a considerable number of people in the constituency I have the honour to represent.

Such is, in a nutshell, the substance of the speech from the Throne, and without further delay I shall take up the amendment of the right hon. leader of the opposition, which may be summed up in two words: You have forgotten our war navy. As a matter of fact that navy of the hon. leader of the opposition has not been mentioned in the speech from the Throne, and if we are to go by the statements made in this House by certain ministers of the Crown, that question seems consigned, to say the least, to utter oblivion.

This amendment does not imply hostility towards the present government; it is a mere pointer to the representative of His Majesty. Now, I trust that the representative of His Majesty is too deeply imbued with the constitutional spirit to accept such a representation, which, besides is one of the most illiberal ever proposed in the House of Commons, and which, were it adopted, would carry us back three hundred years. Then, it seems to me that we may very well discuss that war navy proposal, without being accused of disloyalty towards His Majesty. We are aware that the British Admiralty not very long ago, left the Canadian government entirely at liberty to choose between three distinct ways of contributing to the defence of the empire. That contribution might in the first place consist in a direct cash payment, in the second place, take the form of a local navy; or lastly, be in the shape of public works to be carried out in the country of a nature to help in the defence of the empire. Those were the three alternatives submitted by the admiralty, and surely, it seems to me, we should be allowed to discuss them, and to select one of these plans in preference to the others. We have had here advocates of the direct contribution proposal; others preferred the local navy idea. Why should those who, in the country's interst, looking to the development of its resources and of its territory through the spending of money and the carrying out of work in the country itself, prefer that plan to all others, knowing that it will at the same time help Great Britain and Canada, why should not those, I say, be treated with the same consideration as the advocates of the two other plans?

I am a former Liberal. For a period of ten years I fought the battles of the party. My political education I obtained in the pamphlets of that same party, as well as in the speeches of its recognized leaders, and I may well be allowed to-day to inquire as they do, and in the same way as they have done, whether Canada has contributed its share of the war expenditure of the empire. I, for one, answer yes, and I choose the third form of contribution to the defence of the empire.

I defended the principles of the old Liberal party, which that party sems to have cast aside within the last five or six years: No taxation without representation. From the purely military point of view, Canada has contributed more than any other colony to the defence of the general interests of the empire, through the immense improvements it has carried out, and on this point it will be sufficient for me to quote the words of Sir Charles Tupper. Here is an extract from a speech delivered by that Conservative statesman on September 22, 1893:

> I deny that we are a burden to the empire. I say that if to-morrow Canada was dissevered from the Crown of England, if to-morrow Canada became a portion of that great republic which liees to the south of us, England could not reduce her army by a man or her navy by a ship. She would want more soldiers and sailors and ironclads than she has to-day in order to maintain her prestige. I say, if this great continent was closed, as closed it would be to the ships of England, under the circumstances I have named, if they had no harbour into which to run or a place where they can obtain a ton of coal or a spar, instead of England being strengthened she would be enormously weakened. Her power in the Pacific, her possessions in India and China would be imperilled, and her prestige as a nation entirely changed. Instead of relieving her from any change for diplomatic services, or her army or her navy, it would impose greater burdens upon the tax-payer of Great Britain than at present. I deny that we are a burden. There is not a pound of British money spent in the Dominion of Canada, from end to end, for any Canadian purpose.
>
> I have a word or two more to say with reference to the defence of the empire. They say: Why should Canada with her enormous mercantile marine, her sails whitening every sea, not contribute from her resources to the defence of the empire? I say she does. I say Canada is discharging that duty nobly and well. No person holds more strongly than I do the unquestionable duty of every British subject, wherever he may be found, to contribute to the support of the defence of this great empire. If you are going to strengthen a fortification, what would you strengthen? The strongest or the weakest part? Of course, the weakest. Where is the weakest part? Is it in England, in the United Kingdom, or Canada, or Australia? No person can question that if England was engaged in war with any great power in the world, they would strike, not in its strongest but weakest part, and therefore, if you wish to strengthen the defence of the empire, to increase the power to resist inva-

sion, the best way to accomplish this, I have no hesitation in saying, is by looking after Canada. Those who say that Canada is contributing nothing to the defence of the empire must be very ignorant of fact, at all events, and I would recommend them to peruse a little of that very interesting literature contained in blue-books.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the building of the Canadian Pacific railway and other railways which have opened up our territory, the building of our canal system and the improvement of our harbours and seaports, the increased expenditure on our military organization, which has risen from one million and a half to seven millions, the taking charge of the garrisons and forts at Halifax and Esquimalt, all these items of expenidture the Canadian people have taken over, relieving by as much the tax roll of the mother country. All political men here have acknowledged that we had fully done our share in the manner I have indicated, and quite recently the right hon. leader of the opposition, together with the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), insisted in London to have the Admiralty acknowledge and have it consigned in their records, that Canada had done more than its share through those great works for the defence of the empire.

We are a British colony and propose to remain so, but as loyal subjects of His Majesty we surely have the right to vindicate the position taken by us on the question of the navy and imperialism, and to appeal to that great principle of the British constitution: No taxation without representation. Our stand is in every respect a reasonable one, and in accordance with the policy followed by the right hon. leader of the opposition for a period of at least ten years up to 1908. And if we were to assume part of the expenditure required to maintain the British military establishment, not only in our country but in England as well, I think I would be entitled to say with all our Canadian statesmen, without distinction of party, and particularly Sir John Macdonald, Edward Blake, Sir Charles Tupper, the present leader of the opposition, and before them, Sir Allan McNab, Sir Etienne-Pascal Taché, who all of them wanted an autonomous military establishment for Canada, that we would be sacrificing the principle which I have just mentioned and which has always been the safeguard of British liberties. Instead of providing a useless navy, would it not be wiser to develop our resources and have a land military organization worth mentioning and founded on common sense, in place of a system of militia which consists in having children masquerade as soldiers for a fortnight every year.

We should realize that our geographical situation is not similar to that of Australia, for example, which is surrounded by water. Our only likely foe is the United States, from which we are separated by a boundary three thousand miles long, and which can be traversed by land at every point.

I repeat, it would be wiser to do what, in fact, the present Minister of Militia seems intent on doing, that it reorganize thoroughly our militia, make it strong and stable, capable of coping with any future development, for should we have war with the United States, our only likely foe, as I have stated, our navy would be of no use, and the most difficult problem, that of protecting our lines of communication from west to east, would in no way be solved by means of a navy.

The hon. member for Rouville seemed very much horrified and even poured out sarcasm at some hon. gentleman who saw in the Monroe doctrine a safeguard for Canada. No undue advantage has been taken of the Monroe doctrine, but if the hon. member for Rouville had reproof to administer in that connection, it should have been addressed to his former colleague, Sir Frederick Borden, who declared recently that 'the Monroe doctrine against outsiders was our best guarantee.' The same reproach might have been made to Lord Charles Beresford and to Sir Edward Grey. The latter on the 24th of May last, at a great banquet, accepted the principle of the Monroe doctrine as applicable to America's external relations.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, about this being a coalition government, and some hon. members on your left seem to find fault with Mr. Monk for having agreed to join the cabinet just formed, inquiring what business he has in this new organization. They criticise the hon. Minister of Public Works on account of a difference of opinion as to a particular question, between himself and the hon. Prime Minister. Now, supposing that to be the case, what about it? Have we not witnessed members of the present opposition party sitting side by side at the same council board, though entertaining contradictory views on certain essential questions. Need I refer to the acceptance by Mr. Tarte of a portfolio in the Laurier administration, in spite of his well-known protectionist principles, while two of his colleagues, Messrs. Fielding and Paterson were downright free-traders. Mr. Tarte even always refused to state that he was a Liberal. I have merely to glance over a few pages of the political history of my country to ascertain that differences of opinion were never an obstacle to the formation of a cabinet, and that coalitions were at all times in order. Was it not a coalition that was effected between Joseph Howe and George Brown? Was it not a coalition which was effected in 1873 between Cart-

wright and Mackenzie. And previous to that, the Lafontaine-Baldwin, the Morin-McNab, the Morin-Taché governments were all coalition governments.

When Mr. Dobell was elected in Quebec as an independent Conservative, he refused to take part in the Liberal celebration at Quebec, notwithstanding which, a few days later, he joined the Laurier administration, that is, what I term coalition. Nevertheless, things have gone on smoothly for the Liberal party, no one was scandalized, and I can assure the hon. gentleman on the other side that in the ranks of the government supporters no more harm will come from it. And that navy question hon. gentlemen would fain throw in as a stumbling block, will be settled to the satisfaction of all true Canadian interests. For it seems perfectly well understood, and I have the statement as to that from the mouths of two authorized ministers of the Crown, if we are to change the basic principles relative to the organization of the land and sea forces, and if some new pro-proposal is to be set forth, the people will beforehand be consulted.

That is what we asked, that is what the Minister of Public Works asked, and that is what the people will be called upon to decide; and by their verdict we shall abide.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval). (Translation.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question? Has he any objection to stating the names of the minsters from whom he holds the statement?

Mr. RAINVILLE. (Translation.) The statements from the two ministers were made on the floor of the House.

Mr. WILSON. (Translation.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I understood that those statements had been made to himself.

Mr. RAINVILLE. (Translation.) No, I stated that those statements had been made in the House to the entire satisfaction of hon. gentlemen on this side; and I think that all the members of this House should be satisfied with them.

Are we deviating from the path which has been blazed by the fathers of confederation and by the leading statesmen of Canada on that navy question? I do not believe it, and I now wish to lay before the House the platform of the Liberal party in 1896 and from 1896 to 1908. The hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) contended in his speech the other day that in 1896 there was no question of principle at stake regarding the purchase of Lee-Enfield rifles, but that if the purchase of those rifles had been criticised, it was solely in connection with their efficiency which was being questioned. I wish to contradict that statement and to show by 'Hansard' that it was on the very principle of the purchase that the discussion took place, and not in respect to their worth. I quote from 'Hansard,' of 1896, p. 6172, an extract from the speech of a then noted leader of the Liberal party, and that should convince him once for all:

> There is one feature in connection with this vote which puzzles me. We have over and again been told that in the event of war taking place of Canada being invaded we could rely on Great Britain's protection; and that the only ground for not severing the colonial tie was that should international difficulties arise, we might rely on England's strong arm. Now, Sir, I am sorry to hear under the circumstances that the government, for the purpose of arming the Canadian militia, have made their purchases, not from private contractors, but from the War Office in Great Britain, and that we are asked now to foot the bills. Is that the protection we have been promised by Great Britain? Is that the position in which we stand as a colony? I think we are entitled to an altogether different treatment.

Needless to say that the author of this speech was Speaker of the House of Commons, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and is to-day a judge of the Supreme Court.

I think this authority is sufficient to show to the hon. member from Two Mountains that, in 1896, that question was considered as one of principle, and not as a mere difference of appreciation as to the efficiency of those rifles.

I shall go farther and quote extracts from newspapers, but I shall not follow the example of the member for Two Mountains who was unable to point out the name of the paper from which he quoted, or the date of its publication. The paper from which I am quoting is 'Le Soir,' of June 18, 1896, a paper founded especially to promote the interests of the Liberal party on the eve of the federal elections then to take place.

> Extract from 'Le Soir', June 18, 1896.
>
> One of the hobbies of old man Tupper is imperial federation. Imperial federation means a closer union between England and her colonies in general and Canada in particular.
>
> In accordance with the terms of that union, Canada, in time of war, would be called upon to pay its share of the cost in money and in men.
>
> And as England is nearly always at war with some one, we would constantly be under the obligation of taxing ourselves to find the required funds and of recruiting men to fill up the regiments.
>
> In turn, England would make those rascals baronets, knights of so and so and commanders of so and so.
>
> But the people would continue to supply convenient targets in time of war.
>
> Hardly was Sir Charles Tupper back from England that he began paving the way towards the fulfilment of his awful plan.

England has been expecting some trouble with the United States concerning a few arpents of mining lands of which she claimed the ownership in Venezuela, thousands of miles away from our country, in Central America. In a hurry Sir Charles Tupper to show his zeal, orders the purchase in England of rifles and guns to the amount of $1,800,000, while the House was sitting, without consulting parliament.

That was not enough.

He required three millions!

Mr. Foster on April 21, 1896, (page 6902 of Hansard) moved a resolution authorizing a loan of three millions dollars to settle all purchases past and future.

Orders had been sent out at the time for the issue of 40,000 Lee-Enfield and 23,000 cavalry rifles of the same make. There had also been ordered four batteries of six guns, of twelve inch diameter, together with the necessary ammunition.

The rifles cost $18 each.

The cavalry rifles cost altogether $40,000.

The bayonets, the scabbards, cost four dollars.

Then, the following purchases are to be made:

Fifty Maxim guns.

Two hundred sets of harness for heavy draft.

Forty sets of cavalry saddles.

Why all these armaments if we are not to have war?

And why should we fight for England?

Electors should remember that these great and portly leaders, who are always anxious to show themselves better patriots than others, more loyal than others, and ready to engage us in war for the benefit of others, will not bear the burden of it.

Those rifles, those guns, will be put in action by the people themselves. You are considered the right stuff to be fired at. The Tuppers, the Angers, the Taillons will be in their offices, whence they will dispatch you to a certain death, their hearts filled with joy and their glasses with champagne. Once more, why all those rifles, those guns, those bayonets if the whole Tupper concern is not meditating some damnable onslaught?

Your children will be sent to Africa, to Asia, whence never to return.

If you vote for the Conservative candidates you approve of all these war preparations. Does the government come to your assistance when you are overburdened by taxes of all kinds, when you suffer damages through floods or fires? And three million dollars have been spent on rifles.

Vote for Laurier and his candidates, if you wish your country to enjoy the same tranquillity, and to not run the risk of being some day sent out to foreign countries, while your wives and children and all that is dear to you remain behind.

So I am surprised to hear members of the opposition complain that politicians in the province of Quebec have worked up race prejudices, knowing as I do that since 1896 the Liberal party, under whose patronage, unfortunately, I fought my first political battles, has not ceased working on the prejudices of the race in the name of one man. If any proof be needed, just run your eye through the Liberal pamphlets, and it will be found that for fifty years, in the province of Quebec, political questions have not been considered on their merits, but that continually and solely the personality of one man has been dangled before the people as a means of holding sway over the minds of French Canadians, his greatest merit in their estimation being his nationality and his Catholic faith. And it is such a system of deceit, worked on the greatest possible scale, that we had to cope with in our fight for principles and opinions. Thank God, those principles and opinions have triumphed this year. That playing on the prejudices of the people has been defeated by the good sense of the people themselves, and I trust that for the good of Canada it will never be reinstated.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, if I crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments, it is simply to consider what has been said since the beginning of this debate, rather than to criticise anything which may have appeared in the speech from the Throne delivered by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. It is a matter of surprise to a great many of us that the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) did not see his way clear to have a clause inserted in the speech which could assure us and the country at large of the immediate construction of the Georgian Bay canal. We remember that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) thought it was inopportune to build a Canadian navy, as he said we should immediately begin the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, but this hon. gentleman, whom, if it be not unparliamentary, I would call the Sir John Falstaff of the province of Quebec, does not now show any great sympathy with the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. Has he forgotten his promise? I hope that it is because it is early in the session and that he has not yet made an announcement on the subject, I trust that he will refuse to remain in the government of the Prime Minister if the Prime Minister and his colleagues do not agree to begin at once the construction of that important work.

There was a matter referred to the other day by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville)—labour. Nothing was said in the speech from the Throne about labour. I have had some little to do with labour for the last seven or eight years, in fact since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. I sympathize most sincerely with certain hon. gentlemen seated on the other side of the House in many respects, and especially in respect to the question of patronage. The question of labour is one which necessarily must occupy the attention of every hon. gentleman who has a seat on

the other side of the House, and it certainly occupies the attention of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. I would like to tell hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who must be bothered about patronage, that there is an easy way out of all those difficulties. I am sure that they will believe that I am sincere and that they will give me credit for having had some little experience of my own. Do not give all your attention and thought, as you are doing, to the manufacturers, the trusts, the combines and the mergers of this country, but give some thought to the question of labour. As our shanties are being further removed from our great industrial centres it necessarily follows that there will be a greater demand for labour from the labouring classes during the winter months. I am extremely sorry to see that hon. gentlemen have taken it upon themselves to forget the elementary principles of Christian charity and, untrue to all the principles which they advocated when they sat upon this side of the House, when they told us that patronage should be removed from politics, that it should be placed under a commission, that a man's politics should not in any way be a disqualification for a position in the government, I find that the hon. gentlemen, the day after they found themselves in the majority, forgot the season of the year, forgot the poor fathers of families, and threw them out on the street without giving them a chance of finding any work for the long winter months. I commend labour to the consideration of the government, and I give them my assurance that for any measure which they bring in in the interest of labour I will forget the party with which I am allied and will give them my earnest support.

There is another question which has been bandied about in this country in the last few days that I would like to take up in as delicate a manner as I possibly can. That is the question of race and the question of religion. It has been said that during the last campaign racial and religious appeals were made in this country. It does seem to me that there is in this country too much provincialism and not a sufficient amount of Canadian sentiment. Certain hon gentlemen forget the purpose for which confederation was entered into, and to hon. gentlemen opposite, more especially to my good Nationalist friends, if there are any left on the other side of the House, I would commend the reading of the history of Sir John A. Macdonald and of Sir George Etienne Cartier. Appeals to race and religion are very dangerous. I was somewhat of a victim to them myself during the last campaign, and I propose to speak openly upon this subject to-day. Why should we make such appeals? What good is there in it? I speak the English language, it is my language, and I am glad to say that I understand the French tongue. Let hon. gentlemen opposite study the French character a little more. If they would inquire a little more into conditions in the province of Quebec, if they would go amongst the French Canadians, if they would study the Acts which guarantee the French Canadians their rights, notably the Act of 1774, the treaty of Paris of 1763, aye, and the British North America Act, they would find that our French Canadian friends ask for no more, and certainly no less, than what has been guaranteed to them by these Acts. There may be differences of opinion, because it is only human nature to have differences of opinion. Why then not understand that a French Canadian citizen is as loyal to his country and as loyal to the British Empire as we are? Why these appeals during the last election against my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on account of his race and religion? You, Mr. Speaker, after your long career in parliament, are setting the good example of the study of the French language. I cannot commend too strongly to every hon. gentlemen in this House, who does not know it, the necessity of studying the French language. The French are here to remain, they are here under the security of constitutional Acts, and they will have all the rights which are guaranteed to them by the British North America Act, and which we on the Liberal side of the House are conserving to them.

Why then should gentlemen make appeals against them on account of their race and religion, and why in every school of this Dominion should not the French language be taught to their children? Let me say a word to my very good friend the Minister of Public Works. I am not a believer in the Darwinian theory of evolution, but I never saw a case of evolution so clearly proved to the people of this country as the Minister of Public Works evolving from an extreme Nationalist to an ultra-imperialist for the sake of a portfolio. I do not want to be hard on the Minister of Public Works; I know that the road he will have to travel from this out in the province of Quebec will be sufficiently difficult. I want to treat him as gently as I naturally would treat any hon. gentleman opposite, even the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The Minister of Public Works went through the province of Quebec last election educating the youth of our universities and colleges everywhere he met them against the iniquities of the naval policy. The cry everywhere in the province of Quebec used by the Minister of Public Works and his friends was: 'a bas la marine; we want no navy.' The Minister of Public Works said there were other expenditures more necessary, and to-day we have the member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Rainville) who is

apparently not satisfied with the present stand of his leaders upon the navy question. I want to point out the very noble stand taken by the Minister of Public Works upon this question. He says, as reported in this year's 'Hansard' page 245:

I am confident that the leader of the government has taken the view of this question which should be taken. Notwithstanding its gravity, its importance, its seriousness he will know how to solve it, for no man is better qualified to do it than he is himself.

Couple that with his words in the city of Hull when he said that the Prime Minister was of a sympathetic nature and would no doubt handle the naval question all right. Couple that with his answer to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux): we played the game and we are here and you are there. I regret the absence of the Minister of Public Works from his seat this afternoon, but I would like to ask him were he present if that is the attitude the people of Quebec were led to believe he and his Nationalist friends would take when they were returned to this House? No; these gentlemen gave to the province of Quebec the solemn assurance that they would hardly be a day in this House before they would introduce legislation against the naval policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. But to-day the Minister of Public Works tells us he is in favour of the navy, and that his only objection is that under the naval policy of the late government the ships were not big enough and the guns were not heavy enough. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) also told us that he and his friends would not choose a time of danger as a time when they should consider the relations existing between the mother country and this country. Let me refer for a moment to what was said by one of the Nationalists printed in a paper published in the county I have the honour to represent and published purposely for the last election, and which was paid for I have no doubt by the money that came from the trusts and mergers of this country, and we have some few of them in the county of Wright. One of the candidates of the Minister of Public Works laid down their policy on the naval question in these words:

I am in favour of helping England by every reasonable means in case England is in danger.

That was the attitude taken the other day by the Minister of Public Works; In case England is in danger he will consider our relations to her but not sooner. This gentleman continued to say:

I declare myself opposed to the naval policy as established by the Laurier government.

Hon. Mr. PELLETIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is the Postmaster-General also opposed to the naval policy?

Mr. PELLETIER. Of the late government?

Mr. DEVLIN. The only naval policy we have at the present day.

Mr. PELLETIER. That is the policy of the late government.

Mr. DEVLIN. The only naval policy we have at the present day.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am dead against it.

Mr. DEVLIN. Have you any other substitute?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes, wait until you see.

Mr. DEVLIN. Wait until that rum comes from British Guiana that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is going to bring in. This paper continues, and I translate from the French:

A vote for Laurier is a vote for the decadence of the French language in the west. A vote against Laurier does not mean a vote for a contribution and for an Imperial navy. Mr. Borden himself in spite of his offer of contribution recognizes the right of the people to be consulted.

That is some of the policy of the Nationalist party, but there is a little more:

Why vote against Laurier? Because he has betrayed the constitution and the traditions of all parties. Because, when giving constitutional life to the west he should have protected the rights guaranteed by the constitution. With his prestige and his majority when you gave him the power to do so, he did not stand by his duty. Because, he, in choosing between right and fanaticism put his power at the service of sectarian hatred against right and justice; because he should have defended Canada against Imperialism and he betrayed Canada to Imperialism. For Laurier we have forgotten the humiliation of our brothers in the west; for Laurier we have submitted to the entry of Sifton into the cabinet; for Laurier we have forgotten the participation of Canada in the murdering of the Boers.

These are some of the remarks that were made by the Nationalists during the last election campaign. Then, what do you think when I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there was spread throughout my county on the eve of the election a circular offering $1,000 reward to any man who could prove that I did not vote against every proposal for the establishment of the French as an official language in the new provinces, and the Catholic religion upon the same footing as other religions That will show you, Sir, some of the efforts which were made by our friends opposite to attain

that delightful position they occupy now, and which we on this side of the House do not envy them at all.

My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) said the other day that we on this side were the cause of French-Canadians in the Northwest Territories not having the right to recognition by the state of their language and religion. Will you, Mr. Speaker, permit me to review this question, as it is one in which you must be greatly interested, and as it is well we should all know just how it came about that the French Canadians in the Northwest Territories lost the use of their language in the legislature there. I must apologize to the House for referring to this matter, but I think I have ample justification in the fact that it was the chief argument used in the county of Wright to defeat me, and I think, therefore, it is well that the electors in the province of Quebec should be reminded of the attitude taken by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) upon this question of the use of the French language. In 1877, under the McKenzie government, a Bill was introduced establishing the use of the French language in the territories. In 1890, when a Conservative government was in power, a Bill was introduced by the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy providing for the abolition of the French language. Then an amendment to Mr. McCarthy's measure was introduced which read as follows:

> That this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be resolved that it is expedient the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories should be authorized to deal with the subject of the Bill by legislative enactment after the next general election in the territories.

Mr. Beausoleil, then a member of this House on the Liberal side, moved on Feb. 12, an amendment for the continuance of the dual language. His amendment was voted down and the question was referred to the Northwest Territories for their decision. The Conservatives were then in power in the Dominion. In 1892 the Conservative party was also in power in the Northwest Territories, under the leadership of Mr. Haultain, and that party then and there abolished the dual language. Yet we had the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) coming into the province of Quebec and telling the French electors that we on this side voted for the abolition of the French language in the Northwest Territories and appealing to them to see that we were not again elected to this House. Let me tell the hon. minister that in making such a statement and such an appeal he went entirely outside the fact. Let me go one step further, let me point out that when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) who poses in the House as the apostle of the French language and the Catholic religion, had the opportunity to stand up for the very language of which he professes to be so ardent a champion, he utterly failed to take advantage of it. In 1896 there was in the estimates a small item of $2,000 for the printing of statistics in the French language. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), not then expecting that in the course of evolution he would become a full-fledged cabinet minister, stood up in his seat and said that the printing of statistics in French was a piece of extravagance because every hon. member from the province of Quebec understood the English language. That statement regarding representatives from the province of Quebec was perfectly true, but that was no reason why the use of the French language should be discontinued in our blue-books, or why it should not be continued, even to the printing of a comma, in our statistics.

I should like to pay the Minister of Public Works a compliment, as I know he would to me under similar circumstances. I would say that he is the most consistent man I know of. If any one in this House thinks the Minister of Public Works is inconsistent, let me dispel that opinion. But if he is consistent, it is in the sense used by the poet when he said:

> Consistency thou art a mule.

My hon. friend swallowed every principle which he advocated in the last campaign. I hope, for his own sake, that he did not do it in order to obtain a seat in the cabinet. He does not need a seat in the cabinet. I hope he was actuated by higher motives, and I hope that some hon. gentlemen opposite, who fought the fight for the Conservative party, will not believe that he did it for the sake of a seat in the cabinet. But in paying this little compliment to the Minister of Public Works, I would like to say to him that when he uses the name of Sir George Etienne Cartier as one of the authorities from whom he has taken his political principles, he has gone to the wrong book, because Sir George Etienne Cartier was not a man who ever shirked any responsibility, no matter how grave. Sir George Etienne Cartier always had the courage of his convictions. If the Minister of Public Works and other hon. gentlemen who have seats in the cabinet and who advocated every Nationalist principle in the last campaign—if these men have made an honourable entry into this cabinet, why do they not stand up as men and tell us what was the arrangement made between the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Borden) and themselves under which they entered this cabinet? The Minister of Public Works and these other Nationalist ad-

vocates condemned every other member of the present cabinet from the Prime Minister down. They denounced the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), who is perhaps one of the ablest men in the cabinet to-day. Let the hon. Minister of Public Works tell us why they condemned the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Militia, and practically every minister in the cabinet except the one who was taken from the Liberal ranks. They could not very well condemn him. No one can condemn the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) just at present. Sir, I think it is one of the greatest compliments that could be paid the Liberal party in Canada that the First Minister was forced to go into the ranks of that party to find a gentleman competent to control the purse strings of the Dominion treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with a word about reciprocity. How that poor word has been bandied about the country. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke very strongly against reciprocity, and apparently got very angry with me the other day, because I had suggested to him that he had made sundry little trips to Washington to obtain reciprocity. It was not disloyal then. It was not disloyal for the Conservative party at different periods, or before the Conservative party. It was not disloyal to have reciprocity with the United States in 1854. It was not disloyal for Sir John Macdonald in 1878 to adopt the National Policy in order to force the Americans to give us reciprocity. It was not disloyal in 1869 for Sir John Rose to go to Washington to get reciprocity. It was not disloyal in 1888 for Sir Charles Tupper to go to Washington for reciprocity. It was not disloyal in 1891 for the present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the late Sir John Thompson and Sir Mackenzie Bowell to go to Washington to get reciprocity. It was not disloyal for the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to include reciprocity in his tariff of 1894, and if it had not been that the Liberals had succeeded in getting the promise of reciprocity in natural products from the United States, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to-day, if he had anything to do with the tariff of this country, would be one of the first to include reciprocity in that tariff. But we are going to have reciprocity; we are going to have reciprocity with British Guiana. Of course, it is a little early in the day to ask hon. gentlemen opposite what we shall get from British Guiana. Being of a somewhat inquisitive mind I looked the other day to find what are the natural products of British Guiana, and I found that timber is one. Surely the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not going to British Guiana for timber. Dye-wood is another. Surely he is not going to British Guiana for dye-wood. The other two natural products of British Guiana are rum and sugar. There was a suspicion in this country that the Minister of Trade and Commerce would be quite satisfied with the rum traffic of this country without going for rum to British Guiana. I know he is a temperance advocate. I do not think anybody would accuse him of being addicted to rum, and I do not think anybody in this country wants more rum that we have, and I have no doubt the Minister of Trade and Commerce will tell us why he found it necessary to put in the mouth of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, not rum, but a statement of the means by which we could get more rum. We on this side of the House look with great pleasure at this immense plank in the government's platform dealing with reciprocity with British Guiana, and I have no doubt that when the people of this country realize that they have set aside the late right hon. the Prime Minister for the policy we have before us now, they will be greatly surprised that they voted against us on the 21st of September.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say this in conclusion, and I say it earnestly and sincerely: Hon. gentlemen need not place too much faith upon the appeals by which they won the last election. Any man who tells me that anti-reciprocity carried the day tells me something that I have not yet been able to grasp. I would like to hope that it was reciprocity that defeated the late government on the 21st of September. I had thought that in the province of Quebec the naval question had a good deal to do with the defeat of the government, until I heard the hon. Minister of Public Works say no, that they are in favour of building ships, and that it was only after his visit to Fortress Monroe that he discovered that our ships were not big enough and had not big enough guns, that he decided to come back and oppose the naval policy of the government, and advocate the building of bigger ships and bigger guns. Hon. gentlemen opposite will have to place bigger planks in their platform than those in the speech from the Throne if they want to hold the confidence of the people of this country; and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am not so much attached to any political faith that I will not give to hon. gentlemen opposite, what they did not give to us when we sat on that side of the House, a fair fighting chance. I for one will give them my most earnest support whenever they bring in any measure which I believe to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It will be an awful change.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, you know, this is the age of changes. We will support His Majesty's government in carrying out a

policy which will inure to the benefit of Canada. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) the other day referring to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) said that he was a Nationalist, Why, it seems to me that in this House we are or we ought to be all Nationalists in the true sense of the word. If the word means patriotism, then surely we are Nationalists. If the word means anything, it means patriotism, and I do not think there is a man in this House, and there certainly is not a man in the province of Quebec, who is not imbued with the truest sentiments of patriotism towards Canada and Canada as a part of the British Empire. The cry of disloyalty is misplaced in this country, and if hon. gentlemen who call themselves Nationalists study the programme of the Liberal party of Canada, they will find that we are all true Nationalists in this country, imbued with the one idea of building up a Canada of which we shall feel proud, and which will always lend strength to the British Empire. There is no other sentiment in this country, and when hon. gentlemen opposite abandon petty little appeals against the right hon. leader of the Liberal party, I am sure that he will be the first to give them his assistance in carrying out all measures which will tend to the advancement of the people of this country.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I trust that I shall be forgiven if I decline to wander through the wilds of fancy, fiction and irrelevancy, through which this House has been dragged during the last seven or eight days, and come down to the more prosaic, but I hope not less useful task of considering the question before the House. Let me remind the House that we are called together by an official notice for the despatch of business, and would any one who has looked down on the proceedings of this House for the last week believe that 221 selected representatives of the people, supposed to be the ablest men the people could call to this Chamber to discharge their duties by considering those matters and legislating in those directions which are for the true interests of the people of this country, had spent eight days here without doing one single cent's worth of good.

Let me remind the House of the position we are actually in. A motion was made a week ago to-day for an address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I fully recognize the constitutional right of any and every member at such a time to bring before the House any grievance, to call the attention of the government to any matter of moment to which he may consider it proper to call attention. But we must not forget, despite these rights, that we are called here for the despatch of business, and so far, nothing has been said by the opposition to show that any fault exists in anything that is in the speech from the Throne. Therefore, I think we are entitled to assume that the speech from the Throne, so far as it goes, meets the views of the opposition. But the opposition have not said anything to show that they find any fault with the speech from the Throne with regard to anything that is omitted, because this amendment, to which I will come in a moment, does not find fault with the speech from the Throne on account of anything contained therein, or omitted therefrom, but brings up an entirely new and different matter. And so, Sir, after a week's debate, we find that this House is satisfied with the bill of fare presented by the government in the speech from the Throne.

Under such circumstances, when the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the opposition to-day after so many years' occupancy of the place of leader of the government, comes before the House with an amendment, one would surely be justified in supposing that he would have taken the trouble to consider the subject he is bringing before the House and would have brought before us a motion that hon. members could consider without derogation of their own dignity or waste of the time of the House. I am sorry, very sorry, that the right hon. gentleman is unable to be in his place to-day. But that shall not prevent me from calling attention to two stubborn facts. In the amendment which he has moved there is first a statement of fact and then a proposition of law. Now, the statement of fact is false or it is true, the statement of law is sound or it is childish. I do not need to go very far to find that the statement of fact is not accurate and the statement of law is not sound.

What is the statement of fact upon which the right hon. gentleman has based the amendment which has been the occasion for this whole week's waste of time? He quotes a resolution passed by this House on the 29th March, 1909, a resolution passed under circumstances to which I adverted last session and which I shall not take time to advert to again to-day. But a copy of the principal clause, the one on which the naval policy of the government was based, is given as follows:

> The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service.

And yet, Sir, there is no such clause in the resolution of the 29th March, 1909. Would it be believed?—the right hon. gentleman has put in his amendment a statement of a clause of a resolution passed in this House on a certain day, when, as a matter of fact such a clause is not con-

tained in any resolution passed by this House on that or any other day. Let me read what really was passed by this House on the date referred to, the 29th March, 1909:

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote a speedy organization of a Canadian naval service——

So far, correctly quoted. But there is no stop there, not even a comma, and the resolution goes on:

—in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

A wonderfully different sentence, a sentence which, if introduced into this amendment would have made absolutely nugatory every word stated in that amendment. Yet it is a sentence part of which it is deemed necessary to cite in order to give even the pretext of a shadow of excuse for bringing this amendment before the House. Let me call attention to this clause which the right hon. gentleman has so mangled and misquoted in the amendment before us. This clause declares that the Canadian naval service is to be in co-operation with and close relation to the Imperial navy along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference. In order to understand that, we need to know what the Admiralty did suggest at the last Imperial Conference. I can inform the House as to that from the original blue-book giving the reports of that Conference. On that occasion, Lord Tweedmouth, the head of the Admiralty, said:

I know that you gave to the government and to the Admiralty, with a free and unstinting hand, the help that you thought you could manage to give. Gentlemen, I have only one reservation to make, and in making it I ask that, as we have proved ourselves successful in the past, you should put your trust in us now. The only reservation that the Admiralty desires to make is, that they claim to have the charge of the strategical questions which are necessarily involved in naval defence, to hold the command of the naval forces of the country and to arrange the distribution of ships in the best possible manner to resist attacks and to defend the empire at large, whether it be our own islands or the dominions beyond the seas. We thoroughly recognize that we are responsible for that defence. We want you to help us in that defence. We want you to give us all the assistance you can, but we do not come to you as beggars; we gladly take all that you can give us, but at the same time if you are not inclined to give us the help that we hope to have from you, we acknowledge our absolute

obligation to defend the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

That is what the Admiralty wanted—contributions from the various parts of the empire, in money or in ships, but a navy over which the Admiralty was to have supreme control. Is that the naval policy referred to by the right hon. gentleman, adopted by this House in 1909 and carried out by the late government? Why, Sir, it is a sheer abuse of language, a travesty of justice, to claim that there is any connection between the proposal of the Admiralty asking for a navy along the lines indicated and the navy that would have been foisted on the country by hon. gentlemen opposite had they remained longer in power. But the Admiralty spoke further. Let us see what Canada's position was. Lord Tweedmouth at this conference further said:

I have here a statement of the subsidies which in the past have been given by the various colonies. Australia gives £200,000; New Zealand, £40,000; Cape Colony, £50,000; Natal, £35,000; Newfoundland, £3,000; in all £328,000. . . . We are quite ready to enter into any arrangements with the colonies that may seem most suitable to them and which may seem to bring advantages to the navy, and advantages to the colonies themselves.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that in the list of contributories the name of Canada does not appear. Again at page 470: Lord Tweedmouth lays down in plain language where Canada was and what Canada was undertaking to do, and it was along these lines that this precious navy was to be founded and carried out:

There is at present no proposition from Canada to make any change at all, but I think it is proposed that matters shall go on very much as they have gone on, except that the Canadian representatives announce that they are anxious to do all that they can to expand the interests in the navy throughout the Dominion, and in that way think that they will really be giving a great help to the empire as a whole.

Here is where Canada shines: 'The Canadian representatives announce that they are anxious to do all that they can to expand the interest in the navy throughout the Dominion.'

But, you see, the navy that we were to develop was never along the lines as laid down by the Admiralty at the conference in 1907. That which was accepted by the Admiralty, as voiced by the head of the Admiralty, Lord Tweedmouth, was that Canada would do her best 'to expand the interest in the navy throughout the Dominion.' That was the sum total of the contribution that this great overseas Dominion was willing to make.

As if put to the matter beyond peradventure, at the close of the conference Dr. Smartt moved a resolution that it seems to

me any man with one spark of loyalty or one drop of patriotic blood, or even with a spark of self-respect might support. Dr. Smartt moved:

That this Conference recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make——

And now what were we to do?

—such contributions towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures— the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the Admiralty, and as would best accord with the varying circumstances.

Can you imagine any resolution proposed at any conference of imperial statesmen that would seem less open to criticism than the resolution I have just read, a resolution which commended itself to every statesman present save the representative of Canada, the right hon. gentleman who moved this amendment and who said as soon as Dr. Smartt took his seat:

I am sorry to say that so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution.

The chairman said:

I think it is a pity to pass the resolution if it is not unanimous.

Dr. SMARTT—I should like very much to hear the opinions of the representatives of the other portions of the empire.

Mr. DEAKIN—I have no hesitation in entering into the discussion if desired; but if we are not going to pass the resolution, is it worth while?

Dr. SMARTT—I think it is a great pity we do not pass something. We have done so much in the way of pious affirmation, that I am anxious we should do something of a practical character.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—It can be passed if there is a majority. For my part I must vote against it.

Sir JOSEPH WARD—To do any good we would require to be unanimous about it.

Dr. SMARTT—Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL—It is not much good to have a resolution at all if we cannot be unanimous.

CHAIRMAN—I think we had better not proceed any further just now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—We, of the different dominions beyond the seas, have tried to be unanimous up to the present time. I am sorry to say this is a question upon which we could not be unanimous. Therefore, Dr. Smartt can move it if he chooses or withdraw it. But if he presses it I should have to vote against it.

Dr. SMARTT withdrew the resolution.

There is the right hon. gentleman then finding fault with this resolution and now stating the most absurd doctrine of constitutional law in support of his amendment to the address, and who in 1909 moved the very resolution whose terms I have read committing this House to a fanciful scheme which could no more be carried out than the vessels built under it could be made to sail north by south. I think I have shown then that the alleged statement of fact in this amendment moved by the right hon. the leader of the opposition is absolutely contrary to the facts as laid down in the resolution of March 29, 1909. Based on this so-called statement of fact the right hon. gentleman goes on to say in his amendment:

We respectfully submit to your Royal Highness that it is a fundamental principle of constitutional government that the advisers of the Crown shall be heartily in accord on all important questions of public policy, and that the inclusion, by the Prime Minister, in the present cabinet, of members holding diametrically opposite views on a question of the highest importance to the Dominion and to the empire is contrary to the well understood principles of responsible government and should not receive the approval of the House.

That is to say, the proposition is laid down, for the first time in the history of any parliament in the British Empire, that the advisers of the Crown shall be heartily in accord on all important questions of public policy. What enemy of the right hon. gentleman, behind his back, ever drew up such an amendment as this and induced the right hon. gentleman, without having read it—because I am sure if he had read it he would not have committed his reputation to it—to bring it before this House. Imagine such an impossible doctrine as that the advisers of the Crown must be heartily in accord on all important questions! I wonder if the hon. gentleman ever heard of a coalition government—I am not saying that this is one. We know that the Crimean war was fought out under a coalition government. Does the right hon. gentleman say that the members of that government agreed on all important questions of public policy? Does he remember the history of this country when, in order to form a union of the four provinces, it was necessary to bring in men from all parties to form the first government as a coalition government. Does any one suppose that Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. George Brown, were, to quote his words, 'Heartily in accord on all important questions of public policy?' Is not the very statement of historical fact enough to show the utter absurdity of the proposition laid down by the right hon. gentleman? Does the right hon. gentleman not know, apart from coalition governments, that in every government there are a number of questions that are allowed to be open questions? Some members may be astonished when I

read a list of the questions that have been held to be open questions by governments in the motherland. I quote from Todd at page 404:

Since unanimity in the cabinet has become an acknowledged rule, such great questions as parliamentary reform, the ballot, the abolition of the slave trade, Roman Catholic emancipation, free trade, hours of labour in factories, marriage with a deceased wife's sister, women's disabilities, household franchise in counties, and the Public Worship Regulation Bill, with other minor matters, have severally been considered as 'open questions' by some administrations, though not by others.

There we have a great number of questions of the utmost importance which were held to be open questions and upon which, according to this amendment, all advisers of the Governor General should be in accord.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The author speaks of them as minor questions.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Let us not have any misunderstanding. The list is:

Parliamentary reform, the ballot, the abolition of the slave trade, Roman Catholic emancipation, free trade, hours of labour in factories, marriage with a deceased's wife's sister, women's disabilities, household franchise in counties and the Public Worship Regulation Bill, with other minor matters have severally been considered as 'open questions' by some administrations, though not by others.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And other minor matters.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Minor in comparison with the matters on which the government must be unanimous, but these are the style of questions that are allowed to be open questions.

It is laid down in Anson just how far a government has to be in accord, and I am not for a moment pretending to say that the advisers of the Crown on all occasions can go each his own way, apart from the others; the advisers of the Crown can have as many opinions as members of the opposition and they have a perfect right to these opinions, but when the advisers of the Crown come to advise the Crown or to lay a Bill before this House, then there must be unanimity; but until they do either of these things they may have as diverse views as they see fit.

If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to read the speech from the Throne they will not find one single reference therein to any naval policy that the government is committed to. Therefore, the members of this House have a perfect right in the meantime to differ as much as they like with regard to the naval policy, and such a position is no contravention of any constitutional law or usage. It is contrary to the custom and practice of England that they should be held up before His Royal Highness the Governor General, as being unworthy of the positions which they occupy, because they differ, if they do differ, on matters as to which they have not so far given any advice to the Crown, and as to which they have not brought any question before this House.

I do not intend to go into the various questions which have been discussed by different members here in view of the stand which I have taken that the time of this House is being wasted by a discussion which is certainly out of place. I am content with having called attention to the fact that we have spent a week discussing an amendment to a motion, which is in order, which provides for an address in reply to the speech from the Throne, as to which no fault can be found as to its contents or omissions, and that the amendment lays down an untrue statement of fact and a proposition of law for which no countenance will be found in any work on constitutional law, or the practice of any legislative assembly.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who has just taken his seat, that it is perhaps unwise to occupy the time of this House at very much greater length in discussing the resolution which is before the House at the present time. But I do feel, Sir, that I should have something to say on this resolution, and on matters which are of interest to the members of this House as well as to the people generally in view of the verdict of the people, which has lately been rendered, and the position which I took on the question which was the matter in dispute between the different parties in that election. I occupy a rather unique position, perhaps, from the fact that I differed from my party associates on the question of reciprocity, living as I did in a border constituency having the great city of Buffalo practically as an open market for the people of the county of Welland, if reciprocity had been adopted. From that fact, I think, I should have something to say at this present moment. My Conservative friends were good enough not to oppose me in that election, and I think very wisely so from their own point of view, because I apprehend they felt they would probably be defeated anyway. But, that was not the question. Reciprocity was the sole issue in the election, and as I was diametrically opposed to that proposition the Conservative party thought fit not to put up a Conservative candidate against me, and I certainly must thank them for their friendly attitude towards me in that particular. Some of my own friends of the Liberal party were anxious to have a candi-

date in the field against me and they had their convention at which the principles of reciprocity were discussed at very considerable length, and a considerable agitation was got up to bring out a candidate. I can say very frankly that there was a very strong effort on the part of my political associates and friends to induce me to change my attitude on that question, and to adopt the policy of the Liberal party. Many of my strong supporters and friends approached me on that question and urged me to change my attitude, but I felt that I could not do so. I told them that, no matter what they might think of me, if I had to change my attitude on that question upon which I had felt so strongly, I would despise myself. I maintained the position which I held and the result was that I was elected by acclamation. It was believed by many, I apprehend, that I had completely gone over to the Conservative party. I know that my good and esteemed friend, the 'Globe' newspaper, suggested that I would be on the government benches no matter who succeeded in the election, but I am proud to know that I have always been a Liberal and that I always intend to remain a Liberal. I felt that I perhaps had about as many bad habits as I should have without adding to the number by joining the Conservative party. I know that some of my fellow prodigals who left the Liberal party in that campaign have remained in the Conservative party—ostensibly the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White). Well, I am quite satisfied with the action he has taken, but I am not absolutely certain that it was altogether a free action on his part. I think that there were some other matters appertaining to his change of political attitude which have not been brought fully to the attention of the people. The present Minister of Finance was always a strong Liberal. He stated before his constituents that he had no expectation of being Finance Minister, much less a member of the government, and in that I quite agree with him. He was manager of a trust company in the city of Toronto which was controlled by Mr. Flavelle, Sir Wm. Mackenzie, Sir Edmund Walker and by Mr. Z. A. Lash, of the noble eighteen who signed the manifesto. I do not know that it is a fact, but I believe it to be a fact—I have no doubt of it in my own mind—that these gentlemen produced the currency with which to carry the elections, and they dictated to the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), who his Finance Minister should be. I think that these gentlemen said to Mr. Borden when he was in Toronto: We will produce the money necessary to carry this election, but we must name the Finance Minister. We will not stand for that old gentleman, Mr. Geo. E. Foster. That, I think is absolutely what happened, and I think that the present Minister of Finance was forced into the position without his knowledge, because he had to obey the suggestions of the managers of his trust company.

I was not opposed to the reciprocity agreement on the ground of sentiment. I never believed, as I stated in this House, that the carrying of the reciprocity agreement, and placing it upon the statutes of Canada would bring about any feeling of disloyalty in the hearts of the Canadian people. I did not believe it would bring about any idea of annexation in the hearts of the Canadian people. I have too much confidence in the loyalty of the citizens of Canada to believe that any trade agreement between Canada and the United States would cause them to swerve from that loyalty which they have always and will always maintain. It was on economic grounds entirely that I opposed the reciprocity agreement. I felt that as the Democratic party in the United States had obtained the majority in Congress on the distinct policy that they were to reduce the tariff on agricultural products and food stuffs, that the Democrats would take the duty off Canadian agricultural products or so reduce it as to be sufficient for the people of Canada without our making any disturbance in our fiscal arrangements. That was the principal reason why I opposed the reciprocity agreement. But, Sir, that is a question which it is not necessary for us to enter into now, because reciprocity was defeated at the polls by a large majority. Whether or not it will ever be brought up again is a problem. It is possible that it may. For fifteen years the Liberals governed Canada and controlled its affairs so successfully that at the end of that period the Conservatives said that because everything was so prosperous we should not make a change. The chief argument of the Conservative party at the last election was: Leave well enough alone; Canada is so prosperous, and we are doing so well that we cannot now afford to make a change. And the people of Canada believed that and said: Under Liberal rule we have made such rapid progress in the development of this great country and its resources and in the accumulation of revenue that we should not and will not make a change. Well, what a difference. The Conservatives say that the policy of the last Liberal government was the policy inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878, and I am free to admit that it was practically the same policy. That policy had been in force under Conservative rule for eighteen years; it had been the play on the political stage for eighteen years with Mr. George E. Foster as the chief actor, and at the end of that eighteen years every person in

Canada, Conservatives as well as Liberals, was crying for reciprocity. And so, Sir, I say that it is possible that there may again be a cry for reciprocity if our friends on the treasury benches remain long enough in power to get things into such utter confusion as they were during the eighteen years they were previously in power. That is the only possible reason that reciprocity will ever be brought up again, but that is not at all a probability because I doubt exceedingly that our friends opposite will remain in power for a sufficient length of time to so disturb the financial affairs of this country that the people will desire reciprocity.

Now, there are some matters spoken of in the speech from the Throne with which I am in full and perfect accord. It states that the importance of providing our country with better highways is manifest, and if any scheme can be devised by this government whereby a system of better highways throughout Canada can be established, I, for my part, would be very glad indeed. One of the greatest needs of our country for the farmers as well as for the business men is an improved system of good roads, but it appears to me that this is a matter more for the provincial governments and legislatures and the municipalities than it is for the federal government. So far as this government can do it, I am in accord with that policy. It is also stated in the speech from the Throne that an effort will be made towards bringing the terminal elevators under government control, and I wish the Minister of Railways and Canals were in his seat while I am speaking on this question. I think the government can very properly and under proper advisement take this question altogether out of the political arena. The government elevator already in operation at Port Colborne is an example of successful operation to which we can point with pride. The government elevator at Port Colborne has been in operation for two years; the first year little was done at it because it was finished late in the season, but during the past year something over seven million bushels of grain will have passed through that elevator, and the government will have made a profit over and above all expenses of between eighteen thousand and twenty thousand dollars. I direct the Minister of Railways and Canals to the fact that it is his duty to complete that elevator to its full capacity of two million bushels at the earliest possible date. We have, in the speech from the Throne a reference to the best route to the Hudson Bay and that may or may not be a good proposition.

But what I more particularly complain of is what is left out of the speech from the Throne. I think that the government should have put in it a proposition for the immediate enlargement of the Welland canal. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), who comes from Toronto, knows full well that every citizen of that city desires the immediate enlargement of the Welland canal. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) is also strongly in favour of that scheme, and I think that this government ought to take steps at the first possible moment to enlarge that canal to a depth of 25 feet. All the shipping interests demand it, and the longer that work is delayed the longer will the interests of Canada suffer. I regret, therefore, exceedingly that the government did not think fit to put in the speech from the Throne any reference to this great improvement, and have not immediately set about enlarging the Welland canal to a depth capable of accommodating the large upper lake steamers.

But there is another question of great importance left out of the speech from the Throne—one which has been discussed at some considerable length in this debate already, I refer to the naval policy of the present government. Have they a naval policy, or have they not? Sir, no matter how I might have felt towards the Conservative party on their policy in some particulars, I would have felt bound to oppose them on their present attitude regarding the navy. A more weak, uncertain, indefinite position, I never knew men, claiming to be statesmen, to take. The query has been asked in this House: Who was the man that gave way? Was it the First Minister or the Minister of Public Works? What is the position? In 1909 we had a resolution in this House which my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has cited and which has been referred to by other hon. gentlemen in this debate, but which, I think, will bear mentioning again. It will be remembered that in 1909 the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) moved a resolution looking to the formation of a navy, or at any rate the furnishing of aid to the British government in its naval operations. The right hon. the leader of the opposition, who was then First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), moved an amendment which was not satisfactory to the opposition. A suggestion was made by the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Borden) to the effect that certain words should be added to the resolution. Then a conference was held, and as a result of that conference the resolution finally adopted was as follows:

> This House is of opinion that in the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing Dominions the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval or military purposes, would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

That appears to a fairly clear cut proposition, namely, that a contribution by Can-

ada to the British government would not be a satisfactory solution of the problem of naval defence, and that was agreed to by both sides in this House. The resolution then went on:

> This House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy along the lines suggested by the British Admiralty.

Certainly there is no reference to a plebiscite there, nor is there any reference to the building of 'Dreadnoughts'. That resolution was designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy along the lines suggested by the British Admiralty. With that proposition every hon. member of this House was in accord. Every hon. gentleman from the province of Quebec, who is sitting in this House now, and who then, or has since claimed to be a so-called Nationalist, was in favour of it. Every man from the province of Quebec who sits in this House now, and who has been shouting so-called Nationalism from every platform in that province, and from some in the province of Ontario, was in favour of that proposition. The present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) was in favour of it, and told us the other day he voted for it though he was not in the House. He is a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. The Dr. Jekyll personality of him was in the House voting for the proposition, but the Mr. Hyde part of him was in bed endeavouring to devise some scheme whereby he could inflame the minds of the people of the province of Quebec against the proposition which he said he was in favour of. Is that a position which any statesman, which any public man in Canada, should take? I for one would be ashamed to stand up in this House and say that I favoured that resolution, unanimously adopted by this parliament in 1909, and then be responsible for the statements which the Minister of Public Works made in the province of Quebec, and which have been read in this House. Let me quote one of these statements:

> We are against a navy because we have something better to do with our money than buy ships to serve in the conflicts and entanglements of Great Britain.

A voice from the audience cried out: 'What about Borden?' and the hon. minister replied:

> Yes, my friend, I will speak about Borden. I have separated myself from Mr. Borden on that important question.

When did he separate himself from that hon. gentleman. He agreed to the resolution to which in 1909 the then First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the now First Minister (Mr. Borden) gave their support. A few days ago my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) said in this House that he was still in favour of that proposition. But on the occasion to which I refer he said:

> I have separated myself from Mr. Borden on that important question, and will continue to fight the struggle with my friends the Nationalists as long as the battle shall not be won. We are not going to abdicate our rights and principles to support Mr. Borden.

Well, did he abdicate his rights and principles for the sake of a position in the present cabinet?

Is he the man who advocated that, or is Mr. Borden the man? One of the two certainly has done so. Mr. Borden, definitely and emphatically, in speeches in 1909, expressed his approval of the resolution that was passed. The present Minister of Public Works at that time expressed his approval, and now he says he was in favour of it. Is there not a justification for the resolution of the right hon. leader of the opposition, when we have two gentlemen occupying the first positions in this government standing before the people of Canada in diametrically opposite positions? Is it not proper that the right hon. leader of the opposition should bring to the atteention of His Royal Highness the Governor General that there is this divergence of opinion between the members of this cabinet on one of the most important issues before the people of Canada to-day?

But, Sir, they say they will have a plebiscite. The Prime Minister takes into his cabinet three men from the province of Quebec who are distinct Nationalists, who, throughout the whole campaign, were preaching the so-called doctrine of Nationalism, which is a doctrine of un-nationalism, a doctrine, to my mind, if I may be allowed to express the sentiment, strong though it may be, of treason and disloyalty. Men who will stand up before the electors of the province of Quebec, or before the electors of the province of Ontario, and say that the air of liberty cannot be breathed in Canada except through holes shot in British flags, are not loyal Canadian citizens. Men who will stand on the public platforms in the province of Quebec and inflame the minds of the people to the extent that they were inflamed by these gentlemen, whom the Prime Minister has taken into his cabinet, are not men who should sit, not only in the government of Canada, but in the parliament of Canada. We want none of that in Canada. We are willing that people should differ in their opinions, in their political opinions or their religious opinions; but, Sir, we do not want men to stand on the public platform and deliberately misrepresent the condition of affairs, as these gentlemen, I maintain, have done.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GERMAN. I say gentlemen speaking in the province of Quebec. The Prime Minister has taken into his cabinet three men who were diametrically opposed to him and to the Minister of Trade and Commerce on this question of naval defence. But they intimate, though they do not say, that they are to have a plebiscite, that they will refer it to the people of Canada to determine what shall be done. Sir, is that a policy? That is a makeshift; that is an excuse. I doubt, Sir, if in the history of England or of Canada, or of the United States, or of any self-respecting and self-governing country you will find a condition of affairs such as that. On a great question on which all parties in this House, Conservative and Liberal alike, were agreed in 1909 the government will now come to this parliament and suggest that the question be referred to the people of Canada in a plebiscite. I doubt if the people will have confidence in the men who make such a suggestion, and I believe that when they again go before the people they will receive an awakening which will be astonishing.

But, Sir, the hon. leader of the government has even done worse than that. He is proposing to make as deputy speaker of this House one of the men who made these statements throughout the province of Quebec. He is proposing to place in succession to you, Mr .Speaker, a gentleman who has not denied that he made the statements, or at any rate many of the statements, which were recorded of him in 1910.

(Reading.) You are intimidating the people in waving the English flag, and adding that we must contribute always and everywhere to the defence of that tormentor of our constitutional liberties; but we will not be made to forget that in 1837 it was necessary to bore holes in it in order to breathe the atmosphere of liberty.

Mr. BLONDIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that the quotations which he is making were denied, when I was allowed by the House, in answer to the quotations made by the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, to read the article in 'Le Devoir,' which began with these words: 'Mr. Brodeur a public liar.'

Mr. GERMAN. The hon. gentleman said, as reported in 'Hansard' in 1910, that he denied most of these statements. He said:

I did not till to-day have any knowledge of that report, and I can explain it.

And he goes on later to make an explanation in which he repudiates some of the statements, but not all of them. I have never yet heard him say that he did not make the statement that in 1837 it was necessary to bore holes in the British flag in order to breathe the air of liberty. He can deny that at this present moment if he chooses. And, Sir, the hon. leader of the Government is proposing to make that gentleman the Deputy Speaker of this House. Send that to the eighteen ultra-loyal gentlemen in Toronto who signed the reciprocity manifesto, send that to the Orange lodges of the province of Ontario, who are also ultra-loyalists, put that on the desk of the Finance Minister that he may read it every day when he sits down, because he is ultra-loyal—that in succession to the ex-Grand Master of the loyal Orange lodges of Canada is to be made, first his deputy and afterwards his successor, a man who has made these statements on a public platform of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blondin) distinctly to deny the statement; and it is the rule of the House that an hon. member must accept such a denial on the part of an other hon. member. I think the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) is going too far in repeating a statement that has been denied.

Mr. GERMAN. I bow most respectfully to the rule of the chair. But I deliberately asked the hon. gentleman to deny that he made that statement and so he could do it now if he wished to. I have not yet heard him say he did not make the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GERMAN. Now, I will tell the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) this, notwithstanding that I admire many of his personal qualities, that he has tied himself up to a bad crowd. If he is to allow that element in the province of Quebec to dominate his government, he will have a rude awakening when the next general election comes on. The hon. gentleman holds his majority in this House by grace of the electors of the province of Ontario. He has a majority of 62, I think, from that province. The electors of the province of Ontario are intelligent electors—I believe that as to the last election because, very largely, they agreed with me. And they have always been fair to the province of Quebec; we sometimes think that they have been more than generous to the people of Quebec, to their religion, their customs, their laws and their language. But, Sir, I doubt me very much if the electors of the province of Ontario will stand for the Prime Minister taking into and keeping in his government the Nationalistic element which he has been seen to associate himself with. And I believe that if he continues to travel with them in the same conveyance, when the next general election comes on, his political cart will get a jolt that will send him and his Bourassas, his Blondins, and his Monks into political extinction.

Mr. JOHN WEBSTER (Brockville). Mr. Speaker, I almost feel that I owe you an

apology in rising to speak. Should I be so unfortunate as to make use of any unparliamentary expressions, like my hon. friend from Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) I am quite willing to withdraw them. But I desire to refer to a few of the statements I have heard here to which I have listened with a great deal of interest indeed. My experience in parliament is brief; but I must say I am amazed to find so many intelligent men talking so much trash to the people as hon. gentlemen have been talking in this House in the course of this debate. This is my first attempt to address an audience of public men. But I have never seen a lot of public men display so little wisdom as I have seen displayed on the floor of this House so far this session.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is going a little too far and is reflecting upon the House.

Mr. WEBSTER. I withdraw the statement, but the thing is true as I see it from my point of view. Before proceeding farther I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Borden) on being called to his high position. He has been before the public of Canada for some twelve years; and, I have listened with great pleasure to the testimonials offered him by hon. members on both sides. During the debate of the past week I have not found an hon. member pointing the finger of accusation at the leader of the government because of any political crookedness or graft to be charged against him at any time during his public life. When a man possesses such high and sterling qualities as those which our leader has displayed, we cannot wonder that the people of this country demanded when, on the 21st September last, they had an opportunity to declare themselves by their ballots, that he should be the Prime Minister of Canada. To that hon. gentleman I pay my tribute of respect.

And to the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I would say that his native province of Quebec regards his career with justifiable pride. He has been a tower of strength to his party; he has been an ornament to society whilst in public life; and in years to come, I am sure, historians will record in glowing terms his deeds as a public man, and people, of generations to come, will read that record with pleasure and will feel that the right hon. gentleman was a credit to our sister province of Quebec. But I confess that I am a little surprised on coming to this House as a humble follower of my leader to find the right hon. gentleman here as the leader of the opposition. If I remember rightly I read a report of his speech at St. Jerome, Quebec, in which the right hon. gentleman was represented as stating that if he were not elected to lead the government he would retire; that he would not come here to lead the opposition in this House. Certainly that is the way the papers in Ontario reported it. I am very much surprised indeed to find the right hon. gentleman going back on his promise and still remaining with us.

In passing I must pay you a tribute of respect, Mr. Speaker. You have been in public life for a long time, and in view of your reputation and of all that has been said in your praise by previous speakers, I think you have been worthily honoured by your leader in being called to the Chair. And although the right hon. leader of the opposition said that his light was not your light, I hope that yours will long be a beacon light to guide the men of Canada.

Judging from what I have been able to gather in this debate it seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite are pursuing a fishing policy. They are trying to find out what the policy of the present administration is. But they should not for one moment doubt the ability of the Prime Minister and his colleagues to manage the affairs of this country. It seems to me that we have seen much time wasted in discussing the Naval Bill and other things which have been under debate here. Let us join hands together. We are all brothers, we are all Canadians; let us join to develop the resources of this Dominion.

The motto unfurled by the Conservative party to the people of Canada during the last campaign was: Canada for the Canadians—the grandest battle cry ever raised before the people of this country. Why should we give away the resources of this country to a nation that has always been hostile to us? My hon. friend from Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) expressed himself in noble words the other day when he said we should forget these dissensions, these cries of religion and race, and join our hands in making this country the home of one of the grandest nations in the world. We have, beyond doubt, more resources than any other nation. The eyes of the world are upon us to-day, and by her action in rejecting reciprocity on September 21st last, Canada has won the admiration of the whole British Empire. Let us drop all our petty differences and join hands in developing this great country for the people who are to come after us.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) wanted to know the other day why the opposition were there and the government here. It was just because of the fact that the people of this country had lost confidence in the late government, and by their ballot on September 21 last they said to that government: You have been weighed in the balances and found wanting,

and we are going to place you in opposition. I believe that to be the best thing for this country that has ever taken place. There were other reasons for the change in public opinion, one of them being the lack of management of the affairs of this country. The principal want of Canada to-day is a business government composed of business men who will manage the affairs of this country in a business way. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said upon the floor of this House on several occasions that he is not a business man. I am quite willing to agree with him for had he been a business man his record would have been very different from what it is to-day. Let us review some of those unfortunate things that have arisen to prove to the people of this country that he is not a business man. First of all I shall refer to that monument that has been erected in the pillars that mark the proposed site of the Quebec bridge. What has that bridge cost the people of Canada? Nearly half as many dollars as the Liberal party said they would construct the whole National Transcontinental railway for, and what have they got left for that great expenditure of money? They have a monument to mark their own incapability of managing the affairs of this country.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, when this House rose at six'clock I was commenting upon the inability of the late administration to manage the business affairs of this country in a business way. I had just referred to the great loss which was occasioned by the waste of the money placed in that monumental block down on the south side of the majestic river St. Lawrence known as the remnant of the Quebec bridge. Nothing for that great expenditure of money remains but some cement piers with a great many tons of iron and steel far below the surface of the water. I have referred to that, Sir, as a monument to the inability of the late administration. But, there are other monuments on the little hillside to mark the graves of those poor men who went down on that occasion. I would ask you: What has the late administration done for the poor widows and orphans who lost their bread winners when the bridge collapsed? We were told that the treasury was full, that the government had a large surplus on hand, and we know that when the earthquake occurred in the city of San Francisco there was money in the treasury to be voted for the relief of the sufferers; and right it was, Sir. We also know that at the time of the flood in Paris, France, there was money voted in Canada for the relief of the sufferers. We know that the year of the Chinese famine money went forth from Canada to relieve the suffering of those people, but apparently there was no money in the treasury to relieve those widows and orphans who lost their bread winners on that occasion.

Another feature that I would like to refer to, Sir, which marks their career as a non-business administration is the celebrated Newmarket canal. We have heard a lot about building the Georgian Bay canal by the present administration, but if this administration ever attempt to build a canal I will pass my word of honour that the canal which they build will contain much more water than is contained in the Newmarket canal, or the canal which is known as a dry bottom canal. That is one more monument that they have erected to their inability to do business.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will refer to the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. My opponent in the last election in Brockville, printed in the 'Recorder' a table purporting to show that the Grand Trunk Pacific railway would be built at a cost of $13,000,000. The man who made that statement knew just as much about the building of a railway through that great western country as I would about the construction of a railway that would take me to heaven. Another deal that has caused the hearts of the people to change was that put through by the former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) who purchased at a large price some very softly filled wharfs known as sawdust wharfs. That is one more incident I must refer to which marks the inability of that hon. gentleman to do business with the public funds of this country. He also referred to the horse industry down in New Brunswick. I will prove to this House that he knows just as much about the horse business in Canada as he does about the proper filling for wharfs. I shall refer to that later. The unfortunate thing about the late administration was that they thought they were the bosses of the people of this country instead of the servants. When a public man goes out into this world he is no longer his own boss; he is the servant of the people who give him their confidence and place him in the high position of representing them in this House of parliament, and that is one of the reasons why they are there and we are here to-day. These are only a few reasons which I am giving you, but there are lots of others. During the late campaign we heard something about a white plume, and the old cock. That is a very sporty insinuation, and I think that all sports should certainly be good losers, as well as good winners. If our friends opposite have been so unfortunate as to be misguided into thinking that they were the

bosses of the people, and the people, not being children, declared in such an emphatic manner against them on the 21st of September, let them now prove themselves to be dead-game sports, bow to the inevitable and join hands with us who are engaged in endeavouring to build up this country in order that it may occupy the high and proud position which nature intended it would achieve. To-day this Dominion of ours is the star and gem of the empire, and it behooves us as loyal young Canadians to rise in our might and take care of the interests which we must take care of for the people who are going to possess this country when we have passed over to the great beyond.

I would say to you with all the confidence of a man who has been engaged for the last thirty-five years in commercial interests that this country is simply mad with opportunities. If the firmament of heaven were a blackboard and the Rocky mountains were the chalk a man would not have space enough to enumerate all the advantages which we in this young nation possess. Why, Sir, it is beyond the estimate of any man to say what the future possibilities of this country must be. To-day, Sir, in the eyes of the world we hold the highest possible position in the money markets of the world, and those markets, I am proud to say, are in Great Britain and not in the republic to the south of us. We have been told that Canada is writing history. I am quite sure of the fact myself, but if there ever was a large amount of history written in a small space of time it was on that memorable morning of the 7th of February, when this young nation's contingent of soldiers who had gone to the Transvaal to fight for the mother country, by their bold and efficient service, caused Kronje, the lion of the Transvaal, to lay down his arms and do homage to the old Union Jack. That was one of the occasions upon which Canada has written history that will be referred to with pride by the generations which are to come hereafter. I tell you, Sir, that we are the men of the north, and the men of the north have never yet failed in their ability to do justice to any occasion which demanded their attention. It was the same in 1812 when our friends to the south of us thought that Canada could not take care of her own interests. The memorable day that General Brock lost his life is another occasion that every good loyal young Canadian can point to with the finger of pride.

Now, Sir, I am going to take up something that may possibly prove a little pleasanter to you. Let us refer for a few moments to the speech which was made by the Hon. Clifford Sifton upon the floor of this House. The Hon. Clifford Sifton is a gentleman to whom hon. gentlemen opposite were proud to point as being one of the staunchest Liberals in this country. But, like many more of those honest, broad-minded Liberals, men who had travelled, who had experience, who knew what the wants of the country were, he was able to cut the party tie, and to say to his friends that the policy which the late administration had adopted was not the policy for this country. He joined forces with the Conservative party in using his endeavours to conserve the interests of the country in order that the people in the republic to the south of us might not come in here and despoil the heritage that we should preserve for the generations which are to come.

In the past, men have laid down their lives to preserve the empire and to leave this heritage to their children, and following their grand example we of the present day should not be unmindful of our descendants who will come after us. The broad-minded Liberals who in the late campaign left their party to join the forces of the Conservative party and to keep the country in the lines laid down by Macdonald and Cartier at confederation, are men of whose patriotism Canada ought to be proud. In Northern Ontario we have a country so wealthy in minerals that it has produced a sufficient value of silver to pave the streets of every city in that province. That fact alone should encourage us to develop our mineral resources and to cultivate the yet barren soil of our lands so as to supply the men who are engaged in developing these industries and other resources. The establishment of the Hydro-Electric schemes by Sir James Whitney's government has proved of untold benefit to our province. Last year alone ten million dollars less money was paid out in the province of Ontario for coal, which was mostly American product, and saved by the people of this country by the power from the Hydro-Electric scheme having displaced the previous consumption of coal to that extent. The water-power of Niagara Falls has been so developed that the people of the western part of the province are now supplied with cheap power, and that scheme is capable of yet further development. Then, President Taft and the newspaper owners of the United States were most anxious for reciprocity so that they might get their pulp wood and paper from Canada and consequently preserve for some years to come their own supplies in the United States. Well, Sir, the defeat of the reciprocity pact has conserved one of our great natural resources, and we are proud of the fact that we have more timber and more lumber in Canada to-day than are to be found in any other country of equal population. Then, we have marvellous freshwater and saltwater fisheries, which are sufficient to

feed the teeming millions of the empire for years to come, and these we should preserve for our own people. For some days past in this House we have been holding a post-mortem on the dead corpse of reciprocity, and so I may relate how the Liberal orators in Ontario during the election passed through the province telling the farming community that reciprocity would enhance the value of their farm lands from twenty-five to fifty per cent. Let me, by citations from the columns of 'The Country Gentleman,' the oldest agricultural journal printed in America, show the value of farms in the United States where they have that market of ninety millions of people. Compare these prices with the prices that can be obtained for land in this country and you will at once see how much better off the Canadian farmer is than his American neighbour. I read from the issue of the 4th of May:

For Sale—Hudson Valley Fruit Farm, 19 m. below Albany on river road. 100 acres fertile clay loam, machine worked, no stone, well watered, stream and springs, plenty of wood; grows splendid crops of hay, wheat, corn, oats, potatoes and fruit. 400 young, thrifty apple and pear trees just coming to bearing. Large house, fair condition, open fire places, beautiful lawns and shade, magnificent mountain views. Three min. walk to river and school, two minutes to railway station, small barn in good condition, other out buildings fair. Shipping facilities the best. Price $4,000, part cash.

What is there in reciprocity for the Canadian farmer when in the United States you can buy farm lands at that price? Another advertisement reads:

200 ACRES, $3,000,
Stock and Tools Included.

Ten cows, 2 horses, wagons, all machinery and small tools will be included if taken now. 125 acres machine worked fields, grows all crops, spring watered pasture for 50 cows, quantity of timber, large barn, large bearing orchard, also small fruit. Two story 11-room house 65 x 75 barn, other out buildings, pleasantly situated, shaded by 75 sugar maples. Short drive to railroad station. Price only $3,000, $1,000 cash, balance on easy terms. For details of this and other New York farm bargains, see page 14 Strout's Farm Catalogue 34, just out, copy free.

There, in that great market of ninety millions people you can get two hundred acres of land for three thousand dollars. Another advertisement reads:

217 ACRES, FIFTY CATTLE, FOUR HORSES AND MACHINERY INCLUDED.

One of the best dairy farms in New York State's great dairy county, fully equipped for profitable business. Smooth fields, spring and brook-watered pasture for 50 cows, 1,600 cords of wood, lots of timber, 300 barrels of fruit in season. 12-room house with running water, barn, 30 x 70, other barns, 10-room tenant house. Income $3,000 yearly. If taken immediately, 50 head of Holstein cattle, 4 horses, ploughs, harrows, ensilage cutter, cultivator, wagons, harness, dairying utensils, small tools and all crops included. Price for everything only $9,000, half cash. Further details and travelling directions to see this and other big, equipped farms, page 12, Strout's Farm Catalogue 34, the biggest and best farm catalogue ever issued; gives reliable information regarding railroad, schools, climate, soils, crops, markets, &c., in all the leading farming sections of the east. Free.

I have forty or fifty just such advertisements as that, and hon. gentlemen can inspect them if they wish. Then, as to the condition of the milling industry under reciprocity, the Canadian millers told us that they could not compete with the United States millers, because in the pact it was arranged that wheat would enter the United States free, but if you wanted to bring a barrel of flour back into this country to feed your family you had to pay a duty of fifty cents on it.

Then the dairying industry in this country is greater than any other one industry in Canada to-day, and I know from experience that Canadian cheese is the finest cheese imported into the British market. So fine is the quality of our cheese that some unscrupulous dealers have tried to sell it as British manufactured cheese, and only a few years ago the Canadian farmers to protect their own product, had to establish what is know as the 'Bate Brand' in order that Canadian cheese might retain its identiy and to prevent the substitution of an inferior article.

I tell you, Sir, that was simply for the purpose of preventing the American producer of cheese selling his product as Canadians do. It is reported that there were some dealers, in Montreal who, it was reported, bought American cheese and brought it across the St. Lawrence in bond, and then exported it to England as the Canadian product. For that reason the dairymen of Ontario established what is known as the Bate brand. With this result that any man posted in the trade can know to-day that when he is buying Canadian cheese he is getting what he is paying for. But if that reciprocity pact had gone through in the shape in which our hon. friends opposite endeavoured to have it adopted, it would have ruined the butter and cheese industry of this country, in which we have spent forty of the best years of our lives to place it at its present high standard.

For a moment let me draw attention to the horse industry of this country. Let me point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that in the state of Iowa alone there are more horses than we have in Canada from the east of the Great Lakes to the Atlantic ocean. Let me also point out that they are a superior class of horses, because the people in that

state have been breeding from pure stock during the past twenty years. To-day in the states of Iowa and Illinois they turn out the finest draught horses that can be found in any market of the great American republic. I can state in all sincerity that to-day in the state of Illinois you can buy horses 25 per cent cheaper than you can in any of the Northwest provinces of Canada. As evidence of this, let me point out that every American settler who has the privilege of bringing horses into Canada duty free, brings in his full complement, namely, three to every head of a family. What better proof could you have that they can purchase horses at lower rates in the American market than in our Northwest provinces?

I am pleased indeed to see that our leader, the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Borden) in the manifesto he issued, promised to encourage the Canadian farmer who is engaged in the chilled meat industry and our Northwest ranch owner will never come into his rights until that industry is properly protected; and I hope to see the present administration mapping out something along that line this session. We have to-day from the port of Montreal carloads of butter and cheese shipped in refrigerator cars to the far west and these cars in many cases have to come back to the eastern provinces empty. Had we the chilled meat industry put on a proper basis, those cars would come back loaded as they ought to be. I must congratulate our leader on his promise to do something for the rangeman of the west who to-day is compelled to send his cattle to the American market, owing to the lack of proper facilities to handle that trade in our market. What did we see take place in regard to the shipping of American sheep into this country? Last August I had the pleasure of being in the Toronto market and I found there 2,200 lambs brought in from the state of Michigan. With what result? With the result that the Canadian lambs declined in price in the Toronto market fifty cents per 100 pounds. Well, if they can bring in American lambs under a tariff of 25 per cent, and undersell us, what would be the effect on the Canadian sheep industry if they were admitted free of duty as they would be under the reciprocity agreement? That is a question I have never yet heard properly answered. I call wool as it is shorn from the sheep's back a natural product, and under the reciprocity schedule, what duty was Canadian wool to pay going into the United States under this pact? It was to pay 12 cents per pound, in order to protect the wool growers of Idaho and Montana. My experience in that country is that those people spend all their energies in endeavouring to have legislation enacted that may be profitable to the American farmers and not profitable to the Conadians.

Let me now come a little nearer home and speak for a few minutes on the province of Ontario. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) the other day said that in British Columbia there were immense valleys in which you could possibly hide Ontario and two or three other provinces. Well, my hon. friend has not quite realized the vastness of our great province. I would point out to him that Ontario is 750 miles wide and 1,000 miles long, and contains 220,000 square miles and 140,000,000 acres of land and let me tell my hon. friend that only one half of that province has ever been touched by the ploughshare. We have what is known as the great clay belt in the north that will be opened up very shortly, and it is beyond the expectations of the most sanguine man to realize what the results will be when that new section will be brought under cultivation. In Ontario to-day we produce more dollars worth of agricultural products than was raised in the three great grain-growing provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. These are all considerations worthy of your most careful attention. If we should bend our energy to the development and building up of this great country there is no reason why she should not go forward with rapid strides to the attainment of that high position to which she is entitled.

Now as to agriculture we are told that all wealth comes from the ground, and that agriculture consitutes the corner stone of every prosperous nation, whilst manufacturing constitutes the keystone. Now, with those two stones so well and truly laid as they are in this Dominion, she is bound to go on in the future as in the past. Under the policy of the late Sir John Macdonald, known from one end of the country to the other as the National Policy, we have made most rapid strides, and I would here congratulate the opposition on the fact that they have never had the courage of their convictions and seen their way clear to abandon that policy. To-day in Canada we have a home market for say 80 to 83 per ceent of the total products of our soil, and that market we claim is the best market in the world, while England takes 11 per cent of our total agricultural product, which would mean 94 per cent already accounted and contracted for. Why then should we take so many chances to get a market for the remaining six per cent? The 90,000,000 people to the south of us have 13 farmers for every one we have in Canada and are exporting the same products we are sending to the British Empire to-day. I have heard some comments on the

balance of trade recently in this House. The balance of trade proved one of the most interesting subjects of the discussion during the late campaign, and if you will allow me to go into this question of balance of trade for a few moments I have here some figures which I wish to submit for the consideration of gentlemen opposite, showing the result of the trade between Canada and the United States for five years from June, 1905, to June, 1910:

	U.S. sold in Canada.	Canada sold in U. S.	Difference.
Horses..	$14,172,415	$2,549,211	$11,623,204
Cattle	1,578,179	1,293,796	384,403
Meat and dairy products.. ..	17,011,017	904,191	16,106,826
Breadstuffs.. ..	31,596,556	6,679,884	24,916,672

The total value of goods sold by the United States to Canada during those five years was $886,417,276, while the total value of goods in these lines sold by Canada to the United States was $393,913,673, a total balance of trade in favour of the United States for the five years of $492,503,603 in those articles alone. The members of the House who compose the opposition to-day do not tell us how they propose to raise the revenue of this country to take the place of the large amount of revenue which the farmers of the United States are contributing to this country to-day. That is another question that I never heard referred to by any speaker during the whole campaign. I asked my audiences, which were composed principally of farmers, what was going to become of the great farming industry of Canada when we put down these bars and let the Americans ship these goods in without paying that duty of 25 per cent, and no man has answered that question to my satisfaction for me yet.

Now, I listened with a great deal of delight to-day to the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). He said that for anything in which labour in Canada, and in which he was interested, he would immediately hold up his hand; but I will go him one better, and will say that for wherever labour is interested I will hold up both my hands. I stand for labour every day, and I would ask the hon. gentleman, what did the late administration do for labour at the time of the great Grand Trunk strike? I will tell you it was most pitiable on that occasion to see strike-breakers imported from the United States to take the places of honest, hard-working men, and the alien labour laws and the immigration laws of this country winked at. I saw with my own eyes incompetent men running a beautifully-equipped train, known as the fast express on the Grand Trunk railway, who did not know enough about railroading to go through the cars and take up the tickets. It was a disgrace to this country on that occasion to see the soldiers brought out to protect the railroad interests when the labouring men were asking for nothing but their rights, namely, standard wages. This country has dealt most generously with the Grand Trunk railway, and all that these labouring men asked was the standard wage, and it is a discredit to this country that they were treated in such an ungentlemanly manner. I am told that there are still on trains in this country men who were imported at that time, while good, honest, loyal Canadians are walking around with their hands in their pockets. That was the first time we ever had reciprocity in labour in Canada that I can remember.

I listened with great pleasure to my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), when he spoke so eloquently on the transportation problems of Canada. If Canada continues to be inhabited by a progressive and prosperous people, the transportation problem will be one of the most serious problems we shall have to deal with. Only 6 per cent of the soil of the great grain-growing provinces of the west has yet been tickled with the ploughshare. What will the transportation problem be when the other 94 per cent is brought to yield in the same ratio as the present 6 per cent? I tell you we enjoy privileges in this country that we cannot possibly appreciate. A few years ago we had no transcontinental railway, while to-day we have one fully completed and two others partially completed, and it is going to tax the energies of these railways to handle the traffic before the transportation problem is settled satisfactorily. We have the finest system of freshwaterways and canals owned by any nation in the world to-day. I tell you, as a man who has had a great deal of business experience in the republic to the south, that the people over there envy us the advantages we have in our great waterways. The people of the city of Buffalo wept tears of sadness on the night of the 21st of September when they read the message sent to them by the people of Canada. What other nation in the world enjoys the facilities for cold-storage shipments that we have in Canada? When you realize that you can go to the Niagara peninsula and pick two or three carloads of peaches and ship them in cold-storage, and land them in England, Ireland or Scotland in a better condition than they were in on the day they were picked, it is something we should be proud of; and I hope the new Minister of Agriculture will pay a little more attention to our great fruit industry as well as to other branches of agriculture in Canada. That is one thing that I think the late government was very slack in. They had money to spend on other projects, but very little to encourage the agriculturists of this country, and for that reason the electors on the

21st of September said, 'we will give another party a chance to display their business ability.'

As I have said, no man can form any conception of the greatness of this country twenty-five or fifty years hence. If I have one regret keener than another it is that I was born fifty years too soon. With the great discoveries that are being made all around us, with the progressiveness of this nation, and under the leadership of men of such strength and talents, the country is bound to occupy a foremost place among the colonies of the great empire to which we are so proud to belong.

I was showing, Mr. Speaker, that the reason why hon. members opposite are where they are and we are where we are is that they have lost the confidence of the electors of this country. One of the reasons why the people voted against them was that they had tried to force through this reciprocity pact for which they had no mandate from the people. As I have said, they forgot that they were not the bosses, but the servants of the people. This campaign, I think, was one of the best things that ever happened for Canada. It was a great campaign of education. We heard more during that campaign about the resources of this country and the outlook for its future than we had heard in any campaign since 1878, when the great National Policy was adopted by the people. Another reason why our friends opposite sit where they do to-day is that they had two policies, one for the farmers in the rural districts and another for the artisans and mechanics in the towns. We all know that Christopher Columbus was a great discoverer, but his reputation would fade into insignificance in comparison with that of the man who could discover how it would be possible for the farmer to get more money for his product and the artisan, the mechanic and the business man of the city pay less. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) during the campaign told the story of the Indian who was asked if he were lost, and said: 'No, wigwam lost; Indian here.' They have lost their wigwam, and we are occupying it.

Now, we have heard a lot about loyalty. I do not claim for a moment that there are any more loyal men in the Conservative ranks than in the Liberal ranks. I tell you the salvation of this country is found in just such men as we saw come out and take their stand for the preservation of this country for the people who dwell here. Our Liberal friends cut the party tie and told the late Prime Minister that they could not support his policy and they threw in their lot with the great Conservative party with the result of placing that party in power here to-day. The difference in the policies of the two parties was simply this: The policy of the Liberal party stood for a greater United States, while the policy of the Conservative party stood for a greater Canada, and a greater and united empire, with one King, one Flag, one Throne.

Another reason for loss of confidence in the late administration was explained by a deputation that came here last Thursday—one of the saddest sights I have ever been called upon to witness. I refer to the delegation that came here to seek help to extricate them from the difficulties caused by the error of the late government in granting a certificate to the now defunct Farmers' Bank to do business—an institution that was conceived in sin, born in iniquity, and died in bankruptcy. We hear of a purse of $120,000 having been contributed to the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) by his friends. If I had been the cause of one-half of the suffering that he caused by granting that certificate, I would gladly give up every dollar I possessed to relieve the sufferers. In that room we saw a man of seventy-three years, tottering with age, hardly able to walk, whose future lay before him in some poorhouse or charitable institution, having sunk his all, $11,300, in that defunct institution. Hon. W. S. Fielding, the late Minister of Finance, made one of the most serious mistakes ever made by a Finance Minister of Canada when he granted that charter to that rotten institution. Many complaints have been made about the new Minister of Finance (Mr. White) by the opposition, but I am confident that that hon. gentleman will not make such errors as the Hon. W. S. Fielding made in this case. This Farmers' Bank experience was certainly one of the causes why the people in my constituency lost confidence in the late government.

And there was another. We have heard a good deal about a gentleman who occupied the high position of Minister of the Interior. There was a fund of $69,000 that has never yet been explained away satisfactorily to the members of this House, and I do not believe that that amount of money will ever be satisfactorily explained to those members.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite agree with the hon. member.

Mr. WEBSTER. On the other hand we have seen many bouquets handed to the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers). Let me tell you, as one somewhat interested in one of the western provinces, that the one act of that hon. gentleman in settling the coal mining difficulty has done something to mark him as one of the coming men of Robert L. Borden's cabinet.

Now, let me refer for a moment to what the National Policy has done for this country. In 1878, that great statesman, right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, went up and down this land and told the people that if

they gave him their confidence he would take this country out of the throes of depression, in which it was then suffering, and would place it on a sound basis. I leave it to hon. members of the House to judge whether that was accomplished, for they are in a position to judge. Hon. members opposite came into power at a time when the country was just beginning to feel the effects of the great National Policy; And that accounts for the prosperity of Canada to-day. We all know that the Liberal party at that time told the electors that they would make great changes. But, thanks to our Heavenly Father—and I say it with all reverence—they never had the courage to act on their convictions. The result is that to-day Canada is prosperous and going ahead by leaps and bounds, both agriculture and manufactures are prosperous, and the people enjoying to-day one of the best home markets enjoyed by any nation in the world.

Let us for a few moments consider why we should continue the same line of policy. Our Liberal friends point with a great deal of pride to the high and exalted position held by the great republic to the south. I too would point to that nation and ask what nation has protected her industries as highly as the United States. That accounts for her great march forward in manufacturing and the upbuilding of her great home market for the products of her soil. I extend to my American cousins the right hand of welcome and I say to them: Come over here, bring your capital, erect your factories, use our raw material, employ Canadian labour and give this country the benefit she should enjoy from furnishing these raw materials, and build up a bigger market for the farmers of this country. I believe as firmly as I believe that I am speaking in the halls of parliament that within five years you will see more manufacturers cross the line than in the last twenty years. It is one of the saddest sights when you approach a city to see tall chimneys lying dead. I looked with pride and pleasure at the smoking chimneys of Ottawa as I came into this beautiful city this morning, and I was rejoicing to think that in five years there would be three chimneys in this manufacturing town where there is one to-day. I believe we stand on the verge of a period of the greatest prosperity enjoyed by any nation in the world.

During the campaign we heard a great deal about the memory of the late lamented Sir John A. Macdonald. The policy of Sir John Macdonald served its purpose in putting the Conservative party in power in this country whilst he was living and the reference made by hon. gentlemen opposite to his memory served to put the Conservative party here again to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite told us that Sir John Macdonald was anxious for reciprocity at a certain time. If any hon. gentleman will read the address of Sir John A. Macdonald during the campaign of 1878 when he used those words: 'A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die,' and when he called unrestricted reciprocity nothing but veiled treason for the Canadian people that hon. gentleman should be convinced that the man who said from the platform that Sir John A. Macdonald wanted reciprocity was uttering something that was not true. There were some public men who wanted reciprocity. I heard the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) say the other day that Champ Clark was a fool. I would ask my respected friend if he considers that all those public men in the United States who considered reciprocity the first step towards annexation were fools?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not hesitate to say yes to that.

Mr. WEBSTER. President Taft said he wanted reciprocity, and he said Canada was at the parting of the ways. The people of this country sent a message to President Taft, that rolled down to Washington on the night of September 21, which I am sure must have come to him like a mighty peal of thunder; in that message were these words: Canada is still loyal and still stands by the British Empire. That peal of thunder bore a message to the incoming government that Canada was still to go on along those lines which she had so successfully trodden for the last thirty years and by following those lines would be left free to carve out her own destiny among the nations of the world and that destiny I hope will always be found within the British Empire and under the folds of the old Union Jack.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester). Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate until a few days ago when I was prompted to do so by some remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite in reference to the conditions existing in New Brunswick in the recent campaign. In speaking to the motion for an address to be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne I wish to express my participation in the noble sentiments expressed by both the mover and the seconder of the address. Those sentiments, I am sure, are shared by every man of every race in this country, but never more generously and devoutly than by the race which I have the honour to represent in this House, the Acadian people of the maritime provinces who, 200,000 strong, dwell to-day in that part of the country happy to live under the protection of the British flag under which they enjoy

political and religious freedom to a greater extent than could be enjoyed under any other flag, a flag they love and are ready and willing to defend if occasion requires.

The mover of the address, being a native of the province from which I come, I was especially interested to listen to his speech. Pleasant zephyrs have already carried down to his home and his neighbours the sound of his fame in the far west which he had chosen as the field of his activity, and may I be permitted to say that the first experience we have had of his ability has certainly convinced everyone that the zephyrs in their travels had not exaggerated his eloquence and merit. I have only to congratulate him and to wish that he may be able to render service in this House for many years.

I have also listened with attention to the seconder of the address, a native of the province of Quebec, which has furnished so many eloquent men in this House; everyone of us hung upon his words during the whole hour for which he has entertained this House. He has also expressed very noble and generous sentiments and I wish to the hon. member for Dorchester that he may remain many long years in public life to be able further to develop and display the magnetism of his magnificent eloquence to the admiration of the Canadian people in consistency as well as in brilliancy.

Mr. Speaker, I did not frequently address the Chair when I was on the other side of the House and this is the first time I have had the honour to address you from this side of the House. I do not wish to be offensive to anybody in the remarks which I have to make, especially to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), whose presence I should like to have had in the House for a few moments. I am sorry that he is not in his seat now. The new Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) was in his seat a few minutes ago, and I would have liked merely to have expressed to him my personal consideration, because, as he knows, I have the highest respect for him. Our country is fortunate in having been led for the last fifteen years by a man whose sterling honesty and integrity have been the admiration not only of the Canadian people and of the British Empire, but of our neighbours to the south of us, and if we have to have change after times of war we are fortunate in having placed at the head of the government of the nation a man whose personal integrity and honour stand under no stain and under no suspicion. I would have liked to have seen my friend, from New Brunswick originally, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) and to have congratulated him upon occupying a place in the cabinet. I would have expressed my sorrow to see that he has not been given the position that he possessed for so many years previously under the old Conservative government and to which every one of us expected to see him return. I have not the honour to be acquainted with the more fortunate gentleman who has been appointed to the position of Minister of Finance (Mr. White). I have no doubt that his selection is due to his ability, as developed in the presence of those who may have been near to him. May I be permitted to say, though, that this country has been favoured during the last fifteen years with the intellectual activity of a Minister of Finance who has certainly earned the admiration of the Canadian people, and of the British Empire, and if his successor, who also comes from the ranks of the Liberal party, can, in the next few years, during which he may be at the head of that department, reach the position and achieve the success which characterized the administration of his predecessor, the House and the country will realize how fortunate they have been that the Liberal party have been able to produce another guide and guardian of the treasury of this great and advancing nation?

But the remarks that I wanted to make had more particular reference to the canvass during the last election in the maritime provinces, and especially in New Brunswick. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), in reply to the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr Pugsley), admitted that he did favour reciprocity in the year 1891, when he had the honour of occupying a seat in this House for the city of St. John. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a most eloquent speaker and he is always courteous to those who know him. He has no doubt commanded the admiration of every one who has heard him speak in this House—those who had heard him previously and those who heard him for the first time when he spoke in this debate. We know that he is gifted with great fluency and eloquence, we know that a strong patriotism impels his intellectual activity, and I have no doubt that if many more years are given to his party in power he will be able to render service not only to the province from whence he comes, and from which I come, but also to this great country at large

Meanwhile, I must say that I was pleased to hear him give expression to the fact that he was favourable to the pact of reciprocity as applying to agriculture products in the as applying to agricultural products in the taken by the Conservative party at large since, he has added that conditions have changed. We have had for many years at the head of the Liberal party perhaps the greatest man that this country has ever produced. We perhaps never had any one to compare with the ex-Prime Minister, who has been at the head of the Liberal government for the last fifteen years and whom

we are pleased to have now at the head of His Majesty's loyal opposition. Sir John Macdonald said that a British subject he was born and a British subject he would die. But while uttering this truth he told us that he was also trying to get a reciprocal arrangement with the country to the south of us. Thus we found him trying to harmonize and realize the dual aspirations of life, to firmly maintain his British citizenship and at the same time to improve our relations with our neighbours. We remember that the leader of the Liberal party at one time made the prophecy that the time would come when the United States would knock at the door of Canada and that prophecy was realized two years ago when the United States knocked at the door of the Liberal government of this Dominion. It was loyal for Sir John A. Macdonald to be a British subject and at the same time an advocate of reciprocal arrangements with the United States in order to better the trade conditions of this country. How then can it have become disloyal in 1911 to ask for the same privileges that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said the Liberal-Conservative party were asking for in 1891 and 1894? The conditions have changed, yes, and it is for that very reason that the conditions have changed that I so heartily supported the reciprocity pact for the exchange of natural products between Canada and the United States. Had the conditions not changed I might have been more reluctant to give the enthusiastic support which I gave to this measure during the past summer.

What were the conditions in this country in 1891? At that time we had less than 25 per cent of the revenue that we have to-day. Our total trade was not one-third of the trade that we have now. Prices and wages were low. Our lumbermen in New Brunswick were obliged to work in the lumber camps for $12, $14 and $16 a month. Geographical conditions, climatic conditions have not changed, but commercial conditions have changed, and in 1911 we have a trade of over $750,000,000, nearly half of which is with the United States, with which nation we want to increase our trade.

Is it because we wanted to further extend the market with the United States, which already is increasing by millions of dollars a year, that we should be accused of losing our loyalty. In past years our transportation facilities were not developed as they are to-day, the population of the west was not one-third of what it is at present, our canals were not enlarged and deepened, and our trade was restricted, but, very soon, when the Georgian Bay canal is built and the Welland canal improved, and with the increased railway facilities which are now being provided, our transportation system will have reached almost perfection. We will have the shortest, and the cheapest and the best route between east and west. We need then fear no competition from the American republic, and with reciprocity we could control not only the trade with western Canada, but with the western States as well. Now that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in his seat I wish to commune with him for a few minutes on the issues of the last campaign, knowing that with his amability he will permit the humble member for Gloucester presenting him with his views. We have in our province of New Brunswick the resources of the land and the sea: Fisheries, lumber, and agriculture. The New Brunswick fisheries yielded last year about $4,800,000; the industry in the county of Gloucester alone yielding $1,250,000, which surpassed the yield of the whole of Prince Edward Island. The hon. minister (Mr. Hazen) knows that the best market for our fish is the American market, and that notwithstanding the duties we will have to pay owing to the recent verdict of the people, we must still send most of our fish to that market. The smelt and salmon fishing industry would have to be closed were it not for the American markets. The smelt fishing industry is a very valuable pursuit for three or four months of the winter on the north shore, and without the American market it would not be worth while taking those fish from our waters. No one is more ambitious than I to favour the local market, but when we remember that a market must be found not only for the fisheries of the maritime provinces, but for the fisheries of the St. Lawrence, of the Great Lakes, of the great inland lakes on the prairies, and of the Pacific coast it is easy to realize that the home market cannot take the entire product. We must remember also that our fisheries in the maritime provinces, and possibly our other fisheries as well, can be made to produce double their present yield if remunerative markets are to be found. The cod industry is the most valuable in my country and it is pursued by hardy fishermen who deserve every consideration from the government. I am quite sure the Minister of Marine will extend his consideration to them. It must be remembered that under the reciprocity arrangement our fishermen would have obtained not only the benefit of the American market but also the benefit of the Porto Rico market which is one of the best markets for the cod industry known as the 'Gaspé cure.'

We have also mackerel, for which there is scarcely any other market than the American, and in other parts of the province we have the lobster industry which certainly owes its prosperity to the proximity of that market. Therefore, one need not be surprised that the people of the maritime provinces interested in the fishery, both the fishermen and the farmers,

should have been favourable to this pact.

There is also the lumber industry, the conditions in which have changed since 1890, as the hon. Minister for Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) has said. In 1891 Great Britain purchased 35 per cent of all her lumber from Canada. But in 1911 the British market took only 20 per cent of her lumber from Canada. It took the greater portion of its spruce lumber, the same quality as the spruce we produce, from the Baltic. Would any one tax the people of Great Britain with disloyalty to Canada because they bought their lumber from districts where they could get it at cheaper prices than in Canada? As a result we have been obliged to look more and more to the American market which, during the last 15 years, has been absorbing our lumber to a greater extent each year, until the quantity we export to that market has reached an enormous figure. I might point out that as in the case of our fisheries the American market in the matter of lumber is the only one on which we can depend for the greatest portion of our production, especially the by-products such as shingles, laths, boards, scantlings. These products we can find no market for in Great Britain at all. And as our large timber is yearly decreasing in quantity, and the American market is the one to which we must look for the smaller grades and inferior grades, that market is becoming more and more necessary to our lumbering interests, and consequently the reciprocity pact would have proved a great boon to the maritime provinces.

While we can boast of our transportation facilities, there is still a great deal to be done in order to make them perfect. It is certainly absolutely necessary, in the development of those facilities, that we should build the Georgian Bay canal and improve the Welland canal. The production of our great western country is increasing every day. This year we had a crop of 200,000,000 bushels, and in a few years we will be producing more than a billion bushels of wheat. When Sir Charles Tupper was advocating the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway some thirty years ago, and when he was depicting the great possibilities of that country, he realized that it would not only become the granary of the old world, but would furnish the market of 100,000,000 people to the south of us. No doubt, however, the time will soon come when our American neighbours will be compelled to purchase their grain supplies in our market. But at the same time we in the maritime provinces, while we have never been unwilling to contribute to the development of the great west, while, inspired by a patriotism as lofty as our religion, we have ever shrank from doing our duty by that country in furnishing it with men and money, we have always been looking forward to the time when our magnificent harbours would be developed as they ought to be when every encouragement should be given for the utilization of our great water-powers, and for the settlement of our rich agricultural areas along our rivers and lakes, and when our census enumerators would be able to report an increase in our population which would give us adequate representation in this House. Had the policy of the Liberal party been allowed to be put into force on the 21st of September last our people in the maritime provinces would have been placed in such a position that every child born under our blest heavens would no longer have any inducement to leave their own soil. They would settle along the colonization roads of New Brunswick, along its rivers, lakes, and water-powers which are now waiting development which would have come to them had the policy of the late government been adopted. The majority of the people of Canada decide otherwise. But I am happy to say that the maritime provinces, notwithstanding all the difficulties and circumstances, side issues brought into the campaign, gave a majority in favour of the government's policy, in favour of the reciprocity pact. This policy will, however continue to be the aspiration of the people, and ambition of the people of the maritime provinces as long as there are fish in the Gulf and the Atlantic coast waters and as long there are trees to fell, and lumber to export from the maritime provinces.

It has been said that notwithstanding all the great economic advantages which this pact would give to Canada, our loyalty was endangered, and therefore we are obliged to leave aside that economic advantage, conditions, and prosperity of our people in order to keep our people loyal.

Where is the man in Canada to-day whose loyalty could be suspected? May I be allowed to ask my generous friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, where can disloyalty be suspected in New Brunswick? What is the population of New Brunswick? It is composed chiefly of the descendants of United Empire Loyalists, the ancestors of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I believe, amongst them, and also of the Acadian people, who to-day form one-third of the population of that province. I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has no doubt of the loyalty of the descendants of the United Empire Loyalists in whatever corner of the province they may be, and I can vouch that the Acadian people would not exchange the British flag for any other flag in the world. Therefore, I regret to say that during the recent campaign an education was carried on which showed the other nations of the world that there were among the Canadian people a certain class who doubted the loyalty of certain other

people in Canada; we where supporting the reciprocity agreement at a time when it was to the interest of the British Empire that Canada should be socially and commercially on friendly terms with the United States, when not only the Liberal party which is now dominant in the British House of Commons, but the whole public opinion of the British Empire, was in favour of bringing about a treaty of peace between the two nations by which their difficulties in the future should be settled by arbitration. Therefore, the acceptance of this reciprocity agreement by Canada would have given Great Britain a new-born force and prestige which would have made her not only invincible, but the arbiter of the world.

Mr. Speaker, very recently another sister nation of Great Britain, in which I am sure disloyalty would never be suspected, Australia, has sent delegates to the United States to endeavour to make a similar reciprocity pact between the two countries for the exchange of goods suited to the requirements of each other; and certainly no Canadian would assert that the loyalty of Australia can be doubted. But, Mr. Speaker, reciprocity is set aside for the time, its opponents are in office, and to them we must now look for compensation for the advantages lost to Canada by the rejection of the reciprocity pact. I would ask my generous friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what he would suggest by way of compensation to our fishermen, who have been deprived of the American market? From this out they will have to continue to pay a duty on their fish going to the United States. That is the penalty for their loyalty. Our lumbermen will have to continue to pay a duty on their lumber going to the United States. The man in the camp will have to be satisfied with lower wages; instead of getting from $33 to $35 a month, he will have to be content with $20 or $25; that is the penalty for their loyalty. What will the government propose as a compensation to our fishermen and our lumbermen? Will they increase the British preference? I hope they will. That was my hope before the election, as is well known in my county. It would be an expression of loyalty to the people of Great Britain, an expression of our will to deal with them to a larger extent. At the same time, it would be a compensation to our fishermen, our lumbermen and our farmers by enabling them to get more cheaply the goods they have to buy. Will the government reduce the duties on farming implements for the farmers of the west? I hope they will. I remember that my hon. friend, the bright young member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) last session brought in a resolution in favour of taking off altogether the duty on farming implements. Is compensation of this kind to be offered to the farmers of the west for the restriction placed on their markets by the rejection of the reciprocity pact? I hope that my hon. friend the member for Portage la Prairie is endowed to-day with the same patriotism on behalf of the farmers of the west that he was last year, and will again move for the removal of the duties on agricultural implements, in order to encourage the farmers to remain on their farms to inspire their sons to remain on the homesteads, so that we may not see our cities over-populated at the expense of our rural districts, which would be a great misfortune for Canada, which would cease thereby to be an exporting country.

Again, we are told that at least we should have reciprocity within the empire. Again, I answer that it requires at least two to make a bargain, and in this case it may require more than two. I believe that there is at least one party in Great Britain that will not be very favourable to this imperial commercial union. The artisans of Great Britain will resist, I am sure, the taxation of their bread in the future as they have in the past; and it is to be remembered that this arrangement can only be brought about by taxation of the products now put upon the British markets by others than the sister nations. I hope the government will look into these things. I appeal more particularly to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who represents the province from which I come and whose patriotism and great intellectual powers assure to him the maintenance in the federal field of the reputation he has already won in that province. I hope he will not forget our position, but will see what can be done for the fishermen, the farmers and the lumbermen who have been deprived of this great market in order to stand by his loyalty.

But there was another great question which interested a portion of Canada during the last campaign—the navy question. May I be permitted to say—and I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will bear me out—that in my constituency at least, no other question than that of reciprocity was made an issue in the election. This was in part because my views on the naval question were well known. It had been my lot to express my opinion in this House at the time when this question was before parliament. My constituents generally had read the remarks I made on that occasion, and every one of them, Liberal or Conservative, knew my position on the matter. There can be no equivocation as to the expression of the people of the county of Gloucester and their willingness to share in the defence of the empire by the construction of a Canadian navy in co-operation with the imperial navy in time of need. And, in spite of the greatest combinations that

could be made against a candidate in the maritime provinces, the people of Gloucester have sent me to this House for the fourth time, with a majority of a thousand. I heard with pleasure the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). But, while some of his remarks give me hope for the future, there are others which do not altogether satisfy, not my curiosity, for that is not worthy of his attention, but my ambition to gain accurate information from his statements. It may be due to my lack of penetration that I do not reach the depth of his ideas. But I know he takes this important position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries with intention of promoting the welfare of the maritime provinces and of the province of New Brunswick. Before he took his present portfolio, the policy of the Liberal party had been set forth in the statutes of Canada by the action of parliament in 1910, and contracts in fulfilment of that policy had been prepared and tenders received. Expenditures had been made on ships for training purposes. And this House had voted five-twelfths of the sum required for the construction of ships to be built in Canada. I no more doubted that the country was committed to the naval policy of the Liberal party and that the contracts asked for would be carried out as soon as my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) would be sworn in as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I was more particularly of a hopeful mind because of the statement made by Dr. Daniel, who had been elected for the city and county of St. John and who so generously gave up his seat in order that the Prime Minister might give the province of New Brunswick the advantage of being represented in the cabinet by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen). I say I believed that the hon. gentleman would take the position of carrying out this policy because of the declaration made by Dr. Daniel who eliminated himself on behalf of the hon. gentleman for such patriotic purposes. In a letter to his electors, Dr. Daniel was careful to say that the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries was a very important one, and particularly if the policy of the Liberal government were carried into execution it would be the most important in the Canadian cabinet. For this additional reason I thought there was no doubt about the realization of that policy. But as I have said, my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen), has not given me the satisfaction I had hoped for and expected at his hands. He threw blame upon the late government for having kept the tenders so long. But he forgot to tell us that it had been decided by his predecessors in office, and by the late government as a whole, that these tenders should be submitted for the consideration of the Admiralty.

And the late Minister of Marine (Mr. Lemieux) had scarcely came back from Europe where he had been in consultation with the Admiralty in reference to some tenders when dissolution took place. After the election there was a change of ministry and I would have been most pleased if the present Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) had adjudicated those contracts made that remark to us. The Minister of Marine said in reference to these tenders:

> There were nine tenders. There was the tender of Cammel, Laird & Company, which was the lowest, for $11,280,000. There was the tender of Swan, Hunter & Wisham Richardson for $12,174,000. There were other tenders, ranging from the lowest already mentioned up to $13,055,804. Those tenders did not include the armour plating, the armament, and certain supplies that go with warships of this sort, and which would have considerably augmented the cost.

No doubt it was a large amount and the minister shows that it would have required $15,000,000 to build a Canadian navy such as was proposed by the Canadian government on the suggestion of the Admiralty. It would have cost perhaps $15,000,000 but no Canadian expects to be able to get a Canadian navy of any utility to Canada and the empire without spending some money. So I consider that $15,000,000 was not an extravagant figure for any Canadian who looks into the future conditions of this great country of ours. With that expenditure of $15,000,000 Canada would have been given the advantage of the construction of shipyards for the building of these ships. These shipyards would have remained an asset of the people of Canada and would have secured in the future the construction of commercial as well as war vessels, so the people of Canada would have greatly benefited by the immediate commencement of the construction of these ships. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) tells us that from the information he has at his command these vessels under that contract could not have been completed within six years by which time they would have become obsolete. I do not question the accuracy of my friend's information but it is hard for me to believe that the British Admiralty would furnish to the government of Canada plans for a type of vessel that would become obsolete before their completion. It may be that in the near future the Dreadnoughts themselves will be the most obsolete vessels. We know that many authorities have blamed the British parliament for having commenced to build Dreadnoughts of such dimensions, causing other nations to do the same thing and therefore it might have been better if we had never had the Dreadnoughts. On the other hand cruisers and torpedo boats have always been and always will be required in naval warfare. But there is one consolation for me in the words of my hon. friend

the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is well known that I am in favour of co-operation within the British Empire and assistance to the empire in the time of need, that I belong to that party who wish to co-operate with England when necessary. We in Gloucester county do not belong to that group of do-nothings; we wish to protect ourselves and we wish also to help to protect the great flag under which we live. I was most pleased to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Marine when he said:

> It is a question which is going to involve a tremendous expenditure to the people of this country, and I think it is the desire of all Canadians that when a naval policy is embarked upon it shall be one that will conduce to the welfare of Canada and the strength and maintenance of the British Empire.

I join with him in those words, but they do not offer me all the consolation I had expected from his remarks. He does not say to us whether it will be a Canadian navy built in Canada with Canadian material in Canadian shipyards and as rapidly as possible manned by Canadians. I hope it will and he knows that these are my views. If there is one policy in addition to the policy of reciprocity that would have been of advantage to the people of the maritime provinces it is the naval policy proposed by the late government. No doubt some of the vessels for the Canadian navy would have been built in the great harbours of the maritime provinces, St. John, Halifax, Digby or Bathurst, and therefore all our young men, with so many divers aspirations and such great intelligence, who have proved themselves such great mechanics when they have gone to the United States during the last forty years, because there was not sufficient scope in the maritime provinces for the employment of their skill, would have had their ambitions fulfilled in the building of steel and iron ships and we would have seen our population rapidly increase. The natural increase of population would remain with us and our prosperity would attract many newcomers to our shores.

There is a movement on foot in the maritime provinces for an amendment to the British constitution so that our people may be able to get a larger representation in this House. I respect that movement although I have not been in favour of it. It is not so much representation in this House that we want as the means to secure and retain population. With this great policy of reciprocity and with those great industries which might be created along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and would be complementary to the shipping interests, we would not only keep the population which we have but we would rapidly increase our population, and we would have in future a right to an increased representation in this House. We would not then be considered as securing our representation in this House through the charity of the west. I hope, therefore, that my hon. friend will take this into consideration. I know him to be gifted with great patriotism as I said before, and, exercising the influence which I know he will with regard to the policy of the government on the question of the Canadian navy, I hope that he will not agree to anything but a Canadian navy, built on Canadian soil, in Canadian harbours, by Canadian men and, when built, manned by Canadians. It is all very well for those who favour a money contribution to Great Britain to say that our children, if they desire to serve in the Canadian navy, may go to Great Britain, enlist there and serve on the ships representing Canada, but, that would not take the place of a Canadian navy, and it would not afford the opportunity for those of our sons who desire a naval career, because very few would take advantage of that opportunity. The moment you commence the construction of Canadian ships along the coast of Canada, the people of the maritime provinces will be ready in large numbers to loyally do their share to make the Canadian fleet as efficient as possible. I hope that when my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries comes back from England with the matured plan which is supposed to take the place of the navy now outlined on our statute-books, it will be found to provide for a Canadian navy, and if that is so I for one will render him all possible assistance to make it acceptable to the people of New Brunswick.

I do not wish to refer to other points in the speech from the Throne. I rose more particularly for the purpose of expressing my views to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries upon these two great questions, and I hope that before long that hon. gentleman will give the people of Canada a scheme which will be Canadian and British, but Canadian before all. He has not told us that it will be necessary for him to have a plebiscite on the plan which he may propound. I hope it will not be, because I believe that a plebiscite on such a question would be altogether useless and unpatriotic. I hope you will not place the people of Canada in the position of registering the vote of one Canadian who would not be willing to co-operate with Great Britain in her new aspiration for Canada and other sister nations. Therefore, if the minister takes the responsibility of accepting or rejecting a plan for the navy and if he brings us a plan for a Canadian navy, built in Canada as far as practicable, whether they be

large or small ships, I will for one give him all the support I possibly can in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. W. G. WEICHEL (North Waterloo). Mr. Speaker, we have been debating this address for a whole week and it seems that we cannot offer much consolation to hon. members of the opposition. To a newcomer the situation is indeed highly amusing. I feel that the time and attention of the House could be profitably devoted to the consideration of more weighty matters rather than to ruminating around the events of the recent contest on September 21. Let me add my congratulations to those which have already been expressed to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I assure you that it was with the greatest pleasure that I listened to the eloquent remarks of these two hon. gentlemen. I am sure that the hon. leader of the House (Mr. Borden) may also be complimented upon the accession to his ranks of the talent which we have before us upon the ministerial benches. Certain remarks have been made by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House with reference to the election which was held on September 21. I come from the county of North Waterloo, and happen to have the honour of having defeated that great essayist, the hon. Wm. Lyon Mackenzie King. We have heard a great deal in this House about passion and prejudice. The accusation has been made that in the elections passions, prejudice and sentiment were the predominating features. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that I have with me the facts which will dispel that illusion from their minds. I will take the opportunity tonight of reading to the House an extract from the 'Globe' and I am positive that hon. gentlemen on your left, Mr. Speaker, will not dispute anything that we can find in the 'Globe'.

At the convention held in Waterloo on August 22nd the Hon. Wm. Lyon Mackenzie made this statement:—

> Are the people of this country going to place at the head of affairs a man who will be precipitated into such a position as this, who will take from the treasury of this country and who would have taken money enough to build two Dreadnoughts and send that money to England so that they could spend it as they pleased? And against what country? He was ready to send money to build warships to fight Germany.

In view of this language is it not time for gentlemen of the opposition to call a halt, when they see a minister of the Liberal cabinet actually using such words as I have read from the report in their own party organ. Not only that, but Mr. King asked how the Germans of that county were going to stand behind me when I was supporting a man like Mr. Borden who was taking that stand in regard to the defence of the empire.

Mr. PELLETIER. That's loyalty.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Liberal members present in this House to-night that the people of North Waterloo do not require anything of that stamp to make them loyal. North Waterloo is one of the greatest manufacturing counties in Canada, and it is inhabited by what you might call a German speaking people, although they speak English as well. I can tell you Mr. Speaker, that every man, woman, and child in that constituency resented the implication contained in the statement of Mr. MacKenzie King, and the result of the elections of September 21st in that constituency showed what they thought of such utterances from a minister of the Crown. I would like to ask Wm. Lyon Mackenzie King whether he thinks we are subjects of King George or subjects of the Emperor of Germany. I can assure the members of this House that there are no more loyal subjects in this Dominion than the German people of North Waterloo. When Sir Wilfrid Laurier brought forth his reciprocity policy the people of my constituency could not see eye to eye with him upon it, and although they had been honoured with cabinet representation in the last parliament they decided that it was in the bests interests of the country as a whole that Mr. King should be defeated at the polls, and I can assure you they did the job properly. I was in the House the other day when a member of the opposition interrupting one of the Conservative speakers said: You may have gained in the cities but what about your vote in the rural sections? Let me point out in answer to this question what the result was in the county I have the honour to represent. The township of Waterloo voted practically as in the previous election. In the township of Woolwich there was a difference of only a few votes, but in the township of Wellesley, which is an agricultural district, I reduced Mr. King's majority from 187 to 73. That is a direct contradiction to the claim of the Liberals that in the rural constituencies the vote was for reciprocity. We, in the towns of Berlin and Waterloo believe in the National Policy; that policy which the Liberals had the good sense to preserve when they got into power in 1896. These gentlemen now in opposition may say that during fifteen years they gave the country prosperity, but the country was bound to be prosperous any way and none of the prosperity which prevails is due to any policy initiated by the Liberals. We have heard a great deal about sentiment, and about passion, and prejudice and in my opinion it is high time

that such language should stop, and that we get down to the solid work of the business of the country. Sentiment is a good thing in its place, and I am glad to say sentiment did play a good part in the election, for I believe that no nation can prosper that is devoid of sentiment. On the 21st of September last, the people of Canada did exhibit sentiment combined with good, sound sense and they marked their ballots according to their own free will, and when these ballots were counted the Conservatives were in power. When I hear the Liberals in this House talking about what occurred in the province of Quebec I wish to tell them that the people in the section of the country where I come from do not allow passion or prejudice to influence their votes in any way, manner or form, when it comes to vote. I can tell my hon. friends that although the people of German origin in my constituency may be at heart Germans, they are at the same time above and beyond all, Canadians and loyal British subjects. We admire the people of the province of Quebec; we give them credit for their noble institutions, and for the part they have played in Canada's history, and we Canadians of German origin bear no ill will to them. Sir, the people of North Waterloo do not allow for one minute anything in the shape of religion or race to come between them and their right to mark their ballots as was demonstrated on the 21st September. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the language used by Mr. Mackenzie King was not the only language of the kind used in my constituency during the election, but the words of that gentleman which I have read ought to be enough to teach the opposition to let that matter rest. When Mr. King made that statement he no doubt had the idea that he could sway the German people of the constituency, but in that he was mistaken. I believe, Sir, that neither will that sort of language swerve the people of the province of Quebec from their duty to Canada and the empire. Indeed, the result of the 21st of September in that province demonstrated to a certain degree that the people of Quebec have a mind of their own, and that they will vote entirely as they please.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat). In the early part of this debate the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), gave expression to the opinion that there was danger in the future of a severance of sentiment between the east and the west. As a representative from western Canada, as one who believes we cannot build up this country unless we are all agreed to develop a united Canada, I must express my absolute dissent from that opinion; and I wish to say, on behalf of the constituency of Medicine Hat, that the people there are just as anxious for a united Canada, and opposed to any severance between the east and the west as the most intense Canadian can possibly desire. We are as anxious for the development of eastern Canada as the people of the east can possibly be for the development of western Canada. I happen to be engaged in the newspaper business, and it has been my pleasure on many occasions, as it has been that of every other newspaper man in western Canada to develop that sentiment of sympathy towards the people of the east. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) took occasion to refer to the lack of Canadians and British news in Canadian newspapers, and to the quantity of American news in our western papers. As one familiar with the newspapers of the west, I would like to say that for a number of years our newspapers had a long struggle to secure reduced telegraphic rates, and had made persistent efforts to obtain such reduction from the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company; but to-day and in the last couple of years they have been enabled to come to an agreement by which all the newspapers of Canada, in the east as well as the west, are at present furnished with the same report so that the papers in the west and the papers in the east are supplying the public with the same news. We in the west are making every effort to give the people of Canada and those who are coming into this country, Canadian news, and British news, thus stimulating their interest in Canada and the empire.

I have taken occasion to refer to the remarks of my hon. friend from Brandon because they might create the impression in eastern Canada that there is a sentiment growing up in western Canada that is not in the interests of the whole Dominion. I do not agree with that. I say we are developing a strong British and Canadian sentiment through the schools, through the press, and through all the institutions that are intended for the moulding of public opinion. In our schools the British flag is displayed and the pupils attending them no matter to what race they belong, and no matter from what country they come, are impressed with the idea that that flag stands for Canada. They are given lessons in British history, and they are taught to believe that British institutions are the best in the world. In view of all this the people of eastern Canada need not worry about the future of the Dominion so far as we in the west are concerned. We may differ in our opinions on the trade question. I confess I would not be in this House to-day if it were not for the strong sentiment in western Canada in favour of a low tariff? And I feel that so long as I stand for a low tariff and larger markets that I will be returned by that constituency. I say also that western Canada, while it is anxious for larger markets and anxious for the near-

by American market, is not populated with a selfish people. The people of the west do not believe that their interests alone should be considered, and there is no desire on their part for any tariff which would wreck any legitimate industry in this country. But, Sir, we think we are entitled to consideration and we believe that reciprocity with the United States is in the best interests of western Canada, and in the best interests of eastern Canada as well. I had the opportunity of addressing a great many meetings during the last campaign, and I know that every speaker on the Liberal side announced that we did not want to injure the interests of the people of eastern Canada, nor did we feel that reciprocity would injure those industries. We hold that view to-day and we are not going to advocate that we should wipe out the tariff completely, and wreck any deserving industry in the country. I can tell hon. gentlemen that the sentiment in favour of a low tariff exists in western Canada and will continue to grow, because the people of that country are anxious to have access not only to the markets of the United States, but to all the markets they can procure. In that western country our productions are increasing year by year, and it has become necessary that we should look for these larger markets.

We are quite willing to sell as much as possible within the British Empire market and to the people of Canada, but we must look for other markets than these, and it is for that reason we supported reciprocity so strongly on the 21st of September. I may say that after listening to this debate, I am satisfied that in no other part of Canada, as in the west, was reciprocity considered on its merits. The people of the west voted for reciprocity because they thought it would be a good trade arrangement that would be helpful to the whole of the Dominion; and if the people of the rest of the Dominion had considered reciprocity in the same way and had excluded extraneous matters in connection with racial and religious cries, I am satisfied they also would have endorsed reciprocity and that to-day we would be enjoying its benefits. I would not like to say that any of the members of this House had questioned the loyalty of the American people who have come to this country, but since the election some of the Conservative press have talked about 'a solid American vote,' giving the impression that these settlers have voted for reciprocity in the hope that it might bring Canada into closer political relations with the United States. I want to say of the American people who have settled in western Canada that on taking up their citizenship here they immediately began to take an interest in our affairs, that they appreciate our institutions, that they appreciate the enforcement of law in Canada, and that they appreciate our good system of government. I believe that these former American citizens are just as good citizens as any that have ever come to Canada. It is worth mentioning that when the deputation from western Canada, and eastern Canada as well, presented their claims before the late government they not only asked for reciprocity with the United States but they also asked for the extension of the British preference. That was an evidence of the loyalty of the Canadian farmers. In the west we are prepared to buy the goods that are made in Great Britain and we are prepared also to buy the goods that are made in Canada, but we believe it would be to the advantage of the western Canadian consumers if we had the opportunity of buying in a competitive market of the British and the Canadian manufacturers. I believe that as to the establishment of a Canadian navy, that if the government decide to put it to a referendum, they will find the people of the west in favour of a Canadian navy on the lines laid down by the late government. I believe Sir, that the people of the west will give evidence of their loyalty in that matter because they feel that we should take part in the defence of Canada and the empire. Before taking my seat I would like to say a word as to the criticisms which have been offered as to the treatment accorded by the late Liberal government to western Canada. Let me say that western Canada has only become a country worth talking about since the Liberal government came into power in 1896. That country appreciates what the late Liberal government has done for it in the past; it appreciates the immigration and transportation policy of that government. I can say to the new government that if they consider the interests of western Canada as loyally as the late government did then western Canada will have no complaint to make.

Before taking my seat, I would like to make a suggestion with regard to labour legislation. In the constituency which I represent there are many men engaged in the mines, and in connection with the late strike there was much criticism of the conditions under which the miners have to work and live. The people there feel that the Department of Labour should institute an investigation to ascertain whether the charges made by the miners in this respect are correct. I hope the Department of Labour will take that matter up. These men claim that the conditions under which they have to live are almost impossible, and very injurious to health. I believe the matter is one that comes within the control of this government, and I would be glad if they would give it their consideration.

Mr. A. E. FRIPP moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 10.40 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, November 28, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Chief Justice, F. X. Lemieux, and the Hon. Mr. Justice C. E. Dorion, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to 'The Dominion Controverted Elections Act,' a certificate and report relating to the election for the electoral district of Quebec West, by which the said election petition was dismissed and the sitting member duly elected

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of Conservation Commission on the Water Powers of Canada.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

BANKING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. Referring to the Bill intituled 'An Act to amend the Banking Act,' of which the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) has given notice, I am of the opinion, after an examination of the measure, that it should be introduced upon resolution.

Previous to 1874 the practice in this regard had been somewhat unsettled, but in that year Mr. Speaker Anglin decided (see Bouré inot, 3rd edit. p. 634) that general banking Bills are to be based on resolutions. It is added that this position was in accordance with the practice of the English parliament. The case in which this question arose was of a Bill similar to that now under consideration. (See Can. Com. J., 1874, pp. 142-3). In 1890 the government Bill to extend the charters of the several banks in Canada, and to amend the Banking Act, was introduced upon resolution (See Can. Com. J., 1890, p. 209). I, therefore, decide that similar action should be taken with the Bill proposed by the hon member.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. STEVENS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9,) to amend the Criminal Code.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr STEVENS. This has reference to a slight technical omission in the law relating to the piracy of logs. It is a question that has been agitating lumbermen on the Pacific coast for some time. The Act at present provides for the punishment of those who steal floating timber in rivers, lakes, and so on, but it does not include or specify salt waters on the coast line and under this omission the pirates, as we call them on the Pacific coast, have been evading the law. We simply wish to have the law amended so that it will cover the coast waters of the Pacific. We also desire that the Act shall apply to logs that are marked under the provincial marking Act of British Columbia. This is a mere technical amendment which will enable us to punish those who are perpetrating these crimes.

Motion agreed to, and the Bill read the first time.

CRUISER 'ABOUKIR.'

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the government to Canadian press cable despatches appearing in the press this afternoon to the effect that the crew of the cruiser 'Aboukir,' purchased by Canada, is being paid off to-day That would mean yesterday. The despatches further say that this cruiser will be thoroughly overhauled and transferred to Canada next spring. I wish to inquire if there is any foundation for these despatches.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have no information whatever upon this subject. I will make inquiry and if I can ascertain anything about it I will let my hon. friend know later on in the afternoon. Perhaps he would send me the extract he refers to.

FISHERY TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) if there is any foundation for the statement which appeared in the 'Evening Journal' newspaper of Ottawa on Friday last, to the effect that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was investigating one of the earlier fishery treaties entered into between Canada and the United States with the view of Canada's withdrawal from the treaty altogether. I desire to ask the Minister if there is any foundation for that report, and if so, what treaty is referred to?

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to remind the hon. member, Mr. Maclean (Halifax) that these are questions that probably ought to be put on the Order Paper because they are not matters of great urgency. It is not, therefore, permissible to ask these questions without notice, and if notice were given it would afford the Minister a better opportunity of answering.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Of course, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that I can only ask this question with your permission and by the courtesy of the Min-

ister. I think it is rather an important matter. Perhaps it may be very easily answered.

Mr. HAZEN. I may say for the information of my hon. friend that I would not have any objection to his asking me a question of that sort without the usual two day's notice, and I would be very happy to answer him, if I had any information to give to my hon. friend. I may say, however, that my attention has not been called to the paragraph to which my hon. friend refers, and without having seen that paragraph and having read it carefully I would not care, with regard to an important matter such as a question relating to a treaty, to make any off-hand statement to the House. I think my hon. friend will appreciate how careful one must be in making a statement with regard to a matter of that sort.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). If there is any foundation for the report the Minister might be able to make a statement about it to-morrow, or at any convenient time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett: For an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. A. E. FRIPP (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, I had not any idea that I would have the privilege of addressing this House at such an early date, but I am thankful that I have been given the opportunity. I came into this House with certain expectations and I regret to say that so far they have been rather rudely shattered. There are some seventy-five new members of this House who are taking part in its proceedings for the first time in their lives and none of these new members could, I think, have come into this building, have walked through its corridors, have viewed the portraits of the fathers of confederation, and have remembered that here sat those men who gave the best part of their lives to their country, without being impressed, without having some feeling of awe and reverence for this building and for this chamber.

No student of political history in this Dominion can have read the early debates in this House of Commons without coming to the same conclusion. When we remember that Sir John Macdonald, Sir George E. Cartier, Sir Alexander Campbell, Sir Charles Tupper, and other fathers of confederation were at the helm, we can realize in what competent hands was the difficult task of bringing the scattered portions of this great Dominion into one confederation. When we note the high tone that characterizes every line of the speeches of these great men, I am prone to confess that it appears to me that the debate in this House so far this session has fallen to a much lower level, and that we have departed from the high and dignified and broad-minded way in which the early statesmen of this country debated and considered and gave the best that was in them to the development of this Dominion. Might I refer to what struck me at the time as being the rather unkindly remarks that were made by the right hon. leader of the opposition in reference to the selection of you, Sir, as the first Commoner of Canada? I am one of those who always have had a high opinion of the right hon. gentleman. His commanding figure and his personality in the city of Ottawa during the last fifteen years have made him beloved by all classes of the people no matter what their political leanings, and I am rather surprised that he should take occasion, in a rather sarcastic way, to belittle the selection of you, Sir, for the high office you dignify. That speech was followed by others which I have had the honour to listen to or to read. I specially noted the speech delivered by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), a gentleman who has held a very high position in the councils of this country, and who has been fortunate above other ministers in visiting foreign lands and representing Canada. On these occasions and especially recently in South Africa, he struck a high note of Imperialism which made each one of us who is an Imperialist feel glad that we had such a strong man in our ranks. But, Sir, his recent speech in this House astonished me. Three-fourths of it was taken up by reading extracts from newspapers published in the province of Quebec and extracts from speeches delivered by the Minister of Public Works. Well, I venture to think that the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific do not care one iota whether the Minister of Public Works is a Nationalist or whether he is not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRIPP. My hon. friends to the left of Mr. Speaker may laugh, but I venture to think that my statement is perfectly correct. What does the man in the street care now as to what position these gentlemen took in the province of Quebec? We had to meet that cry in the province of Ontario; we heard the Liberals denounce the unholy alliance as they called it between Bourassa and Borden, but the people of Ontario paid no attention to that. Sir, the people of Ontario, and I believe the people of Quebec as well, are sick and tired of this sectionalism and provincial-

ism. I have had the honour to mix among the French Canadian people in the city of Ottawa; I have the honour now to represent thirty or forty thousand of them in this House and I know the French Canadian people do not approve of such tactics. They are as anxious as we are to upbuild Canada as one united country, and I believe Sir, it is a vicious principle for the hon. gentleman for Rouville and others of his political friends, to attempt to erect a sort of Chinese wall around the province of Quebec, to attempt to isolate and separate that province from the rest of Canada, and to attempt to promulgate within that province small sectional ideas. That, Sir, is conduct which does not redound to their credit and which, I believe, does not meet with the approval of the large bulk of the people of Quebec, or of Ontario either. If these hon. gentlemen imitate the fathers of confederation they will not be found attempting to isolate one province from the others, they will not be found advocating and defending the rights and privileges of one particular province, but they will be found advocating what is best for all provinces and all races in this Dominion. I believe that the citizen of Quebec has as much interest in the affairs of British Columbia as he has in the affairs of his own province, and I believe he will demonstrate that interest if he is not kept in a state of turbulent feeling all the time by pretended champions of the rights and privileges of a particular section of the people of Canada. Sir, if the plane of statesmanship is not elevated higher than that; if the member who represents Ontario is to speak only for Ontario and the Quebec member only for Quebec, Canada will never attain that high rank which she deserves to attain in this British Empire.

I do not pretend, Sir, to discuss the question that has occupied so much of our time in this debate; I cannot understand why, but I would like to be enlightened as a new member, as to why it should be necessary to rehearse all the talk of the last election about reciprocity. Do hon. gentlemen of the opposition think that the people of Canada are now concerned in what has passed; do they not know that the people of this country are principally concerned with the fact that Mr. Borden is at the head of the State, and that he has surrounded himself with ministers from the different provinces who are ready and willing to discharge their duties in the best interests of the whole Dominion? In view of what happened on the 21st September, I should have thought that the right hon. leader of the opposition would have taken the first opportunity to rise in his place and say: Thank God the people of this country had sense enough to keep any foreign country from interfering in our affairs. In view of the verdict of the people I should have thought he would rise and say: What a blessing it is that when we were in power last year we did not force upon the people of this country this reciprocity pact without giving them an opportunity of saying yes or no to it. But, Sir, what has happened is that many of the speeches delivered in this House are simply campaign speeches delivered with some object which, so far, I have been unable to discover.

So far as the people of this country are concerned, reciprocity is a dead issue and likely to remain so. We have been told by one hon. gentleman on the opposition benches that the speech from the Throne was, as he called it, a flat bill of fare and contained no matter of importance. Well, that does not seem to me a very high parliamentary term to use in describing the address from the Throne. It may be an unpalatable bill of fare for the hon. gentleman, but it has within it sufficient meat for the careful consideration of the best brains in this House within the next month or two.

I would have expected that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would congratulate the Dominion of Canada for having as its Governor General His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. The appointment of His Royal Highness singles us out as the chief colony of this great British Empire. It is a mark of special favour to the Dominion of Canada that we should have as our Governor General the beloved uncle of our beloved Sovereign, his adviser and friend, a man of large experience and great wisdom. I say, Sir, that the sending of the Duke of Connaught to preside over our government is an acknowledgment by our Sovereign that after Great Britain herself, Canada is nearest to his heart. And it seems to me most fitting and proper that this event should have occurred when the people of Canada demonstrated, with no uncertain sound, on the 21st of September last, that they desired this country to remain connected with the British Empire and build up that empire with Canada as an important integral part. These, Sir, are some of the thoughts which have come to me during this debate. Let me say, before I conclude, if one new member may congratulate another, that I was delighted to hear the speech of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan), and to know through him that the people of the Northwest recognize that their interests are bound up with those of the people of Eastern Canada and are willing to work with them for the upbuilding of this young nation. We heard during the last campaign that there was some work to be done to keep the east and the west in harmony, but I trust, Sir, that

the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Buchanan), will always be true as it is to-day, and that the east and west will go hand in hand towards building up the prosperity of Canada. I have had the honour during the past three and-a-half years to sit in two parliaments, if one may term the legislature of Ontario a parliament, and I can tell the hon. members of this House that if they want to see a business-like administration and public affairs conducted in a businesslike way and with despatch, they should keep their eyes on the legislature of Ontario and the government of Sir James Whitney. And I would add that the leader of the opposition in that House, during the time I had the honour to be there, vied with Sir James Whitney in giving the closest attention to public matters, with the result, I venture to say, that more good legislation has been introduced, thoroughly considered and passed by the Ontario legislature during the past 12 years than has passed through this House during the past 10 or 15 years. We have no 'Hansard' in the Ontario legislature, and as at present advised, I would be inclined to do away with 'Hansard' in this House as a preventive of long speeches. There are no long speeches in the Ontario legislature. In fact, outside of the statements of the leaders, there are few speeches by members of the House. The members of the House give their close attention to the different measures submitted in the committees, so that when these measures come to the legislature they require very little extra discussion. I do hope, for my own sake as well as the sake of other members of the House who come from far distances, that the length of the sessions of this parliament will be so arranged that they will not as in the past, occupy six or seven months. I am satisfied that by the application of businesslike methods all our legislation can be dealt with in three or four months.

I desire to add my hope that in the debates and in the work we have to do in this country, we shall have heard for the last time the cry of provincialism and that we shall use our endeavours to legislate for the people as a whole. We have many subjects to discuss, we have many important questions to deal with, and I do hope and trust that in all our legislative work we shall bear in mind that we are legislating for the whole Dominion and not for any particular section of it, and that the rights and privileges of all sections and communities will be safeguarded in any measure we may decide to adopt.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Fripp), has apparently come to this House with a mission, and judging from the tenor of his remarks I can only conclude that my hon. friend has become a sort of fanatic in a religious way, because during the greater portion of his speech he seemed to be entirely worshipping himself. When we find him, as a new member, attempting to tell the other members of this House what their duty is, it seems to me that he would have done better to have sat in his seat a little while longer before attempting to lecture the House in the way he did. I observe a disposition on the part of many hon. gentlemen opposite to deprecate any further discussion with respect to the issues which have been raised before this House and which have been occupying our attention for the past week or more. If my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Fripp), had been in this House during the last parliament, there might have been some occasion for the lecture he has seen fit to give us, because he would have found much food for thought had he given his attention to the long dissertations and discussion which took place during the last session of the last parliament. The desire to cut short this debate, which is so apparent on the part of hon. members opposite, is no doubt well founded. No doubt they are anxious that the means by which the change was brought about in the personnel of the government should not be exposed to the people.

I have no doubt that the hon. members who so desire to cut short the debate are anxious that there should be hidden from the people of Canada the means and the methods whereby a change of government has been brought about in Canada. Mr. Speaker, changes of government are not very serious matters, but there are questions the determination of which are of greater gravity, and if hon. members on the opposite side are desirous of closing the debate and of preventing the country from receiving knowledge as to the course which has been pursued by hon. members during the recent campaign, I for one feel that it is my duty, as the representative of the county which I have the honour to represent, to place before this House somewhat as to the course which was pursued during the campaign. We have heard from hon. members, notably the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) as to the course that was pursued in the great province of Ontario. In every campaign there are necessarily issues raised that are not pertinent nor relevant, but I am sure that the people of this country are interested in knowing whether those issues are raised for a purpose, or whether they are merely incidental. I am sure that the people of this country are interested in knowing whether there has been deceit and misrepresentation knowingly and premeditated. I think the people of this country, while willing to condone and even forgive any small or minor issues which

may be raised in any campaign, are certainly not disposed to forgive, but are disposed to resent, any attempt to mislead the electorate on matters which are not issues and which men would be ashamed to speak of in the open.

In the county which I have the honour to represent, and I am bound to say that it is inhabited by an intelligent people, presumably the great issue was that of reciprocity. I assumed from the very outset of the campaign that that was the issue. I assumed, moreover, and I stated from every platform, that it was merely a plebiscite on the question of freer trade relations with the United States, and to all appearances that was the issue that was being fought. But I found, as a result of inquiry at the close of the campaign, that there were underground organizations; and, indeed, I have it on the authority of the gentleman who opposed me in the election, the candidate of the Conservative party, in a statement which he made in a public address in the city of Moncton, that not only did this underground organization exist, but that he was so desirous of keeping it in existence that he urged his supporters to see that it should be kept alive in order that it might do future service in the interest of the Conservative party. If that election had been determined on the question of reciprocity, I certainly would have been content. I was not concerned at the loss of power. I would not have been concerned even if I had gone down to defeat on the question of reciprocity. But, Sir, I do think, in regard to the issues which were raised, that it is in the interest of the people of Canada that they should be exposed and be known from ocean to ocean. Reciprocity was a great issue, a transcendent issue, an issue on which any government might go down to defeat with honour. But that the former government went down on that question, so far as eastern Canada is concerned, I deny, and I think I shall be in a position to prove that denial conclusively. In the county of Westmoreland, there were two underground issues raised: one was the Eucharistic Congress and the other was the Ne Temere decree. I did not meet these questions on the public platform; but as I travelled through the county I learned that the emissaries of the Conservative party had been ahead of me. In some sections of the county there was hardly a man who could not tell me about every incident connected with that Eucharistic Congress held in Montreal over a year ago. The people were told that that congress was convened because of a French Catholic Prime Minister and in the interest of the Romish Church. It was also alleged that the Ne Temere decree

arose out of legislation that had been initiated by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier as leader of the government. I had been told in many instances of every detail. It was alleged that your predecessor in office, Mr. Speaker, attended that congress in the city of Montreal in his robes of office, and that the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was in the procession. Every detail was talked of—the utterances of those who were present, the statement that one delegate at that congress had stated that Montreal should be made the Rome of Canada, and so forth. I am a fairly constant reader of the newspapers, but I never learned in any of my readings or from any other source, the details of that congress. But, Sir, it was not alone with respect to that phase that I had a right to complain. I learned that there were in that county a band of Nationalists, that they had converted a French Acadian newspaper, 'Le Moniteur,' into a Nationalist paper, and that it quoted in each issue from 'Le Devoir' in a way to excite the French Acadian electors of the county of Westmoreland against Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I am bound to say, however, that this attempt did not make very great progress among the French Acadians. I am bound to say they were true to themselves and true to their faith, and were not carried away by any such appeals as were brought to their attention in every issue of that paper.

The issue of reciprocity, as it was joined in this discussion, and as it was set forth in the resolution before the House in the last session of the last parliament, involved, in my judgment, two very pertinent questions, and it is my purpose to devote most of my time in the remarks I shall make to these questions. I hold that the resolutions which were tabled by the hon. Mr. Fielding in the last session of the last parliament raised these two questions, and the campaign throughout the country until the 21st September confirmed them. The first question was the effect of freer trade relations between the young nation occupying the northern half of this continent, and the great republic lying immediately to the south. The second was the results which might possibly accrue to the great empire of which we are an autonomous unit by reason of such trade convention. And, there has been developed since the election in September, and especially during the debates in this House, a third question, that is the duties and responsibility of a party forming a government to the people whose affairs that government is called upon to administer. For the sake of convenience I will comment first upon the third question reversing the order in which I have stated them.

I have already mentioned the means whereby the election was carried in many of the constituencies in the province of New Brunswick. I have mentioned the means used in the attempt to wrest the county of Westmoreland from its old associations and place it in the Conservative fold. But these are matters that relate to the individual as such and not to individuals collectively and in the aggregate. There were, it is true, involved in the campaign two very great questions to which I have not at the moment referred. One was the appeal to the cowardice ot the French Canadians with respect to the naval policy. And hon. gentlemen opposite, in appealing to cowardice of the French race were insulting the French Canadians, for they are not a cowardly race, certainly so far as I have come in contact with them. But there was as well an appeal to the cowardice of the English provinces with respect to annexation and the severance of British ties. That appeal was made unblushingly. It was stated that if we should enter into an economic pact with the people of the United States, our connection with Great Britain perforce would be severed, and we should irresistibly be drawn into the whirlpool of annexation; that we should have no control over the conditions prevailing in this country but should be helpless—and should be so much Americanized, possibly some may have thought, that we should be compelled to speak with a nasal twang. These appeals did not, and do not do credit to the Conservative party. And I think that the exposure that is being made with respect to these appeals may well be left to the consideration of the people who will apply the remedy in their own good time. To say that it was a cowardly appeal to the people of Canada is not an extravagant statement. They planted in the minds of the timid ones the idea that reciprocity and freer trade relations with the people of the United States meant annexation, meant the furling of the British flag and the hoisting in its place of the Stars and Stripes. There were many timid ones, I venture to say, throughout the length and breadth of Canada who had that idea planted in their minds. This in conjunction with these appeals to passion and prejudices wrought havoc, they took the people from the seat of judgment and constrained them to act upon impulse and without regard to reason. I think that those who made that appeal to a fear of the danger alleged to be incident to trade with the people of the United States paid, but a very poor compliment to the people of Canada. They forgot, Sir, the history of Canada within the last hundred years. They forgot the conditions which prevailed during the war of 1812. They forgot the sturdy charcter of the people of the north, their stamina and their force of character. Bliss Carmen, a New Brunswick poet, has aptly described the conditions which prevail and have prevailed in Canada, and I cannot do better than read to the House that pretty little poem of his, 'The Song of the Four Worlds.' In that poem he says:

> Is it northward, little friend?
> And she whispered, 'What is there?'
> There are people who are loyal to the glory of the past,
> Who held by heart's traditions, and will hold it to the last:
> Who would not sell in shame
> The honour of their name,
> Though the world were in the balance and a sword thereon were cast.

I think that aptly and beautifully expresses the sentiments of the loyalists who first settled in our province of New Brunswick. Aye, and it expresses the sentiments of the sturdy Scotch, Irish and French who came to join these loyalists in the pioneer work of the building up and peopling our province. And what is true of New Brunswick, I am sure, is true of the other provinces regardless of situation or name. I hold that the appeals which were made in the direction of implanting fear in the hearts of the people were an insult offered to the people of Canada.

But Mr. Speaker, we are concerned particularly at this moment, not with the individual appeals which were made during the election campaign, but with the aggregation in the form of a government which has resulted from those appeals. Now, I will speak in no personal sense, nor in any sense disrespectful to any of the hon. members who sit in that cabinet, all very worthy men and men whom I hold so far as I know them in the highest respect. But the people of this country are concerned with them not as individuals but as a combination entrusted for the time being with the destiny of Canada. I had some idea, because of my reading, of the difficulties which beset the Prime Minister when he was entrusted with the duty and responsibility of selecting a cabinet. I appreciate to the full all the annoyances and irritations that he must have experienced in finding gentlemen to occupy positions in his cabinet; I appreciate to the full also the measure of success which has attended the efforts of my hon. friend, the leader of the government, in making the selection which he did. I have no personal quarrel with any member of that government. I am glad that my hon. friend was able, in the first instance, to get together an aggregation of millionaires, the like of which cannot be found anywhere in Canada. I suppose that the result was due to the fact that the campaign just closed was one between the classes and the masses,

and if the classes have succeeded, it is in the natural order of events that the representatives of those classes should sit on the treasury benches in this House. Let me deal just now with a question of fact and not with a question of law. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works raised a legal point with respect to the amendment moved by the right hon. the leader of the opposition. I certainly must congratulate the leader of the government in the selection of the Finance Minister. I think I voice the sentiments of every one when I say that the leader of the government, because of his experience as a Liberal in former days, knew where to turn when he wanted a reliable, able, clever finance minister who could be depended upon. He did not seek one from those who came to him in such large numbers from among his own friends in the province of Ontario; he did not look even to his own native province of Nova Scotia, nor to the adjoining province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend the leader of the government having knowledge did not even select the gentleman who had had experience already as Finance Minister of Canada and who sits at his right in this House. He looked to none of these provinces, nor to his friends in any of these provinces, but he went to the province of Ontario, where the trusts do abound, and he selected a good Liberal, I believe, up to within a few months ago, and I have great pleasure in congratulating the leader of the government in making such an excellent selection.

I was much interested, Mr. Speaker, in the explanations offered to this House by the Minister of Public Works the other evening as to why it was that he appeared as the first lieutenant of the leader of the government. It appears that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and the hon. the leader of the government were former lovers, that something came between them, the wooing that had been going on year after year was, for some reason, suddenly brought to an end. It seems that that separation, that coldness, continued down to the 21st of September, and after that date the wooing was renewed. We were not told who initiated the wooing, whether it was my hon. friend the leader of the government or the Minister of Public Works. But the fact remains that those old lovers came together again, the romance was ended, and they joined hands and heart on the treasury benches of Canada. It is creditable to them that they could come together after all these years of coldness and separation. One would almost imagine that their case was like what sometimes happens in real life, where lovers had been parted. 'I have forgotten her face, and she has forgotten my name.' That apparently was not the case, and my hon. friends, remembering each other's names and faces, came together again, and there they sit in the same government, having apparently forgiven and forgotten all.

Now Sir, it must seem strange, I should think, to the hon. members of this House who sat in the last parliament to see such a combination; it must seem strange to the people of Canada that this has occurred after the appeals that were made in the different provinces, after the endeavour to array the people against each other, made by the hon. gentlemen opposite; it must seem strange indeed to the people of Canada that there should now be that unanimity of heart and spirit which hon. gentlemen would have us believe exists to-day. The point has been raised, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment offered by my right hon. friend was not constitutional. I have been at some pains to study the authorities with reference to that point, and I find it is laid down very clearly, beyond all peradventure, first in Morley's Walpole; it is to be found in Anson's Law and Customs of the Constitution, and in Michael McConnell's work on parliament.

In fact, in every constitutional work relating to parliamentary government it is laid down, in the first place, that there are four features to our system of government to-day. The first is the doctrine of collective responsibility, the second, mark you, is that the government is answerable immediately to the majority of the House of Commons and ultimately to the electors whose will creates that majority. The third is that the cabinet is, except under uncommon, peculiar and transitory circumstances, selected exclusively from one party. Of course, there are the exceptions in cases of coalitions. Coalitions are usually only the preliminary of fusion. A coalition is where men of different parties and owing allegiance to different political organizations come together for the common good, to work out, in the interest of the people, some proposition and means for the good of the whole people. We have had instances of that kind in Canada, notably where, at the dawn of confederation, those who represented the Conservative or Tory party, those who represented the Reform or Liberal party, joined hand in hand for the purpose of accomplishing the confederation of the British North American provinces. Whether this government is a coalition government or simply a banding together of different individuals who have not seen eye to eye with respect to great and important questions, I cannot say. We have not been favoured with an explanation in respect to that matter. But, there is one, the fourth feature of our system of parliamentary government, which I wish to emphasize to the House and to the country. The fourth is that the Prime Minister is the keystone of the cabinet arch. But, there is an important qualification of the Prime Minister's

power and that exists with respect to the Crown. Here it is well understood that the Sovereign has the right to demand the opinion of the cabinet and is a court of appeal against the Prime Minister or any other minister. That was evidenced in the foreign crisis which occurred in Great Britain in 1859-61. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister entrusted with the duty and responsibility of selecting a cabinet, has large powers of discretion. I admit that, having made that selection, he is bound to submit to the Sovereign or the representative of the Sovereign, the names of those whom he has just selected, but, Sir, I hold as well that he is bound to tell the Sovereign or the representative of the Sovereign if there is any divergence of views upon any of the vital questions which affect the government of the country. It seems to me that where, as was stated by Disraeli in his day, party is organized opinion, it is due to the sovereign power, or the representative of the Sovereign, that there shall be an explanation made to him and repeated to the House of Commons, because the people have rights in this matter as well as the Crown, as to whether there are differences of opinion and as to how and in what manner those differences of opinion may be fused or coalesced so that the country and the Crown will know just the position in which the government stands upon matters vital to the public welfare, vital, indeed, to the future of the country.

It seems to me that we stand here to-day without that knowledge. When it is proposed in an amendment submitted to this House to inform the representative of the Sovereign that there are men in the cabinet who are divided in opinion with respect to questions affecting the public interest and the public welfare, it seems to me to be the duty of parliament to call the attention of the sovereign power to the conditions which prevail.

Bagehot, in his work on 'The English Constitution,' referring to the position of the cabinet, says that what is mostly needed is the manly utterance of clear conclusions. Mr. Speaker, in 1909 there was a question brought before this parliament which was at the time represented to be of paramount importance not merely to this Canadian confederation but to the empire of which we form a part. That question was discussed at great length, and it has from that moment down to the present been discussed in parliament and out of parliament. The public press of the country have commented upon it, have made representations, have made suggestions and every public man throughout the land, in explaining to his constituents the course which he has taken in parliament, has felt constrained to animadvert upon that question—the question of the naval policy—which was so vividly and emphatically brought to the notice of parliament in 1909 by the then hon. member for North Toronto, the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). I do not wish to use any offensive terms, but in order to be emphatic I feel constrained to say that men who have come together in hodge-podge fashion are face to face with the ultimate question that must arise between them. It was put in graphic language by Mr. Carlyle in this way: 'Can I kill thee, or canst thou kill me?' It seems to me that that is the position in which the leader of the government, the Minister of Public Works and those who sit by their side are placed in the matter, figuratively speaking, by the association of ideas. The question between these two hon. gentlemen must be, and the people of the country will repeat the question: Can I kill thee or canst thou kill me? Indeed, there must have been some killing done already. I do not know who it was that was slaughtered or maimed or wounded, but apparently since the 21st of September there has been some slaughtering. The question as to whether we should have a navy or as to whether we shall make contributions in Dreadnoughts, or in large sums of money, or whether we shall have no navy at all are vital to the future of Canada and vital even, Sir, to the future of this government. The people of Canada are not going to sit idly by and be content with but one answer.

The Minister of Public Works, for whom I have the greatest personal respect, fell far short of my ideal when he attempted to ignore the remarks of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) by the statement: 'We are here, and you are there.' Apparently that is the crux of the whole situation, apparently that is the aim of the agitation that has been going on in Canada for two or three years back.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must remember that was a quotation. I quoted something that had been said previously.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would have preferred to have had something original from my hon. friend; something that would have given us an insight into his inner conscience, but by using it as a quotation my hon. friend adopted it as his own, and apparently there is no other reason to be given for this coming together of the present cabinet. There is only the inference that they were brought together for the common purpose of: 'Being there while we are here.' I do not think that is an ideal way in which to explain the position of public men who are supposed to stand together within the cabinet on vital questions respecting the country. I do not think the Minister of Public Works did

himself credit. I would have been prouder of him had he taken the House into his confidence. It is due to the people of Canada and this parliament that there should be some exposé of the circumstances under which the Minister of Public Works accepted office as the leader of one party with the Prime Minister who is the leader of another party. It is laid down as authority that the men with whom the Prime Minister associates himself as his ministers have probably been engaged in actual political co-operation with him before, although from time to time he may seek additional strength in fresh alliances. The leader of the government had certainly the right to invite Mr. Monk to his cabinet, and personally I am glad he did, but from the standpoint of principle, and from the standpoint of constitutional government the people have a right to know in what manner their divergent views were unified. Michael McDonough, in his work on Parliament, page 151, says:

The Prime Minister, who like the body of which he is the head, is in turn not unfettered in the choice of his colleagues in the administration. He is obliged to select them from among the more able or rather the most prominent members of his party.

It is not always easy for a Prime Minister to select the most able men; there are conditions which make it necessary to make a choice from another standpoint; he is met with alliances; there are connected with the party, members of a former administration, and these men look for an invitation to take a seat in the ministry. I know it must be very annoying to those who have been offered an inferior post in a cabinet when in a former administration they occupied a higher position, and that is a difficulty a Prime Minister must meet, and it is one of the irritations which arise in connection with the formation of a ministry. It is none of my business personally as to what views the Prime Minister may have as to the standing of this man and that man, but it is my business in common with every elector of this country to know the common platform upon which men of admittedly divergent views on vital questions unite. Lord Melbourne on one occasion in connection with a condition similar to that we are now discussing said, speaking of his ministry: 'It it not much matter what, we say, but mind we must all say the same.' That expresses in a nutshell the requirements from a cabinet under our constitutional system. These principles are enunciated by every authority on constitutional government. A constitutional axiom seems to be:

Governments must consist of persons of the same way of thinking in politics, and that way in accordance to the opinion for the time of the majority in the House of Commons.

I wonder whether this government has been brought together in accordance with the opinion of the majority for the time being in the House of Commons, and in wondering that, I am compelled to wonder also which wing of the government is in accord with the opinion for the time being of the majority in the House of Commons. Do those who sit before me as loyal supporters of the Conservative party deem themselves in accord with the views expressed by the Minister of Public Works? If not, are they in accord with the views which have been enunciated by the leader of the government? We cannot compel the ministers to answer these questions, but it does seem to me that the House is entitled to an answer, and that the country is expecting an answer, and an explanation They tell us they have had no time to make up their minds, no time to formulate a policy, no time to explain to the people of Canada just where they stand on that vital question, but during the sessions of the last parliament they had already made up their minds, and they went before the people of the country on their declared policy.

Whether they have completed the details or not, there must be some principle which must guide them, there must be some consensus of opinion on their part. We are not particularly concerned with matters of detail, but we have the right to ask or demand an answer from those who speak for the government on a matter of such vital interest to the people of Canada. Above governments, above Prime Ministers, there is the omnipotence of parliament. The First Minister, although entrusted with the authority to frame a cabinet, is not above the Crown, and much less is he above the omnipotence of parliament. From the standpoint of those who represent the sovereign people of Canada, these men who form the cabinet should explain to the country the position in which they stand with regard to that naval policy, with regard to the course we are to pursue in connection with the defence of the empire, in connection with the defence of our own shores, and the protection of our own commerce. But singular to relate there is no mention in the speech from the Throne regarding this question. That is a very strange omission, but it is no doubt due to the fact that there is really no coalescence in this coalition government, and that the members of the cabinet have not reached a consensus of opinion. But in view of that omission in the speech from the Throne, we ought to have a declaration from the First Minister on this subject.

True, the government have not had very much time in which to formulate policies. Certainly they have not had time to branch out into new highways and byways; but in view of the past history of this country within the last two years, they certainly should be in a position to immediately place before the country a statement re-

garding the policy which has been threshed out in this House and was referred to by them in the election campaign that wafted those gentlemen into the position of cabinet ministers. I have wondered how it is there is no mention in the speech from the Throne regarding the acquisition of branch lines over the Intercolonial. That is a subject which was brought before this House time and again during the last parliament and also in a previous parliament. It is a subject which has received the attention of members of parliament, and the people throughout the country. It is a subject which the newspapers of the country have repeatedly and constantly been commenting upon. It is a subject of vital importance and interest to the people of eastern Canada. The people of eastern Canada are not concerned with the deepening of the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence waterways and the Lachine and Soulanges, and other canals along the St. Lawrence, but they are concerned, materially, sentimentally and in every way, with the question as to the course this government proposes to take for the expansion of the Intercolonial, and for the purpose of affording to the people of eastern Canada those railway facilities for which they long have sought, and for which they have mourned because they found them not. That question was before parliament last session. It was then discussed by the then leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) who is now leading the government. It was discussed during the last campaign in the constituency I have the honour to represent. In the neighbouring constituencies, in Nova Scotia, my hon. friend the leader of the government took such a deep interest in it that he found it necessary to send a telegram to Charlottetown, when campaigning in Prince Edward Island, to the people of New Brunswick assuring them that his party, if returned to power, would take steps to acquire branch lines for the Intercolonial, and thus afford to the Intercolonial advantages it could not have without the assistance of those branch lines. I had hoped that on that question of securing of branch lines, which had been approved by the outgoing government, and resolutions relating to which had been discussed and adopted by this House—I had hoped that it would not take months and years for this government to formulate a policy regarding these branch lines especially as it was the declared policy of the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) to acquire them.

I have no comment to make with respect to the construction of a highway from ocean to ocean. I know nothing of the details, and shall not speak on that matter at this stage.

As regards the division of portfolios the people of Canada are not materially concerned, they are not agonizing for information as to what action is to be taken with respect to the Department of External Affairs, or some other department, but they are interested in the transportation question, they are interested in matters which affect them vitally, which affect them in their homes and communities, and they have a right to ask what is going to be the course of the government with regard to the development of communities which will necessarily and naturally be served by these branch lines, particularly should these lines become a part of the government railway system. Again, the people are somewhat concerned regarding the continuance of the Intercolonial as a government road, constructed by the government, as contemplated by the British North America Act. We ought to be enlightened in this connection, especially in view of the frequent mention made in the press of the possible transfer of this railway. I should be glad, indeed, if the unrest on this point should be quieted, and the people assured that the Intercolonial will continue as a government railway, and that these branch lines will form part of it.

I would not wish to leave this subject without making some further reference to the manner in which the members of this government have come together. I have said that some one has made a sacrifice, or, if there has been no sacrifice already made, that the preliminaries to a sacrifice have been taken and somebody apparently has abrogated his principles. I am reminded of the saying of Hosea Bigelow:

> A marciful Providence fashioned us holler
> On purpose that we might our principles swaller.

I do not know who it is who is going to be called upon to swallow his principles, but if any one is called upon to do so it must be a matter of gratitude on his part that he was thus fashioned hollow in order that he could swallow them.

I have mentioned that there were two main questions involved in the issue which was raised before the people of this country arising out of the resolutions which were moved by Mr. Fielding at the last session of the preceding parliament, and that one was with respect to the effect of the reciprocity pact upon Canada. The other was with respect to the results that might accrue to the British Empire from such a convention of trade between the United States and Canada. We have heard much, in this House and out of it, with respect to that trade agreement. It has been spoken of as if it were a new thing, something that had been born in a night and had been first brought to the attention of the people of Canada in the previous parliament. Why, Sir, I am reminded that the question of reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States had

its origin previous to confederation—indeed, in the discussion of the confederation question. I remember that in the year 1867 I was but a boy going to school, and it was my privilege, during the first general election held in Canada for the Dominion parliament, to listen to those two gladiators in debate, Howe and Tupper, discussing the question of confederation. I can see them even now in the manner of their presentation of their respective views. That was during July or August, a year after the abrogation of the Lord Elgin treaty, which had been in operation in the British North America provinces from 1854 to 1866. I remember distinctly the arguments which were advanced by the then Dr. Tupper, now Sir Charles Tupper, in behalf of the confederation scheme. The reciprocity treaty had had a marked effect, and the people of the maritime provinces were alive to the benefits which had accrued to them from it. Sir Charles Tupper was appealing to the people of Cumberland county to support the confederation pact, and one of his strongest arguments was that by reason of a confederated union of the four provinces of Canada, there would be a greater leverage upon the people of the United States to secure a renewal of that treaty. It is within the knowledge of hon members of this House that immediately after the abrogation of the treaty Joseph Howe carried on a campaign in the northern states in favour of a renewal of it. It is within the knowledge of those familiar with the political history of this country that Sir John A. Macdonald and all the other great public men of Canada were assuring the people of Canada that they would seek a renewal of that treaty, and Sir Charles Tupper, in assuring the people of Cumberland that confederation would be a means to an end, and that end a renewal of the reciprocity treaty, used a powerful and a potent argument, so powerful and potent that the Hon. Joseph Howe, who was the anti-confederation advocate, was staggered at the effect of it, and he had no adequate answer to make, with the result that the people of Cumberland returned Sir Charles Tupper as their first representative to the parliament of Canada, with the hope and the assurance that reciprocity would be the result of the confederation. Sir Charles Tupper was certainly true to his word with respect to the efforts he would put forth to that end, because I find in the first tariff that we ever had in the Dominion of Canada, a clause which reads as follows:

Any or all of the articles mentioned in Schedule D, when the growth and produce of the United States of America, may be imported into Canada from the said United States free of duty or at a less rate of duty than is provided in the said schedule, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, whenever the United States shall provide for the importation of similar articles from Canada into the country free of duty or at a less rate of duty than is now imposed on the importation from Canada of such articles into the United States.

Now, what were these articles mentioned in schedule (D) ?

Schedule D.

The following goods when the growth and produce of any of the British North American provinces may be imported free of duty, viz.:

Grain, flour and breadstuffs of all kinds.
Animals of all kinds.
Fresh,smoked and salted meats.
Seeds.
Green and dried fruits.
Fish of all kinds.
Products of fish and of all other creatures living in water.
Poultry.
Butter.
Cheese.
Tallow,
Timber and lumber of all kinds, round, hewed, sawed, but not otherwise manufactured in whole or in part.
Fish oil.
Gypsum, ground or unground.

There, Sir, is a reversal of the situation. During the last campaign which was carried on in this country there stood on the statutes of the United States a proposal similar to this, a proposal under which they would admit free of duty into the United States all the articles I have mentioned and others, and under which there should be a proportionate reduction of duties with respect to other articles. They had that on their statute-book as we had it on ours in 1868. They were awaiting an answer of the people of Canada as we in 1868 awaited an answer from them.

In 1879, a new tariff policy was to be formulated in Canada. A readjustment of the tariff was made which proved to be an increase of the tariff. And as a palliative of these increases of taxation upon the people of Canada, it was proposed by the national tariff of Canada:

Any or all of the following articles, that is to say: animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees, and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of all other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

There was a renewal to the offer of reciprocity to the people of the United States. That tariff was formulated by the Conservative government headed by Sir John Macdonald whose Finance Minister was Sir Leonard Tilley. Why, Sir, in 1878, Sir Charles Tupper, when, on behalf of his leader Sir John Macdonald he came to the maritime provinces to urge the people to vote for the so-called National Policy, sought to convince them that high taxation carried with it the hope, and indeed the assurance, that the United States would immediately sue for reciprocity, and so the high tariff would be simply the means to an end, that end being the securing of a lower tariff with the people of the United States. That was the hope and aspiration of the people, in many instances, I am sure, in voting in favour of the National Policy. The hope was that reciprocity, which has been the foundation, aye, indeed the corner stone, of every tariff that has ever been made by the parliament of Canada would follow. Indeed every economic problem in Canada has been gauged by the hope and aspiration of the people to secure better and reciprocal trade relations with the people of the United States. And such an appeal was certainly a powerful one to the people of the maritime provinces. In those days they had not forgotten the splendid effects of the Lord Elgin treaty of 1854. Every farmer, every fisherman, every stonecutter, every ship carpenter, every worker whatever his employment, was cognizant of the fact that throughout that period of twelve years there had been nothing but prosperity, contentment and hope among the people of the British provinces by the sea. These halcyon times had been preceded by dark days, the days from 1849 to 1853, when annexation manifestos were issued in the city of St. John, when public men of the province of New Brunswick met together and formulated resolutions in favour of annexation with the express desire of cutting the connection with Great Britain and launching out for ourselves, hoping that as a province we should be enabled to have free trade relations with the people of the United States. It must be borne in mind that the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 arose out of the irritation that existed between Great Britain and the United States as a result of the civil war. It must not be overlooked that that irritation caused Canada a setback which she struggled against for years. It would be interesting to know just what were the effects of that treaty whose term of existence was from 1854 to 1866. It is true that the statistics of trade in those days were no more accurate, perhaps, than those of to-day. And we can best judge of the effects of better trade relations with the United States at this distant day by examining the statistics both of Canada and of the United States. The statistics compiled in Canada and those compiled in the United States do not always agree even in the present day; but, in the main, they point the same lesson. The first lesson is that there was no great invasion of American products from the United States into Canada, as the following table will show.

I present a table showing imports and exports according to both Canadian and American reports:

American Goods brought into Canada.

	Canadian Reports.	American Reports.
1854	$15,533,090	$24,157,612
1855	20,828,676	27,741,808
1856	22,704,508	29,025,349
1857	20,224,648	24,138,482
1858	15,635,565	23,604,526
1859	17,592,916	28,109,494
1860	17,273,029	22,695,928
1861	20,206,080	22,676,513
1862	22,642,860	20,573,070
1863	18,457,683	27,619,814
1864	7,952,401	26,574,624
1865	14,820,577	28,829,402
1866	15,242,834	24,828,880
1867	.....	21,020,302
1868	22,660,112	24,080,777

Now, on the other hand, we find that the Canadians did find in the United States the market they were looking for:—

Exports of Canadian Goods to the United States.

	Canadian Reports.	American Reports.
1854	$ 6,721,539	$ 8,784,412
1855	12,182,314	15,118,289
1856	17,488,197	21,276,614
1857	18,291,834	22,108,916
1858	11,581,570	15,784,836
1859	14,208,717	19,287,565
1860	18,853,033	23,582,796
1861	18,645,457	22,724,489
1862	15,257,812	18,511,025
1863	18,670,773	17,484,786
1864	32,422,015	29,608,736
1865	30,547,267	33,264,403
1866	46,199,470	48,528,628
1867	.....	25,044,005
1868	22,387,846	26,261,379

These figures show that during that period our exports to the United States increased sixfold. Another salient fact is that, according to the American statistics, for the first three years of the reciprocity treaty the balance of trade against Canada was over $35,000,000, while according to Canadian reports it was $23,000,000. During the continuance of the treaty, Canada made such inroads into the American market that the adverse balance was turned in our favour, and the last three years, according to Canadian reports, we sold to the Americans $71,000,000 more than we bought from them; while the American statistics showed that the balance was at least $41,000,000 in Canada's favour.

These favourable conditions were due unquestionably to the operation of reciprocity, and the experience of those who were familiar with the conditions in those days will bear out my statement. I live in a community where, within cannon shot of my residence, there were ten building stone quarries in operation, employing at least one thousand men. To-day, and for many years previous, those quarries have been as silent as the tomb; a cemetery would not be more silent than they. Why? They have been closed because the American market was closed to us. Under the proposed reciprocity agreement the people began to entertain hopes of a brighter day. My hon. friend from North Toronto talks about home markets. There was a home market for at least 5,000 people. Where have those people gone? To the State of Maine, and to the quarries of Ohio. There was a better home market for the agriculturist than even the home market of Moncton, created as it has been by workmen in the Intercolonial shops. Under the reciprocity treaty, in former days, that home market was equal to if not better than the present home market, it was furnished by the reciprocity treaty during its operation. At that period there were in operation shipyards in various portions of the provinces. At these shipyards schooners were built for the purpose of plying to and fro between the ports of the maritime provinces and those of New England and the middle states. That industry has gone, because there is now no longer any use for coasting vessels. Is it any wonder that under these circumstances the people of the maritime provinces still desire better trade relations with the people of the United States?

Sir, I am always glad to listen to the optimistic utterances of our hon. friends from Western Canada. I delight to observe that buoyancy of spirit, that large hopefulness, that grand outlook which they exhibit in speaking of our great western heritage. I join with them in rejoicing at present conditions in that country, and the glorious prospects for the future. But I cannot forget the eastern section of Canada which I am more particularly called upon to represent. I see there a loss of population going on every year. Our agricultural industries, the production of hay, for instance, our stone quarries and their products, our gypsum quarries, our small lumber are all in a lethargic condition, and at times in a condition of stagnation. It is only here and there that there is activity and hopefulness.

Now, with respect to the census, I had occasion during the last campaign to visit some of the historic spots in the maritime provinces. Let me refer to the community known in former days as Beauséjour, in later days called Fort Cumberland. It is on the isthmus between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and is one of the most beautiful agricultural sections to be found, I venture to say, in any of the provinces. The people are a sturdy stock, many of them Yorkshiremen who have come from old England, many Scotch, and other people of sturdy races, who went there to make homes for themselves. They have lived there for generations, yet I found in that one small community that, whereas there were in 1901, 835 souls, in 1911 the census showed that there were only 696. In ten years, in that small agricultural community, there had been a decrease of 139 in the population.

That is simply an illustration of the conditions which prevail in the maritime provinces to a great extent. I bow to no one in my optimism in regard to the future of Canada. I will not agree to take any second place with any hon. member of this House as to the future of our country, but I feel that there must be consideration given to the east as well as to the west. The people of Ontario it is true, have pronounced in no uncertain way against the government which advocated better trade relations with the United States. It may be that they did it upon the question itself, or it may be that they did it because of underground organization. I care not how the result was brought about, I know that a great wrong and harm was done to the people of eastern Canada when that pact was rejected. I have no concern with respect to the loss of power, or to the change of government, but I do hold that in the interest of the people of eastern Canada we had a right to hope for an arrangement whereby our trade relations with the people of the United States would be advantaged.

We live very near to the shores of New England. Our transportation facilities are not only excellent but cheap. Our relationships are of the most intimate character. Indeed, when you consider the position in which we stand as Canadians towards the people of the United States, you must realize that if there is not reciprocity in trade there is reciprocity in social intercourse and in education and religious matters. There is not an organization in Canada, whether it is a labour organization, a charitable or a church organization, but is international in character. Take your labour union, your Christian Endeavour Society, your Epworth Leagues, your great temperance and social gatherings, all these are international and the people of that country mingle with the people of this country and we with them, first in their country and next in ours. It does seem to me reasonable that we can, without endangering our loyalty, without any menace to

the ties which bind us to the motherland, have social and religious intercourse with the people of the United States, we can also have trade intercourse without in any way endangering our autonomy or our status as a dependency of the British Crown. I am borne out in this by statements that have been made in this parliament. In 1894 Sir John Thompson stated in the House that the Conservative government of that day had intimated to Washington:

> That Canada would be glad to know of any desire or willingness on the part of the United States government to take measures towards the extension of trade between the two countries and that Canada would be willing to reciprocate.

These are clear-cut words, strong, definite and conclusive, in favour of reciprocity, and they were uttered by Sir John Thompson who, if he was not at that time leader of the government, was at a latter period Prime Minister of Canada. During that same session my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) who was then Minister of Finance of Canada, made this statement:

> When they, the people of the United States, look over the items in our tariff as it shall have passed the House, they will find that line after line, article after article, grade after grade, we have given them a better chance to get into our market than they have given us to get into their market; consequently, legislative reciprocity, so far as trade is concerned, shines out from the proposition that the government put before the House to-day in a far greater degree than it does out of the legislation which they proposed, and which is in progress through their Congress.

The former Minister of Finance then looked forward to legislative reciprocity. It seems to me a remarkable fact that we could have legislative reciprocity in 1894 without endangering the British constitution or our connection with the empire, but that now in these later days we cannot have that same legislative reciprocity because, forsooth, we are endangering British connection. To me it shows that there was a wrong impression promulgated before the people, that the people got a wrong and erroneous idea with respect to what might be termed the loyalty side of the reciprocity pact.

This reciprocity arrangement, this agreement entered into between this country and the United States last year, was born of the labour and the travail that have taken place since confederation, and so it comes, that we as a people have been looking for it during all these years. Even in the days anterior to the confederation of the four provinces we hoped for it, we sought it but we failed in getting it. The moment we get it, the moment it is within our reach, it becomes disloyal on the part of any one to seek to have it, and newspapers and extras are circulated through the land with great flags embellishing them, and we are asked the question: Under which flag? Here are the Stars and Stripes in one corner and the British ensign in the other, and under these flags the question is put: Under which flag? Mr. Speaker, that question was settled in Canada one hundred years ago and from that moment down to the present time it has been the steadfast desire of the people of Canada to cling to their flag. The only time that there has been any hesitancy or any doubt with respect to it was when Sir John Abbott, himself a great Conservative, and other Conservative leaders throughout Canada, issued annexation manifestos and appealed to the people in favour of annexation as against the British Crown.

I have great faith in better trade relations with the people of the United States. I am sincere with respect to the reciprocity agreement. I believe that Canada lost an opportunity which she will not soon have again. I believe that no greater calamity could have occurred to Canada than the rejection of that agreement. The going out of the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is nothing; the changing of the personnel of those who are to administer the affairs of Canada is a matter of very little moment, but the condition of the people of Canada is of large moment and the future of eastern Canada and the contentment of the people are matters that cannot lightly be thrust aside. They cannot be laughed out of this parliament. This question will not die because the people will not permit it to die.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My friends opposite may laugh, and perhaps they are not concerned because as they say: We are here and you are there. But, the underground organization by which you got there, and we got here, is a matter of some moment to the people of Canada; it was the means to the end, and oh, the end is so glorious. I hold that the reciprocity agreement would minimize the baneful influence of trusts and combines and monopolies, to the advantage of the producer and the consumer alike. I hold it would afford an additional market and furnish a choice of markets. I hold it would stimulate and increase production which would demand increased labour, and thereby create a larger and better home market for all producers, agricultural and manufacturing alike. It would expand our imports of luxuries from Great Britain due to increased purchasing power and furnishing a greater revenue it would permit a greater preference on British goods. The Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke highly of the home market,

and I agree with him, but the difficulty is that our home market is too restricted for the volume of our production. If there is a stimulation of agricultural production in Canada it will necessitate more labour and more labour will mean a larger population and a larger population will create a greater home market not merely for the agriculturist but for the Canadian manufacturer. If there is a larger population and increased agricultural production, there will of necessity be a greater demand for manufactured goods. The people of the west and the people of the east would have greater purchasing power, and they would not only indulge in the luxuries which are brought from Great Britain, but they would be able to purchase to a greater extent of the manufactured goods of Canada. And when the Manufacturer's Association opposed by might and main, and means, the reciprocity pact they stood in their own light because they lessened the possibilities of the home market, the extension of which would be beneficial to them. There would be no discrimination under that agreement against any section or class of people. The opposition of the manufacturers was based on a fallacy. What they feared really was British competition as the result of an increased British preference. I have it from the lips of manufacturers in my own constituency that they did not fear the competition of the American manufacturers, but they did fear that the greater expansion of trade with the United States would mean greater purchasing power on the part of the consumers, larger importations, a larger revenue and a larger surplus, and that with a larger surplus there would be an insistent demand from the people that there should be a lessening of taxation which would possibly take the shape of increasing the British preference from 33⅓ to 50 per cent. Therefore, the manufacturers of Canada had before them the bogey of an increase in the British preference and that is what they fought against, although one would think these persons who claim to have the exclusive monopoly of all the loyalty that is going would surely not object to an increase in that preference. The Manufacturer's Association, great and powerful as it is, must be actuated by sentiment sometimes, and surely they ought not to repine if the increased prosperity from reciprocity would bring increased benefit to the heart of the empire which they pretend to love so well. There is no treason in trade and if there were we would all have been traitors long ago. Our trade with the people of the United States has been growing year by year until it is now one-half of our total trade with the world. We buy from them because we have to; we get from them our raw sugar, our raw cotton, our anthracite coal, and many other things which come in free of duty. The balance of trade is against us; we buy from them to a greater extent than they buy from us, and if reciprocity had been adopted there would have been a possibility of evening-up that trade. Our lumber, our building stone, our hay, our potatoes, our fruits and all products of the soil pay a heavy toll to-day in entering the market of the United States, but we must have the market and so we must pay the toll. Is it a more loyal thing to contribute this taxation to the United States than it is to seek from them advantages whereby our natural products would find entry into their markets free of duty? Is it a crime to trade with them in natural resources without tariff barriers, and not a crime to deal with them when we have to pay them toll?

I know that our people everywhere throughout Canada are anxious for greater trade; I know that it is taken as an accepted axiom of trade that the volume of our exports largely influences the material prosperity of a people, and that such axiom is recognized by the business men of Canada whether in the east or the centre or the west. The Maritime Board of Trade met in the city of Moncton in August last and there discussed trade relations—but not trade relations with the United States. They said that was a political subject. But they discussed trade relations with Cuba and the West Indies, and they passed resolutions—Boards of Trade are great on resoluting—and a clause in the preamble of one of their resolutions was :

Whereas the volume of export trade largely influences a country's material progress, be it resolved that we ask the federal government——

They always ask the Federal government to do something—

—to use every available means to win this trade.

What trade ? The trade with Cuba and the West Indies—

To win this trade, especially that of live stock for Canada, and further——

—and here comes the real crux of what this movement with respect to the betterment of trade with countries which are remote, amounted to :—

Further to inaugurate a modern and up to date steamship service——

Of course by subsidizing some such service. Here, for a day or more business men of eastern Canada were discussing the question of better trade relations with Cuba and the West Indies, and at that very moment there was a live, vital question under way with respect to better trade relations with our neighbours, the United States, and that question they ignored in spite of the fact that the principles which

they laid down, as respects the enlargement of trade with the West Indies and Cuba, would apply with greater force to the enlargement of trade with the United States. Yet not one of them had the temerity to stand up and encourage the efforts that were being put forth in order to bring about a condition of things that would mean a wider and larger market and a better condition generally throughout every section of the country. It seems to me that this shows the hollowness of this whole movement. It shows the hollowness of the opposition to this reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States. We had some illustration of that when this parliament was convened. I think that there are some references in the speech from the Throne to the bettering of trade relations with Guiana. Well, we might as well propose to have better trade relations with Timbuctoo or Morocco or some other remote section of the world; but it would not do to suggest in the form of a resolution before this House the desirability of expanding our trade relations with the people of the United States, although my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), went to New York the other day and there said that he wanted to trade with the people of the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear Hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friends say 'hear, hear.' We are here and you are there. But take heed lest you fall. The day may come when you will not be there unless you take some steps with regard to the enlargement of trade; and certainly you will not deserve to be there, and that is of greater moment than you being there and our being here. When I see the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite I am impressed with the opinion that they have imbibed some of the ideas of the pious editor which are set forth so beautifully in the pious editor's creed. In order to bring to the notice of my hon. friends the position in which they find themselves and in which they acknowledge themselves to be when they reply to everything by saying : 'We are here and you are there,' let me quote to them Bigelow again :—

I du believe in bein' this
Or thet, ez it may happen
One way or t'other hendiest is
To ketch the people nappin;
It aint by princerples nor men
My preudent course is steadied,—
I scent which pays the best, and then
Go into it baldheaded.

I think my hon. friends have pursued that course. Certainly they have followed the scent closely. I do not know how long they may keep in that pathway, but there is one thing which the people of this country do realize, and that is that they have been humbugged. They realize that the means whereby my hon. friends got there and we got here were a species of humbug, and they might fairly say with Bigelow :—

In short I firmly do believe
In humbug generally,
Fer its a thing that I perceive
To have a solid vally;
This heth, my faithful shepherd been,
In pastures sweet heth led me;
An' this'ill keep the people green
To feed as they hev fed me.

An hon. MEMBER. Amen.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is not often called upon to say 'amen,' but I am glad he is training in that direction. But I am sure that in his heart of hearts my hon. friend is responsive to the idea I have quoted and is reconciled to it by the repetition of that other sentence : 'We are here and you are there.'

Now, during the last campaign we had in eastern Canada some so called 'empire candidates.' They were a new species of candidate to me. I was quite familiar with municipal candidates, and city candidates, and candidates for the local legislature, and candidates for the Imperial parliament, but I never had before brought to my notice the empire candidates. And of course I had formed some idea that both as to brain and to stature, an empire candidate must necessarily be colossal, must necessarily take the whole world within his grasp, and stand apart from and above ordinary candidates and ordinary people. But we had these candidates in eastern Canada, and I am not aware that anything they advocated was imperial in any sense.

I was not familiar with any of their imperial utterances, but I know that they placarded themselves as 'empire candidates,' and according to the rule of parliament, when a member makes a certain statement we are compelled to accept it; so of course, when empire candidates flitted before my view, I was compelled to recognize them as such. What was there in this campaign which made it differ in any sense, as far as the empire is concerned, from other campaigns that we have had? The Liberal party had given a British preference; they were the first to hold out the hand of friendship even to the people of the British Isles; and the Liberal party will, in my judgment, be the first in the future to extend that preference, and thus help to build up and cement the empire with respect to its trade. We talk about an Imperial Federation; we talk about trade within the empire. I have often wondered, when statements have been made with respect to the attitude of Joseph Chamberlain towards the fair trade proposition, so-called, in Great Britain, what would happen to our hon. friends opposite, who talk in glittering generalities on this matter, if there came before parliament and

the country a concrete proposition for inter-imperial reciprocity of trade. What would happen to the Manufacturers' Association? Where would those hon. members of this House who are interested in the woollen industry be if it were proposed to have reciprocal trade with the mother country in woollen goods in return for favours that might be granted by the British parliament? Where would any of the manufacturers of Canada be if such a concrete proposition were brought before this parliament? I know this, that if any such proposition comes before the Canadian parliament, the men who will oppose it, Mr. Speaker, are the men who sit at your right, headed by this coalition government. I do not know that I am so agonizingly an advocate of that idea as to twit anybody for his views in respect to it. I believe in British connection, but I believe in the autonomy of Canada. I believe that we as as a people are called upon to work out our own salvation fiscally and in all other respects, and when I make that statement I believe I am but following the utterances of leading statesmen in both England and Canada. In the last campaign Mr. Buxton, the Prime Minister, David Lloyd George, Balfour and all the other great publicists and public men of Great Britain recognized this principle, that the autonomy of the dominions beyond the seas should be recognized, and that it is in the interest of the empire, of Great Britain, of Canada, and of all the other overseas dominions that that recognition should be given. The genesis of the British Empire is to be found in those victorious contests that resulted in giving political autonomy and liberty to each unit of the empire as it is to-day constituted and organized. Let us beware lest any restraints of political or class apron strings contract the largeness of those liberties and that responsible self-dependence. There is such a thing as making an attempt to bind together the British Empire with bands of steel, and cementing them by legislative enactments; but Sir, I believe in my heart of hearts that the way to keep the British Empire together is to have those intangible ties, those sentiments, unfettered by any legislative enactments or legislative interference by one part with another. The government of Great Britain recognizes this. The government of Great Britain has had experience in just such conditions. Go back to 1775, to the war of the American revolution, gather from the pages of history the dealings of Great Britain with the dominions beyond the seas, and you must perforce conclude that the way for the British Empire to stand together is for each unit of that empire to recognize its autonomy and have that autonomy recognized; to have no fettering or contracting or restricting legislative enactment that would in any way impair the freedom which we as citizens of the young nation beyond the seas enjoy in our present condition as responsible, self-governing people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not often crave the indulgence of this House; I did not in a previous parliament, and I feel like apologizing for taking up so much of the time of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. Hon. gentlemen say, hear, hear; if they are disposed to worship themselves simply because they are there and we are here, they must not forget that there are people in this country who take a wider view and grasp of the situation—that there are people in Canada who are still interested in the questions, some of which were brought to light during the campaign; questions brought from the darkness and the twilight into the open light of day, and settled it may be for the time being, but not settled in so far as the future of Canada is concerned; questions that are vital to us. We are a country of wonderful commercial assets; we are a country of great possibilities, and as such we have the right to guard and safeguard our future. In my judgment, though you may not attach very much importance to it, I believe that we are but on the threshold of an agitation not only for freer trade relations with the people of the United States and with the people of all other countries, but we are on the threshold of an agitation that has for its goal the reduction of the tariff duties of this country in the interest of the great consuming masses of the people. That agitation cannot and will not down. We may attempt to laugh at it. We may say, 'We are here and you are there:' but that is no answer and will not be accepted as an answer. I venture to repeat my statement, this issue is not dead; and the government, if it has even its own selfish interest at heart, will do well not to forget the fact I have endeavoured to enunciate.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in the congratulations to the eloquent mover and seconder of the address, and to say with what interest and pleasure I have listened to the succeeding debate, which has been maintained on a high level throughout. I have no intention of making a lengthy contribution to the discussion. But before entering upon my argument, I desire to advert to some personal references to myself on the part of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). I do not desire to take matters

of this kind too seriously, but I feel that I must deal with these allusions in simple justice to myself. The hon. member for South Wellington asserted that I was the 'representative of trusts, mergers and corporations.' The hon. member for Welland said:

> I think that the present Minister of Finance was forced into the position without his knowledge, because he had to obey the suggestions of the managers of his trust company.

Now I desire, Sir, to enter an absolute and unequivocal denial to these allegations. I say that no more unjust, unfair, and, in my judgment, ungenerous accusations were ever made across the floor of this House. The hon. gentleman in charge of this government is not the man to submit to political duress, and I am not the man to accept appointment under the conditions alleged. The people of Canada are well aware of the circumstances of my entry into public life, they are well aware of the circumstances of my inclusion in the cabinet, and I am quite content to leave the matter to their judgment, and in their hands. With regard to mergers and trusts, I have not, and I never have had, any interest of any kind, direct or indirect, in them. I say that to-night I am as free and unfettered to discharge the duties of my position as any other hon. member who has the honour to sit in this chamber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer some observations on subjects that have been brought up in this debate. It seems very curious to me that, although reciprocity was not mentioned in the speech from the Throne and although it is not mentioned in the amendment of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, it has yet furnished the principal topic of this debate. Now, I am the more surprised at this because I had believed, and I do believe, that reciprocity is absolutely a dead issue in Canada. Some hon. gentlemen are unwilling to admit that reciprocity is dead; they seem to think it is in a state of suspended animation. Not so, my hon. friend from South Wellington. He has no doubt whatever as to the matter, he has no hesitation whatever in saying that reciprocity is dead. For his part, he has come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. What would our Liberal friends of Ontario say as to the suggestion that reciprocity is not dead? I think most of them would not only agree that reciprocity is dead, but I think most of them are sorry reciprocity ever was born.

Now, what has been the character of this debate up to the present time? I will not call these proceedings an inquest, but we have undoubtedly been present at the obsequies, at the last sad rites of reciprocity, and this debate has in very truth been its funeral oration. Hon. gentlemen opposite are slow to accept the verdict of the people, they are slow to admit that they have been the victims of a mistaken policy. They say the result was due to passion, not to reason. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is easier to say that than to admit that the negotiations for reciprocity were in fact a political mistake of the first magnitude. The agreement was before the people of Canada for no less a period than six months. And yet it is alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite that the result of the election was due to passion and not to reason. Now, surely, the agreement having been before the people of Canada for six months, that was a period long enough to allow passion to cool. Reciprocity was debated as no other question was ever debated in Canada, it was debated upon thousands of platforms, and I doubt very much if Canada ever saw before such earnest audiences throughout its length and breadth as those that listened to the addresses and discussions upon reciprocity. It was the constant subject of editorial comment and of public discussion. Now, Sir, the people of Canada are intelligent. Man for man, I believe the people of Canada are among the most intelligent in the world, if not the most intelligent. The result of the election was decisive. Was there ever a more decisive political overthrow? Is it not a reflection upon the capacity of the Canadian people to say that the result was due to passion and not to reason?

Now, Sir, I do not propose to introduce the hustings into the deliberations of this assembly, so I shall deal with the question of the rejection of reciprocity briefly and generally. On what grounds was reciprocity rejected? In my judgment, both upon economic and upon national grounds. Speaking for myself, I say it was rejected on economic not less than upon national grounds. The national aspect was the first one considered. During the first few weeks the discussion of the economic side of reciprocity was hardly heard, but rather the national side of the question. It was only afterwards that the economic argument had its full force and effect, and I need not tell hon. gentlemen opposite, or hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that as the campaign proceeded the chances of the government grew less and less, and I believe that if the campaign had lasted two weeks longer the Liberal party would have been annihilated. How many hon. gentlemen opposite would have the hardihood to-day to appeal to the country again on the issue of reciprocity? Objection has been impliedly made to the people of this country deciding a question of this kind upon national grounds. What

objection can there be to the Canadian people deciding any question on national grounds if they so desire? Have not the people a right to be the judges of national considerations as well as of business or economic considerations? I say that the instinct of the Canadian people, both upon the economic and upon national grounds was sound; I say that the instinct of the people is worth all the reasonings of all our statesmen. I say that the verdict of the 21st September was the voice of reason and the voice of patriotism, speaking at the polls as it had a right to do, under the constitution of this country.

Let us now consider the matter from an economic standpoint. This country is, and has been, a protectionist country. Both parties have adopted that policy as a matter of necessity. It is the obvious and necessary policy for the upbuilding of this country. We have had a tariff wall against the United States, and they have had a tariff wall against us; in consequence we have taken our own line of development. That tariff wall has profoundly affected the trend of our trade and the distribution we have given to our industries. It has also profoundly affected our railway policy in constructing the great National Transcontinental systems. We have built up great industries, we have spent enormous sums upon railways, some of them still incomplete. Our interprovincial trade has grown enormously, we are in the constructive stage of our development. Our mixed farmers, our fruit growers, our vegetable growers, enjoy the advantage of a magnificent home market, probably the best home market, actually and potentially, in the world to-day. Now, under these circumstances, was it wise to negotiate an agreement the purport or intent of which was to introduce so sudden and so radical a change in our economic system?

Then our people were profoundly impressed with the fact that there was no assurance of the continuance of the agreement. While upon the face it apparently gave either side the right to withdraw, our people felt that while the great nation to the south could withdraw if they so chose, and could threaten to withdraw, in so far as we were concerned we could not do so. They were afraid of the entanglement which might result. In that connection, when my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Emmerson) was speaking this afternoon of the Lord Elgin Treaty of 1854-1865 and its discontinuance in the latter year, I thought of the negotiations which were then instituted for its continuance. There is a singular analogy between the negotiation of that time and the negotiation of the early part of this year between our ministers and representatives of the United States government. In 1865 Messrs. Hay and Howland, representatives of the Canadian government, went to Washington to see if they could bring about a continuance of the Lord Elgin Treaty. Being unable to do so they entered upon negotiations whereby, under concurrent legislation, a reciprocal agreement might be entered into. The hon. Geo. Brown, then a member of the coalition government of Canada, said that he dissented entirely from any such proposed agreement, that he was afraid of the entanglement which might result, and the hon. Geo. Brown, one of the leading Liberals of Canada, actually resigned from the coalition government by reason of this proposed negotiation of a reciprocity agreement. As I say, the people of Canada were afraid, among other things, that we might not be able to extricate ourselves from the agreement, that it was a one-sided, a unilateral agreement although appearing to give both parties the right to withdraw.

As far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I may say that practically all classes were against reciprocity—farmers, manufacturers, and artisans, and Sir, when a verdict is got from such a province is it not the part of wisdom to accept it? The farmer of Ontario had learned the value of his own market. His cities had been built up and he had come to realize as the campaign progressed that he had probably the most valuable home market in the world. He realized also that he would have been exposed to the competition in his own market of American trusts and of thirteen favoured nations and all the British colonies from none of whom he would receive any reciprocal advantage whatsoever. The manufacturer, on his part, feared commercial union. Boards of Trade all over Ontario and all over the Dominion of Canada passed resolutions against reciprocity. Therefore, is it not presumption to set up the opinion here that the people of Canada on this issue were misled, that all classes were misled and acted upon passion rather than upon reason? Labour was against it. The interests of labour were bound up with the interests of the manufacturer, and labour throughout the length and breadth of Canada was opposed to reciprocity.

Now, we have heard from the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with regard to the west and he seemed to express the fear that the west was greatly discontented with the result of the election. He stated among other things that the price of wheat was higher across the line than in our own west. It is a fact that the price of grain at Minneapolis, for special reasons, is higher than it is at Winnipeg at times. But let me ask my right hon. friend, having regard to the special conditions which prevail at Minneapolis, what would happen to the difference in price if the tariff wall were thrown down

between Canada and the United States and an avalanche of our wheat were allowed to descend upon Minneapolis? What, I ask, would happen to the difference in price then? The price of wheat is determined by the export price and the people of the west are well informed of that.

What about our great transcontinental railways, and, in this connection, I desire to call attention to the speech which the right hon. leader of the opposition made on July 30, 1903, with reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. He said:

We consider that it is the duty of all those who sit within these walls by the will of the people to provide immediate means whereby the products of those new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost, and whereby, likewise, a market may be found in this new region for those who toil in the forests, in the fields, in the mines, in the shops of the older provinces.

Such is our duty; it is immediate and imperative. It is not the duty of to-morrow but of this day, of this hour, and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late: heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels, and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that properly belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land. Upon this question we feel that our position is absolutely safe and secure; we feel that it corresponds to the beating of every Canadian heart.

In view of that speech, in view of the millions we have sunk in the National Transcontinental railway, and in view of the policy of the government with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific, what, I ask, is to be said of a policy that would divert the wheat of the west to the American roads and the other vigilant competitors referred to in the speech of the right hon. gentleman? I have to read in that connection a clipping from the 'New York Sun' in reference to reciprocity. It is as follows:

The scheme will give the United States greater control of the wheat market than it ever had before. It will enable its milling plants to turn Canadian wheat into flour and send the finished product abroad, and it will stimulate the sale of manufactures and other things that we have to sell to Canada. Canadian grain will pour into Minneapolis, to the benefit of American millers, handlers and exporters of grain. For every bushel that comes across the border a bushel will be exported at New York so long as the United States continues to raise more wheat than it consumes.

Why should Canada not do the milling business that will go to the millers of Minneapolis, and why should not our railways and our railway operatives have the carriage of the grain from the west if the farmer of the west will derive no more advantage under reciprocity?

Let me advert for a moment to the business side of this question. Is it not a fact that on the evening of the 21st September, as a result of the election, practically every business man in Canada felt a sense of relief? Is it not a fact that nearly every business man in Canada breathed more freely as a result of the election?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. WHITE. What about the improvement in business which has been shown since the 21st day of September last? What about the judgment of the London money market, the great financial market of the world? Ask any financial man as to the situation with regard to Canadian securities prior to the 21st September, 1911, and subsequent to the 21st September, 1911. I desire to say with all due respect to hon. gentlemen opposite—because I know that this agreement was negotiated in the best possible good faith, although I believe a serious mistake was made—that the rejection of the reciprocity agreement constituted the best advertisement that Canada ever received in Great Britain.

And I say further that the work of the people of Canada on the 21st day of September last—I say it also with due respect to hon. gentlemen opposite—was as good a day's work as they have done since confederation.

I come now to the question of the United States, and notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, judging from the tone of their public men, and the tone of their press, I believe the people of the United States have received the verdict of the Canadian people without any feelings of animosity or resentment. There was a standing offer of reciprocity upon our statute-book for eighteen years, and when the people of the United States failed during that period to take advantage of it surely they have no ground of complaint if the people of Canada in the exercise of their judgment failed to approve of the proposed agreement for the exchange of natural products. And, as for Canada, there has been growing up here a more neighbourly feeling for the United States which I feel certain will continue. But, is it wise to suggest, as the right hon. the leader of the opposition did, the possibility of an unfriendly feeling? Is it in the interest of this country that even the possibility of an unfriendly feeling should be suggested? Let me recall in this connection a speech of the right hon. gentleman delivered some years ago in which he said that in the course of his experience he had found that our best policy as far as the United States was concerned was that Canada should be absolutely independent of her.

I come, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the navy, and I do not know that any greater compliment could be paid this government than to suggest that within the

few weeks in which we have been in office we should have been supposed to be capable of maturing and bringing down a naval programme that would commend itself to the judgment of this House. In that time we have been very busy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, we have all had to be re-elected, and according to popular report one of us needed a good deal of time to get elected. At all events we have been so busy that we have hardly had sufficient time to properly consider the bill for repairs to the 'Niobe', let alone being able to mature and bring down a naval programme that would commend itself to the judgment of this House, and of the country, and of Great Britain. As to the naval programme of the late government, I have just this to say: I say they deserve some credit for having taken up the question, but I say that their naval policy was not only not satisfactory to the people of Quebec, but it was not satisfactory, as I read public opinion, to the people of Ontario, or to the people of any of the other provinces of Canada. The general opinion is that the proposed navy would be a source of great expense in peace and would be absolutely useless in war. Now, the Prime Minister purposes consulting the British Admiralty, and what better course could he take preparatory to maturing a naval programme? After he has consulted with the British Admiralty, we shall be in a position to deal with the whole question, and I believe, Sir, that we shall have public opinion both in Canada and Great Britain behind us in the policy which we shall adopt.

Much time has been consumed during this debate in personal attack upon the members of the ministry. I am not prepared to say that such attacks are unprecedented in constitutional annals, but it is my opinion that this attack has been carried further than is warranted by precedent. I can assure you, Sir, that such attacks must fail of effect. If there is dissension in the cabinet, it is strange that none of the ministers have even heard of it. Dissension in the cabinet! —why, Sir, there has been nothing but the utmost harmony and hard work since the beginning. As I have said, it is not my intention to make any lengthy contribution to the debate, but I wish to say before concluding that it is the object of this ministry to administer the affairs of Canada to the satisfaction and advantage of the people whose servants we are, and, notwithstanding the personal attacks that have been made upon us it is my belief that we shall continue to do so. This, Mr. Speaker, is my first experience in addressing the House; I have to thank my hon. friends, and especially hon. gentlemen opposite, for the kindly and courteous attention with which they have listened to me.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). Mr. Speaker, most of the speakers who have addressed the House during this debate have opened their remarks with congratulations. I wish to congratulate the leader of the government upon his choice of his Minister of Finance, and I wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance upon the choice of language, and of ideas with which he has favoured the House to-night. It is important that the man who occupies the position of greatest importance in the government should bring to that position ability and judgment, and I think we are safe in assuming that when the Minister of Finance has spoken on the question of reciprocity, the best has been said that can be said by its opponents on the economic side of the argument. We have waited more or less patiently to hear an expression on the economic side of the reciprocity argument from gentlemen occupying the Treasury Benches and their friends, but we have had to wait until the Minister of Finance spoke to-night for even a shred of argument. If I were to make any criticism on the address of my hon. friend (Mr. White) it would be that he has mistaken Ontario for the Dominion, and that when he wonders why Canada does not accept Ontario's verdict with regard to reciprocity, he has hardly that view of the scope and responsibility of the position he occcupies which no doubt he will have in a short time.

I was glad to hear my hon. friend disclaim most emphatically any connection on his part with or any interest in trusts, mergers and combines. At the same time, as the leading representative in the government from that province which has declared so emphatically in favour of the rule of the trusts, mergers and combines in the economics of this country of ours, we are bound to assume that if he is not of them at any rate they are behind him; and while the voice may be the voice of Jacob the hand behind is the hand of Esau. Let me relieve my hon. friend's mind from the impression under which he appears to labour that reciprocity is dead as an issue in Canadian politics. In so far as the reciprocity proposals were proposals for the reduction of taxation and the increase of trade in this Dominion, I would like him and his friends to understand that they were never more alive than they are at this moment and that, although he and his friends may have been able, by appeals to passion and prejudice——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER—during the recent elections, to snap a popular verdict, I think that the course of this debate will enlighten the people of Canada somewhat on the

merits of the arguments placed before them during that election, and that, when the question comes to be considered again, the policy of lower taxation and larger trade will win in Canada.

My hon. friend and his associates have extracted a great deal of comfort out of a word let fall by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) when he said that reciprocity was dead. Reciprocity is dead.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. Reciprocity involves, by its very nature, an arrangement between two parties; and so far as the party of the United States is concerned, that party, which for forty years refused and rejected reciprocity, but which, under the stress of circumstances, accepted that policy for a moment, need not be expected to accept it again as the policy of that country for the next forty years. So that when my hon. friends comfort themselves with the idea that reciprocity is dead, they surely are to entitled to be congratulated on the fact that when the opportunity came to Canada to so greatly benefit her material conditions they were able to destroy that opportunity. It is assumed in the course of this debate that the United States were clamoring for reciprocity with Canada, that it almost needed a regiment of soldiers along the boundary line to prevent the people of the United States from forcing their goods upon us and from taking ours without the impediment of a tariff barrier. But the facts of the case are that the monopolies, trusts and combines of the United States fought reciprocity in that country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. Just as the monopolies, trust and combines of Canada fought reciprocity in this country. And I do not think there is any doubt that had reciprocity been submitted to the people of the United States, as it was submitted to the people of Canada, the same line of tactics which was successful in securing its defeat in Canada would have secured its defeat in the United States.

Our friends, the monopolies, trusts and combines in Canada, fought a good fight, and they did not fight single handed either.

Mr. CURRIE. What trusts?

Mr. OLIVER. I have here a list of gentlemen of Canada, patriots—they had been Canadian patriots inasmuch as they had been Liberals up to a certain time—who, as stated by the Toronto ' World ' on February the 20th, announced their opposition to reciprocity. And I notice in that list of patriots the name of the present Minister of Finance (Mr. White), I also notice another name—that of Mr. W. K. George. It is, Sir, a matter of record that Mr. George—this Liberal whose patriotism compelled him to come out and declare himself against this reciprocity arrangement, because it had a tendency to turn the trade of Canada to the benefit of the United States—it is a matter of record that Mr. George was a hireling of the United States trusts at the time. It is of record that another gentleman of the same class and kidney, named McNaught, also from that patriotic city of Toronto which will not truck or trade with the Yankees, was also a hireling of the Yankee trusts, and this is what was done under the name of protection of Canadian interests.

But they had their help, Mr. Speaker. I read a despatch which appeared in the Toronto 'World,' of July 30. The heading of the despatch, placed over it by the editorial management of the Toronto 'World,' not a part of the despatch itself, is:

Will Help Borden to Fight Election; British Tariff Reformers are Raising Campaign Funds for Use in Eastern Canada; They Rely on the West to Vote Strongly against Reciprocity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who is the proprietor of the 'World'?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Get a committee to inquire into it.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just spoken has the liberty to move for any committees he desires to inquire into any matter in which he finds an interest. The despatch reads as follows:

London, July 29—(Special)—In all the fury and billingsgate of the fight between the two chambers of the British parliament and the public uneasiness over Morocco, British tariff reformers do not lose sight of their fiscal ideal. They will leave no stone unturned to help Mr. Borden and his Conservative followers in the Dominion, defeat the Knox-Fielding pact.

Large money has been raised in Chamberlainite circles for ' educational purposes ' in eastern Canada, the assumption being that western sections do not require any fresh stimulus to oppose the proposed commercial relations with the United States.

If the Laurier ministry should decide upon a September general election the contribution to the war chest of its opponents will be greatly increased from Birmingham and other protectionist strongholds.

Mr. CURRIE. Will the hon. member state——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CURRIE. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman a question.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be questioned during my remarks. Any hon. gentleman who has not yet spoken in this debate will have every opportunity to

take the floor and favour the House with his remarks when his time comes. Now, what I want to point out to this House is that there was the most gigantic aggregation of capitalistic influence that this world ever saw——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER—brought to bear to win the elections of the 21st September. For Canadian patriotism, for imperial loyalty. No! In the interests of the trusts, mergers and combines of Canada, of the United States, and even of Great Britain. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, the delicate reference in this despatch to the west. The west was counted upon to vote against reciprocity without any educative effort. Two of the provinces of the west voted for reciprocity very strongly. Is it because the means of educative effort that were applied so successfully in other parts of Canada were not applied to these provinces? It looks very much as if we must concede to the over-confidence of this grand aggregation and association of patriots and imperialists the fact that the western provinces were able to send representatives here to support their own interests in connection with the economic affairs of this country. If they only had thought to reach far enough, they might have succeeded exactly as the Minister of Finance thinks they ought to have succeeded.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance was kind enough to give us some information as to economic conditions in the prairie west of Canada and as to the economic results which would flow from such an arrangement as was proposed between Canada and the United States. He told us that wheat was worth more in Minneapolis than it was in Winnipeg, and I suppose he wondered that the western farmer wants to sell his wheat at that higher price. If he has any doubt about the fact, I want to assure him that the western farmer is just like the eastern banker or the manager of an eastern trust company or of a manufacturing industry or of any other enterprise in eastern Canada, even in the city of Toronto, and he would really like to get for his product all that the market will give him. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in that the western farmer is not unreasonable, although it would seem that he is considered unreasonable by the gentlemen who are behind my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. But the Minister of Finance seems to think not only that the western farmer is unreasonable, but that he is not gifted with reasoning powers, and so he gives us an argument that I am sorry to hear come from a gentleman occupying the high and responsible position of Minister of Finance. He tells us that owing to special conditions in Minneapolis wheat is worth more there than it is in Winnipeg, but he has not told us why the Manitoba farmer should not have the benefit of those special conditions as long as they exist. I forgot, Mr. Speaker, he did tell us why; the reason was because if the Manitoba farmer got the Minneapolis price for his wheat, the railroad companies would not get that wheat to haul to Canadian and American ocean ports.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I shall be delighted to hear the Minister of Finance tell us what he did say.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I told you once.

Mr. OLIVER. Then will the hon. member take my word for my understanding of what he told us?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). What I said was that the western grain grower, in the event of the tariff wall between Canada and the United States being taken down, would not derive a higher price for his wheat than he does at present because the wheat would be put at once on an export basis.

Mr. OLIVER. If I may be pardoned, that was only part of what the Minister of Finance said. He went on to say—and if I am quoting him incorrectly I ask him again to correct me— that if the wheat went south, the railway companies of Canada, these very transportation interests, would not get that wheat to carry. And he read from the speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Prime Minister, on the Grand Trunk Pacific, the statement that the Grand Trunk Pacific was to be built for the purpose of carrying the wheat. Am I right?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. I am right. Then, let me say this to the Finance Minister, that if the tariff wall comes down, and the price of wheat in Minneapolis falls, then the wheat will not go to Minneapolis and the eastern roads will get the carriage of it just the same. The only reason a bushel of wheat goes to Minneapolis instead of to Fort William is because it will be worth more at Minneapolis than in Fort William. But if what the Minister of Finance said is true, that the taking down of the tariff wall will bring the price of wheat on either side of the border to a level, then he has nothing to fear on behalf of his railway companies, on behalf of his milling interests, on behalf of his monopolies, trusts, mergers or combines. I say he has nothing to fear on behalf of any of these interests if what he assured this House would take place does take place.

Now, we say this on behalf of the western farmer, and on behalf of Canada at large—that it is to the interest of Canada at large, as it is to the interest of the western farmer, and it is the right of Canada at large, as it is the right of the western farmer, that the western farmer should

get the best price for his products that it is within the power of the government of this country to allow him to get, whenever he can get it, wherever he can get it, and for as long as he can get it.

Now, I hope my hon. friend (Mr. White) has a better understanding of the position. He shakes his head he says he has not a better understanding of the position. Then I am sorry, but I shall have to withdraw what I said in the beginning of my remarks, and to suggest that the Prime Minister did not make as wise a choice as I had thought. Mr. Speaker, we are told that there were economic arguments put up against reciprocity. You have heard from the mouth of the Minister of Finance the only economic argument ever attempted to be put up; and I ask you, Sir, of what value is it? Mr. Speaker, did it ever strike you that there is no possibility of a valid economic argument being put up against a fair proposition to reduce taxation, and to extend trade? Why, the thing is a contradiction in terms. There is no economic argument applying to the people of Canada as a whole that can be put up against the proposition to reduce the burden of taxation upon the people, and to widen the opportunities of trade for the producers of Canada's goods.

Now, let me trespass a little upon the time of the House to give a few facts with regard to the values respectively of the greatest of Canada's products on either side of the boundary line. The quotation that I have is from November 15, and is as follows:

	Wpg.	Minn.	Difference.
1 Northern wheat... ..	98⅝	1.05⅝	(7)
2 Northern wheat... ..	95	1.03⅝	(8)
3 Northern wheat... ..	90½	1.01	(10½)
No. 2 C. W. oats.. ..	40⅜	46½	(.06)
No. 3 barley..	65	1.20	(.55)
No. 4 barley..	55	1.12	(.57)
Feed barley	50	1.05	(.55)
No. 1 N. W. flax.. ..	1.87	2.04	(.17)

In order to understand the matter thoroughly it is necessary to bear in mind that No. 3 Northern wheat in Canada is equal to No. 1 Northern wheat in Minneapolis; that Canadian oats are 34 pounds to the bushel and Minnesota oats 32 pounds to the bushel. But there are other products besides grain. Let us consider the prices of cattle. On November 18 for choice butchers' cattle at Winnipeg, the top price was $5 per cwt., and choice export cattle $4.75 per cwt. In Chicago on the same day, beeves were from $4.40 to $9.10; western steers $4.30 to $7.30; stockers and feeders, $2.90 to $5.75. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that stockers and feeders were worth 75 cents per cwt. more in Chicago than choice export steers were worth in Winnipeg. Texas steers in Chicago were $4 to $5.75. On August 25 grass-fed steers were $4 to $4.50 in Winnipeg, and $7 to $7.10 in Chicago. Now, in order to give an idea as to what these figures mean, let us understand how many bushels of this wheat, and barley, and flax, and oats, and how many head of cattle are to be disposed of each season. The Grain Dealers' Association of Winnipeg estimates the total wheat crop at 178,000,000 bushels, of which they expect that the farmers will sell 130,000,000 bushels. The oat crop is estimated at 187,000,000 bushels, the barley crop at 33,000,000 bushels, the flax crop at 5,500,000 bushels. To be well within the mark in making the calculations I will take, not the figures of this year's crop, which is larger than last year's, but the figures of the crop of last year as inspected by government inspectors—that is the crop that actually passed out of the farmer's hands, and was inspected for market purposes.

There was of wheat 84,000,000 bushels, of oats 28,000,000 bushels, of barley 4,000,000 bushels, of flax 3,500,000 bushels; and of cattle there were exported 46,000 head.

Now, Sir, estimating the loss to the western farmer by the rejection of reciprocity at 6 cents per bushel on his wheat, and estimating that he sells all this year's crop, on 84,000,000 bushels he loses $5,000,000; and if we add for the increased crop of this year 46,000,000 bushels, he loses $2,225,000 more. On the 28,000,000 bushels of oats, at a loss of 5 cents a bushel he loses $1,500,000; on 4,000,000 bushels of barley, at a loss of 50 cents a bushel, he loses $2,000,000; on 3,500,000 bushels of flaxseed, at a loss of 15 cent a bushel, he loses $500,000. On 46,000 head of live cattle, at 1,200 pounds per head, estimating the loss at only one cent per pound, he loses another $500,000. On the transactions of this current year, taking the minimum of exports, taking the actual market prices of the present day, the farmers of the three prairie provinces lose no less than $12,000,000, as a result of the rejection of the arrangement to admit their products free of duty into the United States markets. Estimating the population of the three provinces at a million and a half, it means $8 a head for every man, woman and child in town and country throughout those provinces, as a result of the vote of the 21st of September. But if you say that one-third of the population is in the towns, then it means $12 per head for every person residing outside the towns, on the land. Estimating each family at five persons, it means that each family of five occupying land in those prairie provinces, loses this year $60 as a result of the accession of our hon. friends to office. I want to say to them, talented though they may be, worthy though they may be in many respects, from our point of view the price is too high, they are not worth the money.

I said something about monopolies, trusts and combines. I have given the House the result of the triumph of the monopolies, trusts and combines on one end of the farmers' transaction. Let me give a little light on the other end, that is to say, on the buying end of the farmers' necessities. It is given on good authority that the Cockshutt Plough Company of Brantford, which makes an eight-furrow engine gang plough, sells that plough at Brantford for $600. They sell the same plough in Winnipeg at $680; in Saskatoon the same plough costs $705. But this infant industry which requires a protection of some 17½ per cent tariff to prevent those villainous Yankees from selling ploughs in Canada, it appears, is able to pay a 15 per per cent duty and sell their ploughs in the United States. The remarkable thing is that after paying the 15 per cent tariff duty, they sell their plough at Peoria, Illinois, at $525, and at Minneapolis at $502. The same plough that is sold in Brantford at $600 is sold in Minneapolis at $502, after paying a 15 per cent duty besides the freight. There is no manner of doubt that interests such as the Cockshutt Plough Company did feel a stupendous relief as a result of the election.

Now, we have heard it said that the victory was won by economic argument. We have had the refutation of that to-night from the lips of the Minister of Finance. He said, however, that there was no reason why the people of Canada should not vote on the national aspect as well as the economic aspect. I want to say that I fully agree with him. There is no reason why the people of any country should not decide a question on national as well as economic considerations. I am absolutely at one with him on that point. He said further that the decision was given on economic considerations as well as national, and not because of appeals to prejudice and passion. Well, I would not contradict my hon. friend, but I would suggest that his memory is at fault. I will trouble the House to read only a few samples of the arguments that were made, to show how far they were removed from any relation to economics, and how closely they were related to passion and prejudice. I will only refer to one or two. Probably the leading newspaper in the campaign which defeated the plain people of this country on behalf of the mergers, trusts and combines, was the Montreal 'Star.'

The Montreal 'Star' of September 20, the day before the election, in a double column article on the first page, contains the very last appeal to the electors, and almost the first paragraph is as follows:

> The vote will decide whether Canada is to remain a distinct nation or is to become an appendage of the American Republic.

Our old friend of the Toronto 'World,' on September 2, used this careful phrasing, this sane and hard-headed appeal to economics. The 'World' was satirising the Liberal position, and it said:

> Let us be hewers of wood and drawers of water for them; let us dig and plant and sow for them; let us reap and thresh for them and sell to them; let us be their bond slaves and the hired men slaves of their politicians, and the hired men of their merchants. We shall finger their greenbacks, and we shall sing the praise of the star spangled banner, and by and by we shall be allowed to vote for their President.

What does my hon. friend the Minister of Finance think of that economic argument? I think I can see him blush; I hope I can, at any rate. I think I heard the leader of the government declare in his place in the House that the economic argument was the principal argument. I think he denied that it was the sole argument, but he declared it was the principal argument in the campaign so far as he was concerned. But, I find on September 18, three days before the election, as reported in the Toronto 'World,' he issued one of his numerous manifestos, and I find the following paragraph in that manifesto:

> Throughout this Dominion the electorate now understand that they are called upon to determine not a mere question of markets, but the future destiny of Canada, and perhaps the empire.

Mr. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend does not blush; I am sorry. We have another specimen of economic argument, which introduces another feature, from the Toronto 'News,' dated September 5, under the heading 'Play Borden.' The 'News' cogitates in this way:

> Suppose on the other hand that the rest of Canada regrets this insidious advice and gives Borden not 75 but 100, 105, 110, Quebec will add its quota to his following for the opposition to Liberalism in Quebec is far from being confined to Nationalism. At once he is placed in the saddle, what then? Will he conduct the business of Canada glancing over his shoulder at the Nationalists? The way to answer that is to ask what be the source of his strength in Ontario and, once reciprocity is cleared out of the way, the entire west, that is where he will look for inspiration.
>
> Thus the British Canadian in this juncture is offered his choice. He can vote for Laurier, and deadlock for Laurier and government to satisfy the Nationalists.
>
> He can vote for Borden and a policy which will pay undue deference to no one section of public opinion.

We have a despatch from London appearing in the Toronto 'World,' and which is as follows:

> Among the more modern of the tariff reform morning newspapers, the feeling of tri-

umph is tempered by expressions of regret at the disappearance from political life of such a staunch Imperialist as Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the recognition that the victory is partly due to the Bourassa party. These papers declare they are glad that R. L. Borden has a majority large enough to render him independent of Mr. Bourassa's support.

We have another authority that we may quote on this question of economic argument and to settle the point as to whether passion and prejudice or economics had most to do with the result of the 21st in this province of Ontario. The 'Orange Sentinel' of September 28, says:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues evidently miscalculated the strength of the sentiment of loyality to the mother country. They depended on the selfish tendencies of Canadians, whose natural desire to add to their material prosperity the ministers imagined was stronger than their determination to resist any movement that might have in it the germ of separation from the empire. The appeal of the Liberal party was to the pocket; that of the Conservatives to national pride and love of the flag. In a most emphatic way the country pronounced in favour of the policy which puts national integrity first. Canadians will take their chances of prosperity under the present tariff rather than jeopardize their future political condition.

Defeat was due to our roused Protestantism as much as to reciprocity.

There grew up a settled conviction in the minds of Ontario citizens, Liberals and Conservatives, that the time had come to put an end to Catholic rule in the Dominion.

And my hon. friend said that there was no passion or prejudice in this campaign that achieved the victory of September 21.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again I say that I have no quarrel with my hon. friend the Finance Minister when he says that there is every reason why a self-respecting country ought to put national considerations before economic considerations. If the victory of September 21 had been won on national considerations there would be no fault to find, but, when the economic considerations upon which the victory was won were the economic considerations which take out of the pocket of the western producer the sum of $12,000,000 in cash in this present year, and when that is done at the demand of the transportation companies, the milling interests and the manufacturers of Ontario and of every class, kind and condition of selfish interest that was brought together in the campaign, I say the victory was not won for national interests, but that it was a victory of sectional interests of the most debasing and destructive kind. If we are to have a Canadian nation, Canadian nationality must be based on fair and equal opportunity to all the people of the Dominion according to the conditions surrounding them and that government which deliberately and definitely takes from the people that opportunity is pursuing a policy and manifesting a spirit which are not such as will build up a Canadian nationalism. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance said to-night, in effect, that the western farmer should not be allowed to sell his wheat in Minneapolis, because, in the interest of Canadian nationality, if you please, it ought to be milled in Canada. It can be milled in Canada to-day and it could be milled in Canada to-morrow if reciprocity had become the law, if the milling companies would pay the fair market price for the farmers' wheat.

These men who talk of Canadian patriotism, and ask that the western farmer shall be sacrificed to their selfish interests, let them show their patriotism by paying the farmers a fair market price for their product, and not come into the political campaign to prevent the farmer from getting access to the market he can reach to the best advantage to himself. I say that if the transportation companies, and the millers, and the manufacturers of this province of Ontario; if this financial oligarchy which sits at Toronto and Montreal is to sacrifice the interests of the people of all the rest of the Dominion to their interests, that is not the way to build up a Canadian patriotism, it is not the way to build up a Canadian nationality. And, I say it is absolutely to be demonstrated out of the mouths of those who have spoken on the other side that that and that alone is what the defeat of reciprocity means. It means that these interests combined—assisted from the other side of the line, and even from the other side of the water—to fasten upon this country the control of monopolies, trusts and combines, such as has not been fastened upon the neck of any other country, and my friend who sits opposite is the means and instrument by which this is being done.

They have told us that reciprocity meant the handing over of Canada and Canadian trade to the monopolies, trusts and mergers of the United States, and they tell us that the United States is full of trusts and mergers, and so it is. But it is again a remarkable fact that these same trusts, and mergers in the United States were fighting reciprocity on that side of the line just as ours were fighting it on this side of the line. Let me point out however, and it is worth the while of the plain people of this country to understand it, that the beef trust of the United States pays a higher price for the farmers' product and sells the result of their manufacture to the consumer at a lower price than does the beef trust of Canada; that the milling trusts of the United States pays the United States farmer more for his wheat and sells the flour cheaper to the consumer than does the milling trust of Canada; that the

manufacturer of the United States pays higher wages and sells his product at a lower price than does the Canadian manufacturer. I say that the conclusion is irresistible that though Canada has been pluming itself in the belief that while the people to the south of the line were cursed with trusts, mergers and combines, we were free of them, the fact is that this financial oligarchy in Montreal and Toronto holds this country under the control of trusts, mergers and combines more merciless, more comprehensive, more pitiless, than are the trusts, mergers and combines of the United States.

Mr. BORDEN. May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. How long has this dreadful condition of affairs prevailed?

Mr. OLIVER. This condition is a growing condition; it is growing in Canada as it has been growing in the United States and the reciprocity proposal was the means to be taken by the people of Canada—one step at any rate—to shake themselves loose from its grasp. Did this list of philanthropists in the city of Toronto get out to fight reciprocity from motives of pure Canadian patriotism, or did they get out and fight it because they felt that reciprocity was an attack upon the special privileges that they were holding at that time and that they would not hold in such great degree if reciprocity passed. Why was it that the manufacturers of this country lined up their employees before the election and told them in so many words that if reciprocity carried the factories would close, and told them that whether they were affected by reciprocity or not. It was because there was a combine of combines to defeat this proposal which would at any rate have opened the door to a better condition of things in regard to trade matters in this country. Don't let these gentlemen forget that the people of this country know whom they were fighting and what they were fighting, when the last campaign was on, and don't let them forget that so far from the battle having ended the battle has only begun.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is a very poor beginning for you.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend should not speak too loud; he had quite a chase to save his neck.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I got here all the same.

Mr. OLIVER. I rather think that with the experience the country is likely to have during the next four years my hon. friend will find the sledding a little harder next time.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Speak about the present.

Mr. OLIVER. It was said from every anti-reciprocity platform and in every anti-reciprocity newspaper that this campaign was a campaign of Canadian patriotism and imperial loyalty. Did these hon. gentlemen ever think that when they arrogated to themselves the whole of the Canadian patriotism and the whole of the imperial loyalty of this country they were placing Canada in a very sorry position in the eyes of the empire. If they were able to prove their case that those who voted for reciprocity were disloyal and unpatriotic, then there is only a difference of 43,000 votes in the million and a quarter cast, between loyalty and disloyalty. Our friends opposite have proved too much.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. OLIVER. I say they have proved too much because they have brought into question their own loyalty and their own patriotism. I am one of those who considers that my loyalty to Canada is involved in my loyalty to the empire, and that the maintenance of the prestige of the empire is a guarantee to Canada of her rights and liberties and the opportunities of her citizens. I am bound to say that although the triumph of our friends on the other side, on the 21st of September, has laid a heavy burden on the people of this country, yet they would be willing to bear that burden if the interests of Canada and the empire demanded it. But there have been developments since this parliament met which bring seriously into question, not only the good faith of our friends on the other side in this matter of Imperial loyalty, but their actual loyalty itself. The amendment which is before you, Mr. Speaker, is of more than an academic character. It is a test by which we find where this government stands on this question of imperial loyalty. They have asked to be judged on that question. They have admitted that economics were not the most important part of their argument and they have asked to be judged by the test of their loyalty to the empire.

It will be remembered that two years ago there was a German war scare, as the result of which a resolution was unanimously adopted by this House, and that resolution was the basis of a most important departure by Canada in the matter of imperial defence. The government accepted that resolution as it was offered; and taking the responsibility that properly rests upon the shoulders of a government, appreciating the demands of the situation and voicing, as they believed, the opinion of the country, they proceeded to take measures to aid in the naval defence of the empire. Time will not admit of a full

discussion of the merits of their proposals, but I will say this, that their proposals were absolutely in line with the resolution which was unanimously passed by this House and that the steps which were being taken were taken with due consideration. They were taken in the face of strenuous and disloyal opposition—an opposition that might very well have caused the government to hesitate before taking such an important departure. Notwithstanding that opposition, the government of the day went forward with their naval policy. That policy has been ridiculed. Some of our hon. friends on the other side objected to it because the vessels were not big enough, and others objected because the vessels proposed were going to cost too much and would take too long to build. Well, let me say that with regard to this naval proposition, it was one which was accepted by the British authorities as satisfactory to them. It was also in line with the autonomy of Canada, and was of a character which would give the Canadian government its best defence in time of war. Who is there who does not know that Britain's danger in time of war is not greater from the Dreadnoughts of the enemy than from the enemy's privateers preying upon the commerce on which Great Britain depends from week to week for the living of her people. Will those people who say that Canada should build Dreadnoughts tell me how a Dreadnought could protect Canadian boats when traversing the ocean from Canadian to British ports from the privateers of any country that might be at war with Britain? I say that the policy of a cruiser navy was the only sound policy for Canada, if the interests of Canada and Britain were to be properly served. A Dreadnought in the battle line in the North sea would not prevent the people of England from being starved for wheat. I would not be astonished at anything the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), might say, but it did occur to me, when he was declaring that the one thing which we needed for the defence of our country was to build Dreadnoughts, that in this he was differing from so eminent an authority as Lord Charles Beresford, and I may be permitted to take Lord Charles Beresford in preference to the Minister of Public Works with regard to naval matters.

But whether we agree with the policy of the government or not, whether we want cruisers or Dreadnoughts, it was the consensus of opinion of this country, it was the settled policy of the government of this country, that Canada should participate in the defence of the empire, and that a definite, tangible policy should be entered upon for assisting in that defence.

Two years ago there was a German warscare. Well, what is the condition to-day? If there was necessity to prepare for naval defence two years ago, how much greater is that necessity to-day? Two years ago there was merely a suspicion of danger, but to-day Germany and England are exchanging what are practically defiances. It is admitted that the only security which the British Empire has to-day is the British fleet; and that without that fleet the prestige of Britain would be gone and the liberties of Canada would be endangered.

My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works said that he supported the unanimous resolution of the House because, he said, 'I and my friends are not those to fall back in the matter of aid at a time of stress and necessity.' That was two years ago; but to-day he sits a member of a government, at a time when those two countries are exchanging defiances, and although every effort has been made for more than a week to get a definite declaration of policy from that government, it has not been possible to get such a declaration. There is no effort at assistance of Britain; there is no effort at preparation for a navy. What we have on the record is that the Minister of Marine has stated to this House that the steps which had been taken by the previous government are to be cancelled, that the Admiralty is to be consulted. We are bound to assume, from what has been said, that before this government formulates a policy, a plebiscite will be taken. In other words, this government which came into power on a cry of loyalty to the empire at the time of the empire's greatest danger—and I say that the empire admittedly, never since the days of Napoleon the First, has been in greater danger than it has been within the past two months. Does anybody deny it? I would not trouble to discuss the matter with any gentleman who would deny it in the face of the facts. I say that at such a time this party, elected on a policy of loyalty to the empire, cancel the preparations that were made by their predecessors to assist in the defence of the empire, and bring forward no other proposition in its place, and on the face of the record, cannot be expected to bring forward any proposition for the space of a year or two years. Worse than that, so far as we have been able to get anything from these gentlemen, we are bound to conclude that they not only have no policy with regard to naval defence, but that they do not intend to have any policy with regard to naval defence—that they propose to put this question to a vote of the people of Canada. They have rejected the proposals of the late government, they have already by resolution in this House placed themselves against a direct contribution, and under these circumstances it cannot

be expected that the people of Canada will vote for a naval policy. These gentlemen think that they are escaping responsibility by refusing to declare themselves on this subject. That might be true if the circumstances were other than they are. But I say that under the circumstances which have occurred during the past two months, when only yesterday the telegraph wires were awaiting and expecting an announcement that might have meant war, these gentlemen cannot escape responsibility by saying that they have no policy. The responsibility is there, and they must discharge it or be held responsible for not living up to their professions. Mr. Speaker, the question is too serious to bring it down to the point of showing the lack of good faith on the part of those who achieved power on a cry of loyalty and then go absolutely contrary to the most pressing and urgent necessity of the case, a more pressing and urgent necessity than has ever occurred before in the history of this confederation. I am compelled to draw only one conclusion. We have been told that the government is in accord on this question. We have it on record that certain members of this government have the promise of the Premier that the naval question will be submitted to a vote of the people before any action is taken. Then, if this government is in accord, and if the member of the government who has made that statement has told the truth, there is no question that the naval policy of this country, the policy of maintenance of the prestige of Britain, is dictated by that section of the government which represents an idea and a campaign that to my mind is neither more nor less than a campaign of disloyalty to Canada and disloyalty to the empire. We are not ignorant of the campaign that has been made by the party called Nationalists in the province of Quebec. We know what the ideals are that that party has expressed. Are they the ideals of a united Canada? Are they the ideals of a strong empire? These men are not Nationalists; they are Separatists. If I read their utterances aright, if I gather correctly their ideal, it is the ideal of a separate state on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and not the ideal of a united Canada or the ideal of a strong British Empire. And these men sit in the councils of the government, and, so far as the record shows, dictate its policy on that question which is to-day most vital to the interests of Canada and of the empire.

This government is a coalition, so it is said. If so, it is a coalition on these terms, that the party of the Nationalists, the party of sectionalism, has agreed to support the mergers, trusts and combines in grinding the faces of the producer and consumer throughout Canada, in consideration of the party of loyalty which to-day represents those trusts, mergers and combines of this country, assisting to attain the ideal of the Separatist party for the establishment of a separate state on the banks of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. Speaker, the economic question that was decided on the 21st of September—that was decided adversely to the best interests of the people—was an important question; it was important from a national and from an imperial, and if you like, from an international and world-wide point of view. The proposal was a step in advance in the interests of the common people of two great countries. To that extent it was important. But, Mr. Speaker, I consider that the development that has taken place since the 21st of September, is still more important. I am one of those who agree with the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), and in that I may be agreeing with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) that the national interests and imperial interests are greater than economic interests. And, to my mind, the question of what the attitude of Canada is to be in this matter of the naval defence of the empire is even more important than the question as to whether the monopolies, trusts and combines shall control the affairs of this country for the next four years. And I should be satisfied to fight it out with them on that line, on the merits of the case, on the economics of the question. But I say that when they enter into an alliance, such as, apparently, they have entered into, whereby the interests of the empire itself are being sacrificed, then I have no words in which to express my opinion of that government and that arrangement. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the amendment.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). Mr. Speaker, I desire to claim the attention of the House for a very short time to discuss some of the questions which have been brought before us in this debate. I have no apology to make for taking up the time of the House, and particularly so in view of the fact that no one from the province of Saskatchewan has yet spoken in this debate.

I join in the congratulations expressed by hon. members on both sides of the House to the mover and seconder of the address for the exceedingly able way in which they presented their views. I join also in the congratulations expressed in the speech from the Throne on the fact that Canada to-day is prosperous, that trade has increased by leaps and bounds. And I say that it will stand as a lasting monument to the late administration that our foreign trade went up from $225,000,000 in 1896 to $800,000,000 in 1911. I congratulate the government also on some of the planks of the platform—

if I may so express it—laid down in the speech from the Throne. I notice that the government intends to push forward the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. As a western man, I commend and congratulate the government upon adopting the policy of the late government on that subject. I notice in the remarks, some of them very eloquent, made by the hon. member from Brandon (Mr. Aikins), in this debate, that he could not leave the question of the Hudson Bay railway where it stood in the speech from the Throne, but had to get in a 'knock' at the late government, for having, as he said, promised for years to build that railway, yet not having done it. Every man who has been in this House for three years, every man who has read the political history of those years, knows that the late government did not promise to build that road until three years ago. It was in August or September, 1908, I believe, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the present leader of the Opposition, promised that his government would adopt as its policy the construction at an early day of the Hudson Bay railway. Everybody knows that in the first session of parliament in January, 1909, a vote of this House was taken providing $150,000 for the construction of that road. And in the second session of the parliament, in 1910, a further estimate of $500,000 was voted for the construction of a bridge across the Saskatchewan at La Pas. And, during the last session of that parliament, the contract was let for the first hundred and seventy-five miles of that road. I have heard—I do not know if it is true—that the present government cancelled that contract, or at least discontinued the work of construction. I see the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) is not in his place. I would like to know whether it is true or not that the work has been stopped. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of western Canada as a whole, would view such a condition of affairs with great disappointment. The hon. member for Brandon pictured eloquently the situation that exists in places in regard to railways in western Canada. Every hon. member in this House agrees that the building of the Hudson Bay railway is necessary in order to partially solve the transportation problem. The people of western Canada, and I speak especially for the people of Regina district, whom I have the honour to represent, will view with disappointment the action of the government, should it be true that they have discontinued the building of the 175 miles of the Hudson Bay railway.

The speech from the Throne informs us also that the government intends to appoint a tariff commission. I want to place myself on record as being against a tariff commission, should that step mean placing upon that commission the responsibility for tariffs and taxation and taking it from the government and from parliament where it belongs. I think I am correct in saying that the first suggestion of a tariff commission came from the Canadian Manufacturers Association. I must say I view with suspicion any suggestion for the appointment of such a commission that comes from that association. They have only one end in view, and that is to increase the tariff and put more money from the pockets of the consumer into the pockets of the Canadian manufacturer. And I have very little hope that a government as at present constituted, when every man on that side of the House is getting up and making protectionist speeches,—I have little hope that, for the number of years this government may remain in power there will be any reduction in tariff or taxation for the benefit of the people. What is a tariff commission for? They say it is to obtain information. I say if they want information, let them increase the staff in the Department of Trade and Commerce and get their information through that department. I noticed in the newspapers a suggestion as to the tariff commission. I do not know from what source it comes, and I have some hesitation in referring to it, because both the men spoken of are personal friends of my own. I notice that it is suggested to appoint a certain gentleman residing in the city of Toronto who has been writing articles in magazines in favour of increased tariffs, and at the same time in favour of a tariff commission. That is one of the men that, according to the newspapers, the present government intends to appoint to the tariff commission. I also note that they intend to appoint the present paid agent of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, who has been coming down to Ottawa for years urging both the late government and the present government to increase the tariff. I presume he is already at Ottawa asking the present government to renew the bounties on iron and steel. So I say to the government that if that is the kind of a tariff commission they are going to appoint, we in the west, at all events, will have very little confidence in it, so far as reduced taxation is concerned.

Now, I will refer briefly to this question of reciprocity. I did not take an opportunity of speaking upon it when the debate ran four or five months in succession in the last House of Commons. I will say now, however, that if hon. gentlemen opposite think that reciprocity is dead, as the Finance Minister seems to think, they are making a big mistake, for it is a very live corpse indeed. The Minister of Finance did not deal with any other subject, at any rate while I was present in the House, ex-

cept that dead subject of reciprocity, and he tried to show why the people of Canada rejected it on the 21st of September. I will tell you why reciprocity was defeated. I believe that in western Canada, in the province of Manitoba, as well as in Saskatchewan and Alberta, reciprocity was discussed on its merits; but I do not believe that it was discussed on its merits in any other province of the Dominion of Canada. I lived in the province of Ontario for many years until a few years ago when I went west. I took some interest in politics in Ontario before I left for Saskatchewan, and I can tell this House that in western Ontario, one of the things that helped to defeat reciprocity was the anti-Catholic and the anti-French feeling in that part of the province. I can say further that in the county in which I was brought up, when I went to cast my first vote—I was only 21 years of age then—I was approached by Conservatives, by two or three prominent men who said to me: You must not vote for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, because he is a Frenchman and a Catholic. I have heard that said dozens of times in the province of Ontario, and I say without hesitation that in my belief one of the things that defeated reciprocity was the anti-French and anti-Catholic feeling. And yet these hon. gentlemen deprecate appeals to sectionalism, and pretend to blame us on this side of the House for appealing to that sentiment. I do not believe there is a man in the Dominion of Canada who, during the past fifteen years, has done more to cement the two races, French and English, together than Sir Wilfrid Laurier has done. He has always stood for equal rights and equal privileges to all, he has always pursued a course that I believe was in the best interests of all the provinces of this great Dominion.

Another thing that defeated reciprocity, we felt it in the west to a certain extent, was the loyalty cry. We were told, you cannot trade with the United States without affecting the loyalty of Canadians. I am not going to refer to that further. Another thing that helped to defeat reciprocity, was the money of the manufacturers, the combines and the trusts of this country, and if reports are true, the money of the manufacturers, the combines and the trusts not only of this country but of the United States, all combined to defeat reciprocity and to keep us in the west, at all events, from getting the advantages of reciprocity. The people in the province of Ontario did not think it was of any use to them, but we in the west thought it was a great deal of use to us, and I venture to say that there is not a man in this House from Manitoba, unless it be the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Rogers) and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) who will say that he does not believe reciprocity would be in the best interest of every man living in western Canada to-day. The men from Manitoba think they gained a great victory; but I would point out to you that reciprocity was a fairly popular issue in the province of Manitoba, outside of the city of Winnipeg. The hon. member for Brandon, who I am sorry to see is not in his place to-day, endeavoured to prove that the farmers of Manitoba and the farmers of the west—I think he used that expression—voted against reciprocity, and he told us why the farmers of the west voted against reciprocity. At the same time, the hon. member for Brandon himself was defeated by the vote of the farmers in his own constituency by no less than 124, and he got his majority in the city of Brandon. The hon. member for Brandon well knows that so far as the farmers of the west are concerned, and the farmers of the constituency of Brandon, they were in favour of reciprocity. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) for whom I have a great deal of respect, knows very well that reciprocity was a most popular issue with the farmers in his constituency, because his majority which, in 1908, was about 860, was cut down in 1911 to 64. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) knows that he had the chase of his life in the recent election campaign, and he knows how popular reciprocity was with the farmers of his constituency. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) actually crawled into this House on the issue of reciprocity, with a majority, I think of 16 or 20 votes. The hon. the Secretary of State himself, whom I congratulate on his preferment, saw his majority of 760 in 1908 reduced to 126 in 1911. And still they tell us that reciprocity was not a popular issue in the province of Manitoba. Now, in the province of Saskatchewan there was only one side to the question; there is no doubt that in Saskatchewan both Liberals and Conservatives were in favour of reciprocity. And mark you, Mr. Speaker, the criticisms that were made in the province of Saskatchewan were not against the reciprocity pact; they were in favour of lower taxation, and larger markets, better markets for our farm products, cheaper agricultural machinery, and the complaint was that the reciprocity agreement did not go far enough, that it should go further. In order to prove to you what the people of Saskatchewan think of reciprocity, I will refer you to the resolution that was passed in the legislature of that province in the spring of 1911. The resolution was passed unanimously, both Liberals and Conservatives voting for it, and it represents very well the opinions of the people on that subject.

Mr. STAPLES. Tell us about your homestead inspector.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of proving, if he can, that there was a single homestead inspector in the province of Saskatchewan who took any part in the recent election.

Mr. STAPLES. I have not got a list of them, but I will tell the hon. gentleman that every homestead inspector in the province of Saskatchewan was most active, every one of them.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I know something about the province of Saskatchewan. I won't venture to speak for the northern part of it, but I will venture to speak for my own constituency and the adjoining constituencies, and I will say this on my responsibility as a member of this House, that there was not a solitary inspector in my district or in the adjoining districts, who took any part in the recent Dominion elections. I will say further for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, that the Conservative party in Manitoba during the recent election has nothing to be proud of. The Liberal party, fighting a battle for larger markets, for lower prices for agricultural implements and reduced taxation, was opposed by a political machine in the province of Manitoba which has not its equal in the whole history of Canada, a political machine that has not hesitated on many occasions to prostitute justice to political ends, a machine which demands that every hotelkeeper in the province of Manitoba should be a Tory, a political machine, further, that is not satisfied with fighting through its paid officials in the federal elections, but which, during the provincial elections in Saskatchewan, shipped those officials in there by the dozen to draw the wool over the eyes of the people of Saskatchewan. Up to the present time they have not succeeded very well in doing so. But I was going to read the resolution that was passed by the legislature of the province of Saskatchewan, passed unanimously, supported by every Conservative member as well as every Liberal in the legislature. What did it say? It simply regrets that the reciprocity agreement did not go far enough in the way of reduced taxation and larger markets. I will read the resolution, because it shows clearly, to my mind, what the people of Saskatchewan think of reciprocity, and what they think of any measure to reduce taxation that may be brought before this parliament.

That this House is of opinion that the proposed reciprocal trade arrangement between Canada and the United States will be a benefit to the people of Saskatchewan.

That while expressing this opinion, this House is nevertheless of the opinion that the proposed arrangement does not fully meet the desires of the people of Saskatchewan with regard to general tariff reduction.

That this House also desires to express itself as strongly in favour of a Canadian trade policy looking to an immediate increase of the British preference and the ultimate establishment of free trade within the empire.

Also that in the opinion of this House the said agreement by its promotion of the prosperity and development of Canada will thereby greatly strengthen Canada's power for Imperial defence and thus directly assist the British Empire.

And further, that in the opinion of this House the duties on agricultural implements should at an early date be further reduced if not abrogated.

This resolution passed the House unanimously. So, the situation in Saskatchewan and the west in general was not that the reciprocity agreement was taking away a certain amount of protection from the manufacturers in Ontario or, as was said in this House, taking away one of the bulwarks of protection, but the Conservatives in Saskatchewan actually said: You are not taking away sufficient protection from the manufacturers. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I say to every hon. member of this House that if you are labouring under any delusion that reciprocity or the principle involved in reciprocity, that is larger markets and reduced taxation to the farmers of the west, is dead, you are living in a fool's paradise.

I was somewhat surprised at the remarks made by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) in this House and also at the remarks reported to have been made by him in an address which he gave before the Canadian Club in the city of Montreal. I have read his speech delivered in Montreal very carefully and I see he is reported to have said that there was a division between the east and the west, and that we will have to take measures to prevent it. As far as the part of the country from which I came is concerned there has been no division and there is no division now. We think in western Canada that eastern Canada might have sympathized a little with the west by voting for reciprocity which was in our interests because it would give us access to the larger markets of the United States. The east did not see fit to do so and we bow to its decision, but in the course of time the population of western Canada will be such that it will overwhelm the voters in eastern Canada, and we will insist upon the right to gain access to larger markets and to trade with the United States. There are some natural divisions between the east and the west; there is no question about that. Coming down from the west to the city of Ottawa a person travels through Northern Ontario for hundreds of miles where, as far as you can see there is nothing for cultivation purposes. There are no inhabitants practically and this is one of the natural div-

isions between the east and the west. I say to you who live in eastern Canada that you must be prepared to sacrifice something for the benefit of western Canada. We in the west are prepared to meet you half way. Up to the present eastern Canada has not met us half way. During the last twenty-five or thirty years, or ever since western Canada has had a political and commercial existence, we have been bled by the railway corporations and bled by the Canadian manufacturers by means of an unjust tariff. We are not going to stand for that kind of thing from now on to the end of time. Take the question of freight rates; we have been suffering from that unjust burden. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) knows that what I say is correct. I will not take up the time of the House, because I have not the statistics here to give you the figures if I chose to do so, but I will tell you that freight rates in western Canada are undoubtedly higher than they are in the northern states or than they are in eastern Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What was the late government doing that it did not relieve the people from the burden of high freight rates?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I am not concerned with what the late government was doing; I am concerned with what the government that has assumed the reins of office is going to do. We are going to look to the future and not to the past. I could give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) a great many instances of assistance being given to western Canada by the late government but I do not propose to discuss that question now. I shall not go into details as to the difference in freight rates in western and eastern Canada, but I want to point out two or three instances of discriminations that exist between Winnipeg and Regina. Ship a car load of fourth class freight from Toronto to Winnipeg, and a similar car from Toronto to Regina and the rate to Regina to-day, after allowing for the additional mileage, is $21.60 more than the rate charged on the same class of freight to Winnipeg. On a car of fifth class freight you have to pay $50 more, after allowing for the additional mileage, in shipping to Regina than to Winnipeg. In spite of this discrimination by the railway men of western Canada persons were to be found who said: You are going to injure the Canadian railway corporations. How are you going to injure them? You are going to injure them by bringing in competitive railways from the United States and yet there is no man from the West in this House who would not in one minute support any application from any American railway to come into the southern end of any of these provinces.

Mr. MARTIN.

Yet, the logical outcome of the argument which was used was that you are going to injure the railway corporations.

I also said that one of the troubles that we have to put up with in western Canada is the matter of the tariff. The hon. member for Brandon said that we must get manufacturing institutions into western Canada. It may be possible that in some parts of western Canada that can be done and I am not going to dispute that it may be the case, but in so far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned I do not think that in my time, or in the time of any hon. gentleman who sits in this House, we will see manufacturing to any extent carried on in that province. We have no water-power, we cannot get cheap fuel, labour is high at the present time and I do not believe that the manufacturer can carry on his business successfully or remuneratively in Saskatchewan. We are purely an agricultural province. I believe that we will more or less remain the agricultural province of the Dominion of Canada. It may be possible that in the city of Calgary, where they have good water-power, they may be able to get a great many manufacturing industries, but I do not think it is at all possible in Regina. But, notwithstanding the fact that there is no division as far as I can gather between the east and the west at the present time, unless the east is prepared to meet us in matters of tariff to some extent the situation will not always continue. Take the Canadian Canners' Combine and let us see what has been the result of the formation of that combine. Right up to the time that the reciprocity agreement was defeated you could buy canned tomatoes, not the canned tomatoes that the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) is accustomed to, at two cans for a quarter or two cans for thirty cents in the city of Regina. Immediately after reciprocity was defeated you could buy two cans of tomatoes for forty-five cents. I could give similar quotations for almost all kinds of canned goods in Regina. What is the cause of the high cost of living to-day in the west as compared with what it is in the east? It has increased in the east but it has not increased to the same extent that it has in western Canada. There are two causes in western Canada for the high cost of living. One is the tariff which puts up the price and the other is the excessive freight rates which we have to pay in western Canada.

Mr. LALOR. Is not the hon. gentleman aware that the price of tomatoes depends largely on crop conditions?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I am aware that the price of tomatoes depends on what the Canadian canners combine says it will

be, and I should judge from the haste of the hon. member (Mr. Lalor) in rising that he has something to do with the canners' combine, and just as long as we have men in this House of Commons who have made hundred of thousands of dollars out of such a combine there is very little chance for the consumers of the Dominion. I have not studied the cement question sufficiently to say how the tariff affects that commodity, but I know what the railway rates on cement are to western Canada, and I know that you have to pay $3.25 in Regina for the same barrel of cement that costs you $1,20 in Owen Sound. Is it any wonder the people of the west feel that they have been bled more or less by the railway corporations and by the manufacturers of eastern Canada? I say, Sir, that the necessaries of life should be placed on the free list, in the best interests of the consuming masses of the country. Why should we have to pay a tax of 25 per cent or 30 per cent on the woollens we use? Why should men be permitted to make millions of dollars on the tinware and kitchen utensils we use to cook our food, on account of the tariff which protects the manufacturers of these articles? That is how we look at these things in western Canada, and I tell the men of the east that if they are not prepared to meet us by reducing the tariff on certain items, they need not be surprised if a feeling does arise between eastern and western Canada, and if such a feeling does arise it is the manufacturers of eastern Canada who will be to blame. Yes, the manufacturers are loyal just so far as their pocketbooks are concerned. What is Canadian nationality to them but their pocketbooks? There are men in this House of Commons to-day who are proclaiming against the farmers of western Canada and who have actually made millions of dollars out of the consuming masses of this country. I do not know whether or not there is a manufacturer of agricultural implements in this House, and I don't care.

An hon. MEMBER. There are some on your side.

Another hon. MEMBER. In the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Perhaps before I conclude some member on that side will bob up and say he is a manufacturer of agricultural implements. Perhaps the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, who brought the matter up in the House last session, can tell us why it is that in the southern parts of Saskatchewan and Manitoba the farmers pay more for their agricultural implements than the farmers of the adjoining northern states pay for the same implements. I have here figures obtained from implement men, and no doubt they are correct, and they show that in southern Saskatchewan the farmer has to pay $90 for a wagon which in Montana or Minnesota he can buy for $80; that the farmer in southern Saskatchewan pays for five-foot mowers $57, which are bought by the farmer in the northern states for $47.50 each. These figures also show that binders cost the southern Saskatchewan farmer from $150 to $160 each. I am told that last year they sold in Regina for $180, and the same mower can be bought for $140 in the northern states. Then the Saskatchewan farmer has to pay $85 for a gang plough which can be bought for $70 across the line, and $57 for a hay fork which his neighbour in the northern states can purchase at from $28 to $35. How is that explained? Is it fair that the southern Saskatchewan farmer should pay from 10 to 20 per cent more for what he needs than does his brother farmer to the south of the line, just for the benefit of affording protection to the Canadien manufacturers? You can only ascribe the difference in cost to the tariff or to the freight rates, and you can divide the burden on the Canadian farmer between the two just as you please. Now, I have always stood for a moderate tariff, excepting perhaps on the necessaries of life. I have always told the people of my province that I believed it to be in the best interests of the whole Dominion that we should have a moderate protective tariff. But, when the reciprocity agreement, making for reduced taxation and larger markets, was put before the electors, and the eastern manufacturers—by what means it matters not—succeeded in defeating it, headed by the loyal city of Toronto, is it any wonder that there should be a divergence of opinion and a sort of separation existing between eastern and western Canada?

I want to say a word in conclusion about the amendment moved by the right hon. the leader of the opposition. Every one who was in this House last session knows full well that the head of the Nationalist party was the Minister of Public Works, and every one knows that he and the present Prime Minister were then at daggers drawn on the navy question. I saw printed in the newspapers statements that were alleged to have been made by the Nationalists of the province of Quebec and if such statements were made by any man who occupies a seat in this House he does not deserve to be here. Whether they were made or not as alleged, the people in my part of the county have an idea that they were made, and if such statements were made by the Nationalist leaders in Quebec then all I can say is that these men are traitors to their country and their flag. In view of the great

divergence of opinion that existed between the two divisions of the present cabinet on the navy question not longer than a few short months ago, I would like some one to tell me: have the traitors given in to the imperialists, or have the imperialists given in to the traitors. The people of Canada would like an answer to that question, and they are entitled to be informed as to what policy on the naval question has succeeded in bringing together the divergent views represented in the present cabinet.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe). When I was returned for the electoral district I have the honour to represent I made up my mind that when first I would address this House I would speak in my own language, it being easier for me to do so, and I thought that if on the 21st September last the voice of Toronto had been heard all over Canada it was nothing but fair that the French voice of Quebec should be heard at least once in a while in the House of Commons, and that my native tongue should have the right accorded to it by the constitution of this country. Since the opening of parliament, Mr. Speaker, you have been appointed to your high office, and prompted by courtesy and deference to you, Mr. Speaker, and also by the desire that my remarks should be understood by the majority of hon. gentlemen in this House, I decided to address the House in the English tongue, although I cannot master it as I would like.

In taking part in this debate I of course understand that I shall not have the sympathy or favour of hon. gentlemen who are supporting the government of the day because every one of them who has taken part in this discussion has declared that speeches were of no use and that we were simply wasting the time of the House and squandering the money of the people in taking up so much time on the question at issue. Well, if we read the remarks which have been made by different members supporting the government, we can quite understand why they should like this debate to be short. For instance, if you take the last utterance of the Finance Minister (Mr. White), he began by saying that he had no connection whatever with corporations, combines, trusts and mergers and that he was free from all entanglements with these concerns, but every one in the country, who will read to-morrow the speech he has made, will be rather surprised to find that the only aspect of the question of reciprocity which he would discuss, that the only argument he advanced against reciprocity in reply to those who opposed the government, was that it was better for the farmers of the west to lose the profit they could make on their grain so long as the railway corporations got the hauling dues on that grain.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I never said that.

Mr. GAUTHIER. I want to refer to a remark made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). That hon. gentleman told us that the government had decided to cancel the naval policy of the late administration. It is all right for the government to make such a statement, but does the government believe that the people of this country will think for a moment that all the members who sit on the Treasury Benches have come to a decision to set aside the naval policy of the late administration without also having come to an understanding as to their policy which is to take the place of that which they have cancelled. No one will believe that. There is no one who will not come to the conclusion that when this government decided to set aside the naval policy of the late administration, they must, before doing so, have come to some understanding, and we are entitled to know what that understanding or agreement is.

My hon. friend the first minister (Mr. Borden), has said that during the course of the debates in the last two years he did not, it is true, see eye to eye with an hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), but the difference of opinion between them, he claimed was but a small one, it was only regarding the question of a referendum. Well, if I remember aright the leader of the government wanted a referendum because he claimed the late government was not doing enough on the naval question, whereas the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) wanted a referendum because he thought the late government was doing too much and he did not want it to do anything at all. Well, if these two gentlemen have come to an agreement, we are entitled to know what were the terms of that agreement. I must admit that when the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Borden) saw fit to take into his cabinet the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), that hon. gentleman was good enough for me personally. I have no objection to his personality, but the people who, during the late electoral contest, were told by the friends of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) in the province of Quebec that there were three parties in the Dominion, namely, the Liberal party, having Sir Wilfrid Laurier as its chief, the Conservative party, having Mr. Borden as its chief, and the party of honest men having Mr. Monk as its chief—these people will want to know, and are entitled to know, what agreement has been come to between the Minister of Public Works and his leader. If the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) was the chief of the third party—

the party of honest men—the people have the right to know if it is his party which is holding the reins of power to-day; and if it be not, they are entitled to know what were the terms of the understanding by which that hon. gentleman consented to enter the cabinet.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to create the impression and started the legend that we on this side are dissatisfied simply because we are beaten. Not at all. We admit that the people voted against us and we abide by the decision of the people, but if the government, if the First Minister has rights and privileges, we on this side have rights and privileges and have duties to perform, and it is our duty to compel the government to state what were the terms of the agreement entered into with the Minister of Public Works and his party, because otherwise—if we take the resolution of the 29th of March, 1909, and if we take what has been said on the floor of this House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), we shall have to come to the conclusion that the government of the day has no policy at all on the naval question. Speaking for myself, it is my opinion no government in Canada should set aside a policy so important as that adopted on the naval question before being in a position to state to the country by what policy they were going to replace the one which they were setting aside.

The late government, in the eyes of its opponents, was a faulty government. That may be, but we claim that, in the management of the affairs of this country, it was loyal to the empire, it was loyal to Canada and true to its principles as set out in the platform of the Liberal convention in 1893.

I claim, Sir, that the late administration was loyal to the empire, and I think we have proved it. What was the government in power at the time of the South African war that was willing that the Canadian soldiers should go and fight for England on the African veldt? Was it not a Liberal government headed by a French Canadian, who our opponents claim was not loyal to the empire? I appeal to the members here who represent the voice of Toronto, and I am not ashamed to tell them that it was a French Canadian and Liberal Prime Minister who, without fear of prejudice, without fear of hatred, proposed to this country a naval policy which did justice to the empire, justice for the autonomy of this country, and justice for all our population, and who, when he went to defeat on that policy, fought like a man, and was defeated like a man. He does not deserve a single reproach, he does not feel a single remorse, and he went out of power with his party without regret, because that party fought like men, and were defeated like men.

Now, the Prime Minister stated that the late administration must have favoured trusts, mergers and combines, because they existed before the 21st of September last. Well, I do not want to discuss that matter with the Prime Minister, but I think he is not doing justice to the people who fought with him in the recent campaign, in which the masses of the people were on one side with the Liberal party, while the trusts, mergers and combines were on the other side with the Conservative party. More than that: I claim that the late administration did its duty in fighting against the trusts. For instance, it enabled the Gall-Schneider Oil Company to fight the Standard Oil Company in 1897; it also fought the American Tobacco Company for the rights of the people.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the late administration reaped what had been sown by its predecessors. But if it was in the same country, with the same population, and the same policy, my hon. friend must admit that the late administration understood that policy, and the needs of the population better than his own party did, because the late administration increased the population, the trade, and the wealth of this country and had surpluses all along, whereas our opponents had deficits during the 18 years of their administration.

Now, I come to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. He says he was a Conservative; but, Sir, everybody who followed him or met him on the platform in the last campaign must remember that he stated all over the province of Quebec that he had severed his connection with the party that is now in power, and with the chief of that party, that he had denied to the hon. member who now leads the government the right to give him orders and commands.

Mr. CODERRE. Will the hon. member please tell me where he met Mr. Monk personally during the last campaign?

Mr. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe). Yes, I met him in the town of Lachine, at Cote St. Paul, and at the town of St. Laurent.

Mr. CODERRE. Do you declare on your honour as a member of this House that the statements which you have put in Mr. Monk's mouth were uttered by him on those occasions?

Mr. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe). The declarations made by the hon. Minister of Public Works were not made in a Tory parish, or in the manufacturing centre of Cote St. Paul; but in the parish of St. Laurent, those were the words he used. During the campaign of Drummond and Arthabaska I met the hon. Minister of Public Works on nomination day at Drummondville, and what did he say there? That he did not want any navy for Canada at all, that he was against the navy,

that he would fight against the navy, that he had severed his connection with his party on that question, and that he would never go back to the fold of the Conservative party as long as it was in favour of that policy. Now, what did he say on the floor of this House when he took part in this debate? He said that the Prime Minister would choose a type of vessel that would be convenient. What a change of principle. What caused me the greatest surprise was the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works that he adhered to the resolution of the 29th March, 1909, and the reason he gave for doing so was that it carried out the suggestions made by the British Admiralty, at the Imperial Conference of 1907. But the greatest surprise that I felt was when I heard the Minister of Public Works summing up the whole situation with a cynical impudence—if that term is parliamentary I will use it—by saying: 'We are here, and you are there, and that is the game.' These words will be repeated throughout the whole Dominion of Canada as proving to the people of this country that our opponents did not fight the late administration as statesmen, but as people who wanted to play a game. And, Sir, it is only just that they should be there and that we should be here, because this is our reward and that is their punishment, and the people of Canada will never stand for public men who say on the floor of the House of Commons that politics is a game. If politics is a game, Sir, we do not envy hon. gentlemen opposite their responsibility, but we want them to shoulder the responsibility, and we expect that the people of this country will soon be able to call them to account. When the electors of this country voted on the 21st of September last, they never voted to favour people who were playing a game; but they thought that the hon. gentlemen who have now the reins of government were fighting the fight of the empire and the fight of Canada and were working for the welfare of the whole community. They never supposed that these hon. gentlemen, under the veil of the public welfare, were working for their personal ambitions, merely to secure portfolios in the administration that was to replace the late administration. I do not wish to detain the House, but I wish to say this—that it is without regret that we have crossed the floor of the House—

Some hon MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe). Without regret, I say. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have been 'playing the game' may laugh at such an expression from a representative of the people But, Sir, I utter these words as a representative of the people ; we crossed the floor of this House without regret. We have been true to our policy; we have been true to the trust given us by the people of Canada. The House, by unanimous vote, decided on the 29th March, 1909, that it was time for Canada to work for the speedy organization of a naval service. The government of this country went to work; they decided upon a naval policy after having it endorsed by the Admiralty of His Majesty. We had to face prejudice—we do not complain of that; there is no recrimination whatever on this side. Hon. members opposite try to create the impression in the mind of the people that we are recriminating. Not at all; we bow to the wish of the people knowing that we have done our duty. But, for having done our duty we met opponents who, instead of seeking as statesmen the solution of a public question, as to the navy, decided that it was time to 'play the game.' But if you look at this navy question and at the resolution which was brought before the House in 1909 by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), now Minister of Trade and Commerce, and if you follow the discussion that then took place, you will see that after the House had voted unanimously on the question, the government of that day sent two of its representatives to London to discuss with the British authorities the whole situation of the protection of Canada as a confederation and as part of the empire. They decided on the course that was to be followed. And after the representatives of the government came back, a policy was announced in accordance with the terms of that resolution and with the views of the Admiralty. But, Sir, we have since seen part of our opponents claiming in the English-speaking provinces, that the government did not go far enough, while in the French-speaking province, Quebec, another part of them were claiming that we were going too far. That is the double policy that was followed up to the 21st of September last. But, Sir, the game was not alone on the navy question, but also on the reciprocity pact. Since 1866, the Conservative party, as declared by the utterances of its greatest men, has been in favour of reciprocity in natural products with the United States. There was a clause in the traiff of 1879 which was a standing offer to that effect. In the convention of the Liberal-Conservative party in 1884 this standing offer was made one of the planks of their platform. In 1891, they sent representatives to Washington to discuss the situation and try to enter into a reciprocal pact with the United States. In 1893, the Liberal party at its great convention declared for reciprocity with the United States in natural products. So, the two parties were united on this question, for it was one of the planks in either platform. When the measure was brought

down by representatives of the late government, coming back from Washington last session, hon. members who now sit on the Treasury Benches, but who were then sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, could not believe that the government of that day had succeeded in getting from the United States an acceptance of the policy which up to that time they had always advocated. But, Sir, after the honour of Canada had been pledged to the United States, we found our opponents trying to arouse prejudice and loyalism against the government; trying to arouse hatred against it; trying to represent the members of the late administration as bad Canadians, disloyal to the empire. I suppose this was the other part of the 'game.' We cannot but be aware of the declarations of the different members of the present administration who are now trying to conceal the terms of the understanding that brings together men who were fighting against one another up to the 21st of September last. During the campaign the present Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), held a small meeting for the electors of one section of Montreal in His Majesty's theatre. At the same time, the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), was holding a meeting in the parish of Cote des Neiges, in the county of Jacques Cartier. And after the meetings, these gentlemen were closeted in the rooms of the Windsor hotel discussing the whole situation. And next morning the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), was on the stump trying to arouse prejudice, not only against the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who led the government, but against the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden), who then led the opposition, and who leads the government to-day. 'Small differences of opinion,' they say. I think that when they come before the people it will be hard for them to explain the situation to the people's satisfaction.

I shall vote in favour of this resolution. Not because we on this side pretend that we should have been consulted as to the formation of the cabinet. That is none of our affair,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe). Yes, Sir, I say that, and it is true. But the people of this country who have been induced to believe that there was a strong difference of opinion between the leader of the government and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), are entitled to know the terms of the agreement that has been entered into. I hope that the amendment of the leader of the opposition endment of the leader of the opposition will compel hon. members who sit on the treasury benches to tell us by their votes what they think of it, and I hope for the sake of this country and for the sake of the Conservative party that they will not set aside the naval policy of the late government without telling the people by what they intend to replace it.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Before this debate closes I deem it my duty to present to the House very briefly the views of my constituents upon the question of reciprocity between this country and the United States, also their views and my own upon the question of our contribution to the Imperial navy, to make it, so far as we can, supreme and invincible upon the ocean; also the views of the people of Prince Edward Island on the very important question of transportation between that province and the mainland. With regard to reciprocity, I notice that several Conservative newspapers and a great many Conservative gentlemen in this House appear to be anxious that the Liberal party should drop it. I am pleased to know from the utterances of the chief spokesman of the Liberal party that there is no idea of dropping that question. If the policy of larger markets and steadier markets was sound, the Liberal party would be unworthy of its name if it dropped that policy. If it was sound a few months ago when the present Minister of Trade and Commerce recommended it in the University Magazine, with some limitations of course—it is sound to-day. If the policy of reciprocity in trade matters between the two countries was sound some years ago when it was advocated by the leading men in the Conservative party, by Sir John Thompson. Sir Charles Tupper and the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, why is it not sound to-day? If it was sound when Sir John A. Macdonald made it a part of the statute law of this country, why is it not sound to-day? Our Conservative friends tell us that these Conservative leaders I have mentioned were statesmen, were men who looked into the future, were men who knew the potential resources of this country, and that they legislated not for a few years only, but for all time. But they now tell us that the policy these Conservative statesmen advocated 20 or 25 years ago, would at the present time be ruinous to this country. Why, Sir, no greater condemnation could be pronounced against the foresight of those men. It must be a good thing that they are dead and gone, as otherwise they might have rushed Canada into an agreement with the United States that would have broken our connection with the mother country, and annexed us to the United States. It is true, as they tell us, that our conditions have changed within the last few years. Conditions have greatly improved in Canada during the last 15 or 20 years. The prices of farm products having advanced, but they have also advanced in the United

States; and relatively speaking, the conditions now are as favourable in Canada, and indeed more favourable, than they were 15 or 20 years ago. I have taken pains to look into this matter, and I find that relatively speaking, the prices of agricultural products in the United States are higher now than they were when these Conservative statesmen were advocating reciprocity with that country. What is the reason that induced the President of the United States and his associates to desire to bring about reciprocal trade relations with this country? It was the high cost of living in the United States, and the fact that in that country consumption is fast overtaking production. The people of the United States wished to have access to the products of this country in order to reduce the cost of living in the United States. The House will permit me to quote a few figures. I find that the exports of animals from the United States, going back only ten years, have fallen from $43,000,000 in 1900 to $17,000,000 in 1910, or over 60 per cent. In breadstuffs they have fallen from $262,000,000 in 1900 to $133,000,000 in 1910, or 50 per cent. The exports of meat and dairy products fell from $184,000,000 in 1900 to $130,000,000 in 1910 or 30 per cent. Now, Sir, the very reverse of that is true in Canada. We are essentially an agricultural country. Our exports of agricultural products are increasing rapidly year after year, and we must of necessity look abroad for markets. Where can we find a better market than in that great country to the south of us? the greatest consuming country in the world, a country that is ready to open its markets to us. I find that the exports from Canada in animals and their products, from 1896 to 1909, increased from $36,000,000 to $51,000,000, or nearly 50 per cent. In agricultural products they increased during the same period from $14,000,000 to $71,000,000, or 500 per cent. Under these circumstances, there can be no doubt whatever in the mind of any man who wishes to give the matter fair consideration, that the natural market of the maritime provinces is the New England states. The maritime provinces produce in abundance potatoes, barley, oats, animals and their products, sheep, swine, dairy products, and for these things we must find a market. The only market we have at present is either the British market, or the local market in the maritime provinces themselves, whereas our natural market is the New England states.

Now, I want to call attention to the unfortunate condition in which we are placed in the province of Prince Edward Island in the matter of transportation. That is one of the reasons why our population is decreasing, why we are far from holding our own in comparison with the other provinces. We have to contend with very inadequate transportation facilities. I find on examination that it costs the people of Prince Edward Island to ship a car of farm produce 160 miles, or from a point in Prince Edward Island, say Miscouche or Souris, to Truro, in Nova Scotia, 21 cents per hundred pounds.

While for the same distance on the mainland it costs 14 cents per 100 lbs. From Chatham, Ont., to Halifax, a distance of probably 1,500 miles, it costs 21 cents per 100 lbs., and to Sydney 24 cents, while, if we send 100 lbs. of potatoes to Ottawa or Montreal it costs us 31 cents to 33 cents, a difference of over 10 cents per 100 lbs. Largely by the vote of Ontario we have been shut out of our natural markets, or prevented, at all events, from having these markets opened to us. The people of Ontario will not allow us to secure access to these markets and at the present time we are unable to ship our products to this province. This is a condition of affairs which cannot last because it is unfair to the maritime provinces and particularly to Prince Edward Island. I want to call attention to the fact that the hon. Prime Minister, who is aware of the condition of things and who, when he was in Prince Edward Island some two weeks previous to the last election, stated that if returned to power he would take the earliest opportunity of remedying this grievance. I wish to read you his words:

TRANSPORTATION.

And now, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I come to a question of vital importance to your prosperity. I refer to the transportation question. You can never fully enjoy the benefits of the markets of Canada and of the outside world under your present dislocated traffic arrangements. I believe the conditions as at present existing are not such as you anticipated when you gave up your status as an independent colony and became part of the Dominion. A solemn compact was then entered into, binding as well on the government of Canada as on you as a province, and the hardship is manifest that whilst the Dominion government have exacted a strict performance on your part, they have not in my judgment used reasonable diligence to obviate your insular disadvantages in this regard. I believe that instead of this subject being controlled by different departments it should be under the supervision of one department only, and your steam communication with the mainland should be arranged in conjunction with the Island railway and the Intercolonial railway, thus doing away with the exasperation of the three short hauls.

I say that the government of Canada has not in my opinion taken effective or reasonable steps to demonstrate the feasibility or otherwise of a tunnel connecting your beautiful and fertile island with the mainland. This matter has been dangled and played with too long to your very great detriment.

I promise you that, if in my power after the 21st inst.,—and at present I have reason to believe such will be the case—that I will, with as little delay as possible cause such action to be taken as will settle this question. If it is shown that a tunnel is reasonably feasible I will enter upon the undertaking as soon as possible, but if it turns out to be impracticable I will then use my best endeavours by the best means obtainable to remove as far as possible the disadvantage of your present communication and make an honest effort to give you in this connection what you expected to receive when you joined this great confederation.

The problem of transportation including a thorough and efficient system of cold storage is of enormous importance to the people of Canada and especially to Prince Edward Island. That problem begins at the farm or the factory and does not end until the market is reached whether at home or abroad. Your markets to-day are all that could be desired, provided your means of access thereto were as cheap, rapid and efficient as they ought to be.

I do not present this as a criticism of the present administration, because I know that the ministers have not had much more than time enough to look into their offices, but I want to take this early opportunity to call the attention of the Prime Minister to this promise he made to the people on the eve of the last election, and I will tell him that if he implements this promise, as I believe, he will have the support in this respect at all events, of the electorate of the province. If he does not do that—and I have no reason to believe that he will not— he will certainly receive the condemnation of that province. I see the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) present; he will have something to do with this arrangement, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) will have more to do with it. I ask these hon. gentlemen to give it the earliest possible attention they can, and if they do that I will promise them that in so far as that is concerned they will have my support.

Now, I wish to say a word with regard to the question of our contribution to the imperial navy. I believe it is the well understood desire of the constituents I represent that we should do our duty. They are quite willing to do their duty and to contribute their fair share towards the maintenance of the imperial navy, towards making a contribution in whatever form it may be decided to make it in order to make that navy supreme upon the ocean. The people of the maritime provinces, in so far as I could ascertain their views, were strongly in favour of the policy laid down by the late administration. That policy was well represented by the present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). These ships were to be constructed in our own ocean ports, as far as possible by our own workmen and out of our own material and manned by Canadians. In that respect we would have a vital interest in it because incidentally it might and probably would encourage commercial ship building and give to the maritime provinces in the construction of steel ships that preeminence that they occupied in the construction of wooden ships. It would assist greatly in building up cities at some of our ocean ports and therefore give a market to our farmers and fishermen. Inasmuch as we are shut out now from the markets of the United States we want to a still greater extent our own markets and the policy of the late government in that respect would certainly have been of great advantage to the ship building interests of the country.

In these few words I have endeavoured to present my views and the views of my constituents upon these points and I ask again the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give his serious and prompt attention to the grave question of transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. That question is of vital importance to us. I would ask him to take the earliest opportunity of having a proper survey made in order to ascertain whether or not a tunnel is feasible. If it is found to be not feasible then we want another sister ship to the 'Lady Grey' that will give us as constant communication as possible between that province and the mainland, and above and beyond all we want equality of traffic rates. We want to be able to send our produce from Prince Edward Island at the same rate per mile as people are enabled to transport their produce on the mainland.

Mr. STANFIELD. Why did not your party give you that?

Mr. HUGHES (King's, Prince Edward Island). Our party did a good deal towards that. They did not do all and a good deal remains for this party to do. Our party, when they came into power, found one steamer playing between Prince Edward Island and the mainland—the 'Stanley.' The Liberal party provided a sister steamer called the 'Minto,' and later on, they provided a third steamer, the 'Lady Grey.' That was doing a good deal but they did not take hold of the question of transportation rates as they should have done, and as I hope this government will do.

Pending the construction of the tunnel, if it is found to be feasible, a sister ship to the 'Earl Grey' is much needed, and I hope the government will take that into consideration. I repeat that we should have equal transportation rates for equal distances, that we may be put upon an equality with the people on the main-

land. That is not asking too much, and I believe the people on the mainland will concede it to us. We ought to be able to ship our produce from Prince Edward Island to the markets of Ontario at the same rates as the people of Ontario can ship their produce into our market. The Minister of Marine is a maritime province man and I think he will agree with me that that proposition is a fair one, and I trust he will do all he can to bring this condition of things about.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.), moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. HAZEN. I was informed by the premier that an understanding had been come to between the chief whips that the hon. member (Mr. Loggie) should go on with his speech to-night.

Mr. LOGGIE. With the concurrence of the chief whip I have moved the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LOGGIE. I would prefer not going on until to-morrow as the debate will be adjourned.

Mr. HAZEN. I am sorry the chief whip of the Liberal party is not in the House, but I believe it is necessary that the hon. gentleman should speak to-night so that the further agreement can be carried out that the division will take place to-morrow afternoon. That was agreed to in good faith on both sides of the House. I would be the last to urge my hon. friend (Mr. Loggie) to proceed unless he desires to do so, but in view of the agreement arrived at I think he should.

Mr. OLIVER. May the matter stand until the chief Liberal whip comes into the chamber?

Mr. FOSTER. Meantime the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) can give us the first instalment.

Mr. LOGGIE. I agreed with the chief whip to limit my remarks to-morrow afternoon to 40 or 45 minutes and perhaps he has not communicated that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LOGGIE. As suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I may make a beginning to-night. I think on one occasion before I had to make three different attempts to finish my speech and I was only at it a short time on each occasion. First of all I take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett), who moved the address. He is an old friend and a townsman of mine, and it was my pleasure to sit with him around the council board of our town, so that it is a peculiar pleasure to me to congratulate him on the eloquence of his speech. I take this opportunity of congratulating the Prime Minister upon his accession to office, and I join with those on both sides of the House who have eulogized him. Neither can I refrain from adding a word of congratulation to my old friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). It was my pleasure to follow him in the legislature of New Brunswick once when we had a coalition government, and although I was a Liberal in federal politics and my leader (Mr. Hazen) was a Conservative in federal politics we found ourselves rowing in the same boat in the New Brunswick legislature. I am not at all surprised to find the Minister of Marine in another coalition government. While I congratulate the hon. gentleman from Calgary on the manner of his speech I cannot agree with the sentiments he has propounded. The speech from the Throne says:

> Our trade both with British and with foreign countries is rapidly expanding and there is every prospect that its volume in the present year will be in excess of that attained at any time in the past.

Well the hon. member (Mr. Bennett), urged that we should protect our manufacturers, our farmers, and our artisans so as to develop the home market, but there was not a word in that part of his speech as to our foreign markets, and yet the vast extent of the foreign trade of the mother country is the glory of the great statesmen of the old land. The only foreign markets the hon. gentleman referred to for extending trade were the markets of the British West Indies and Guiana, but to my mind, and in the minds of others, our foreign trade is quite as important to us as our home trade.

The hon. the Minister of Finance laid great stress to-night on the fact that we have a great home market, one of the best in the world. I do not take issue with the hon. gentleman regarding that statement, but I do take issue with him when he makes no mention of the foreign trade and the foreign markets that we have to-day. It is a noticeable fact that Canada's population is made up of about two of a rural population as compared with one of an urban population, whereas the population of the United States is about two of an urban population to one of a rural. That being the case, it seems to me it ought to draw our attention to the possibility of the United States using a large portion of our surplus natural products, and as a matter of fact in 1910, we did use the American market to a considerable extent. I wonder how it is that hon. gentlemen opposite, in addressing the House, have made no reference whatever to the value of foreign markets. The question of reciprocal trade relations with the United States was before the last

parliament and before the country repeatedly. That question was fully discussed on the public platform. It is alleged that in some portions of the province of Quebec at least, other matters were discussed; but for my part, I spoke on the platform in my county on no other issue. I regret, however, to find that what was alleged by the press of this country as the cause of the defeat of the government in Ontario, after the election was over, has been verified by hon. gentlemen opposite. We had the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) the other night giving us definite information as to why the Liberal party were beaten in the province of Ontario. It is to be regretted that such an important matter as reciprocal trade relations with the United States should be placed before the people and that then other issues should have been brought in to defeat a measure so vital to our interests and of such great benefit to this young and growing nation.

I beg now to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The CRUISER 'ABOUKIR.'

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Before the orders of the day were called, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) called attention to a despatch from London to the Canadian Press which reads as follows:

London, Nov. 28.—The crew of the cruiser 'Aboukir,' purchased by Canada, is being paid off to-day. It will be thoroughly overhauled and transferred to Canada next spring.

My hon. friend asked me if we had purchased a cruiser of this description and what the facts were. I had no knowledge at all of Canada having purchased a cruiser of this sort, but having been in charge of the Marine Department only a short time, I did not wish to speak positively on the subject. I, however, got in touch with the deputy head of the Naval Department and have received this memo. from him:

The department has not purchased any cruiser and I have no knowledge of what has been referred to in this article which has been going the rounds of the press.

THE MANITOBA BOUNDARIES.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to call attention to a despatch which appears in the Montreal 'Star' of the 31st November last, and which reads as follows:

After many years of fruitless negotiations the question relative to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba has at last been adjusted.

An announcement to this effect was made last night by Premier Roblin, following a final conference yesterday with the Premier, the Hon. R. L. Borden.

In short, the boundaries of the province are to be extended on the lines suggested by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and accepted by the Manitoba government, but the other issues which formed the obstacle in the past are also adjusted. The territory north of the present boundaries and paralleling the line of Saskatchewan is to be added to the province, which will go as far as Hudson bay and include Port Churchill.

The annual subsidy payable to the province and the indemnity in lieu of the control of public lands are to be re-adjusted on a basis of equality with Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Legislation will be introduced at the present session to give effect to the arrangement, the conclusion of which is eminently satisfactory to the Manitoba Premier.

Mr. Roblin expressed himself as delighted with the reception accorded him by the government, and the fact that a long-standing and vexatious issue is now removed. He announced that the provincial government will lose no time in building a line of railway from Winnipeg to connect with Hudson bay, whose shores and chief ports will now be in Manitoba territory. A detailed statement of the case will probably be made in the House very shortly.

I think it is scarcely in accord with parliamentary usage that an agreement which has been arrived at between this government and the government of a province should be first communicated to the public by one of the parties concerned instead of to parliament; and I would ask my hon. friend if he would be good enough to-morrow to inform the House whether this statement is correct, and whether an agreement has been actually arrived at as indicated.

Mr. HAZEN. It seems to me that my hon. friend is entirely out of order in reading a long newspaper article to this House. There may be of course cases of urgency which call for immediate information, and my hon. friend, if this were such a case, might then be in order. But this is not a case of that kind, and the hon. gentleman would have to give the usual notice of motion required by the rules of the House before the question can be answered.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Might I be allowed to point out—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the hon. member was out of order in putting this question, and that would be my ruling on an occasion of this kind. But I understand that on a motion to adjourn, the only argument that can be raised is on the question of adjourning, and that on a question of the nature of that mentioned by the hon. member the usual two days' notice would be required. If it were something of great urgency, such as that which was brought up yesterday, with regard to the reported massacre of missionaries, that might be permissible; but in this case the usual

notice should be given, and, therefore, the question is out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With your consent, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I was following what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said with respect to the proper question of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and I was simply following the practice pursued ever since I have been in parliament, under which the member acting as leader of the opposition for the time being has been permitted to ask a question on some matter of great public importance, as the question of the boundaries of Manitoba and the financial terms certainly is.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, November 29, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett (Calgary). For an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N. B.). Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night I was expressing my regret that a matter of such great importance as the proposed trade agreement with the United States should have been defeated at the polls on extraneous issues. I substantiated that fact by referring to the statement made by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) in which he emphatically said that side issues caused the defeat of the government candidate in his riding, and as I understand it, the same applies to practically all the ridings in the province of Ontario.

I shall now make a few brief references to the statements made by the Minister of Finance whom I take pleasure in cordially welcoming to the high position he occupies. In considering this question from the economic standpoint he said that both parties have adopted a policy of protection, and that protection is the settled policy of this country. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on that broad statement unless it be that he means that a moderate tariff is protection, and incidentally it is, but it is framed with a view of securing the necessary revenues to carry on the great public works of this country, and not with a view of protecting any specific industry. When the Liberal party came into power in 1896 they did very materially alter the tariff then in force. At that date nineteen dollars on every hundred dollars was being collected from the people of Canada who used imported goods, and last year that nineteen was reduced to sixteen dollars, so that the Liberal party had reduced the rate of taxation by about 14 per cent. By the reciprocity agreement proposed it was expected the tariff would be still further reduced by three per cent or a total reduction of seventeen per cent on the tariff in force under the Conservative regime Then the Minister of Finance told us that because of the United States tariff wall we had taken our own line of development. That may be true. If our tariff has incidental protection in it, and we use the textiles, &c., that are made by our own manufacturers then of course the trade must be interprovincial because we have no other customers except our own people. But it does not seem to me that the proposed trade arrangement in any way interfered with that line of development or with that distribution of our industries, and when the Minister of Finance speaks of industries I presume he means manufactures as distinguished from the products of the sea, the land and the forest. Then the Minister of Finance assumes that we had attempted to make a change in our economic conditions and he used these words:

> Now, under the circumstances was it wise to negotiate an agreement, the purport or intent of which was to introduce so sudden and so radical a change in our economic system.

I fail to realize what is meant by that statement inasmuch as we in no way proposed to interfere with our industrial development, and that our home industries would not be in any way adversely affected. Another reason given by the Minister of Finance as to why this reciprocity arrangement was rejected was that we had no assurance of the continuance of the agreement, and he went on to say that it was admitted the United States could withdraw from the agreement if that great country saw fit, but that it was a grave question whether Canada could do the same. The Minister of Finance made that statement in view of the fact that it is plainly set forth in the wording of the agreement that the power to withdraw applied to each country alike, and that being so I cannot understand what the hon. gentleman meant. As a further reason why the Liberals were defeated, the Finance Minister said that the people of this country were afraid of the entanglement which might result. Well, the trade arrangement was that we could send our natural products to the United States market without paying into their treasury, and that in return we should allow the natural products of the United States to come into the Canadian market without their paying into the Can-

adian treasury. In 1910 Canada marketed in the United States forty million dollars' worth of natural products on which we paid into Uncle Sam's treasury no less a sum than three and a half million dollars. The proposed arrangement simply meant that if next year we sold forty million dollars' worth of natural products in the United States we would not have to pay into Uncle Sam's treasury a single dollar, and yet the Minister of Finance tells us that because Canadian products can go to the United States without Canadians paying tribute to the United States' treasury, forsooth that may bring on entanglements. I shall later on state what the people in the Old Land had to say about entanglements, but meantime the Minister of Finance should bear in mind that that statement of his instead of being considered a progressive policy for his government is rather what I would call a fly policy, because we know that flies are caught on tanglefoot made in the United States. I cannot understand the dread of the Minister of Finance with regard to entanglements, because the fisherman who lives on the Canadian side of the lake can market his fish in Cleveland without paying duty.

I wonder if the hon. gentleman saw a cartoon in one of the daily papers a short time ago. That cartoon represented an automobile with two gentlemen in its back seat. One had the Stars and Stripes around his hat and the other the Union Jack. The one represented the great American republic and the other the motherland, and beneath the cartoon was this phrase : 'Another passenger wanting to get on.' What did that mean? It meant that President Taft, and the representative of the United Kingdom were riding in the same carriage and that the President of the French republic wished to get on board and keep company with them, and bring his country into the agreement. Just think of it. Under this great masterpiece of policy inaugurated by the present government of the United States, American and Canadian neighbours living along a 4,000 mile border could trade together in natural products without paying any customs duty, had that policy not been rejected by the Canadian people.

Then the hon. gentleman spoke of the danger to our transportation companies which would result from that policy. He said :—

> What, I ask, is to be said of a policy that would divert the wheat of the west to the American roads and the other vigilant competitors referred to in the speech of the right hon. gentleman?

The hon. the Finance Minister seemed to apprehend that our western wheat would be brought to Minneapolis and there ground into flour and shipped to Europe. But I would like to ask him what is there to hinder that being done to-day ? The hon, gentleman drew the presumption that if the duty were taken off wheat, that remission of duty would have the effect of diverting our Canadian wheat south of the line, and transporting it to European markets through American channels. But what is the position to-day : the hon. gentleman knows that if he had ten cars of wheat, there is nothing to prevent his shipping it to Minneapolis and there having that wheat ground into flour and thence exported to the United Kingdom.

He would pay the duty of 25 cents per bushel, but when it was exported 99 per cent of the duty would be refunded. So that to-day Canadian wheat ground at Minneapolis when exported is practically free of duty.

There is no duty on wheat exported from Canada via the United States. That wheat goes through in bond. Why then does our wheat not go through American channels to-day ? Why does it not take the southern route over American railways and thence to Europe ? I would suggest to the hon. the Finance Minister that he might perhaps read with profit what the great chief who leads the Liberal party said on that point when the reciprocity pact was under discussion in this House. He would then discover that the reason why our western wheat does not go south to-day is because Canada furnishes the shortest and best route to the old land and not because of the rejection of the reciprocity pact at all. Our wheat can reach the seaboard through Canadian channels much easier and with less mileage than over the American railways.

Then it is only fair to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to this further fact. We ought not to forget that the day is coming when we shall have a very large surplus to export and will have to look for other markets. To-day the United States have only two-thirds of a bushel per capita of wheat to export, whereas Canada, with only a small portion of her land under cultivation, has 16 bushels per capita to export, so that the time is near at hand when the United States will not have any wheat to export but will have to import wheat for home consumption, and it will be a happy day when Canada can have the United States market free of duty for natural products.

I do not wish to transgress on the time of the House but I would like to say a word with reference to another statement of the Minister of Finance. Speaking of the effect of the elections, he said that the rejection of the reciprocity agreement was the best advertisement Canada ever received in Great Britain. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman meant by those words, but I would point out that the present policy of the motherland is

friendly to a reciprocal trade agreement between Canada and the United States; and in pointing to the public opinion of the motherland on this matter, I take it that that opinion is represented by the party now in power, the great Liberal party of the United Kingdom. Well, what did the people of the United Kingdom say about this proposed trade arrangement? Did not Mr. Asquith himself say that the United States were in a position to offer Canada reciprocal trade advantages which it was impossible for the United Kingdom to give Canada because of geographical and other reasons. Mr. Asquith went on to say that he believed in having the dominions over the seas make the best trade arrangements they could in their own interests He believed in the principle of the fullest autonomy for the overseas dominions, and he added that anything which could make these dominions more prosperous would favourably affect the textile manufacturers of the United Kingdom. In like manner, when we make our fishermen, our farmers and our lumbermen more prosperous we incidentally favourably affect the textile manufacturers of the motherland and our own home industries.

I want to revert to one or two remarks made in the speeches of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. A. De Witt Foster) and the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Webster) to the effect that under the reciprocity agreement United States citizens could come over into this country and take our forests and our fish. These statements are absolutely without foundation. I challenge any hon. gentleman in this House to show me one sentence in the reciprocity agreement that would give an American citizen a right to put an axe into a Canadian tree that he has not to-day, or a sentence that would give United States fishermen a right to put a hook or a net into Canadian waters. It is not fair for hon. members to make speeches of this kind that are not borne out by the facts and that go broadcast throughout this country.

The Minister of Finance stated that the discussion of the situation from a national standpoint was the scheme for the first portion of the campaign. I verily believe the hon. gentleman, for that was the case. They aroused the people of this country with a false alarm from a national standpoint. Listen to what the Montreal 'Star' said to our Conservative friends on the 18th of July:

> The members ought to know more accurately what the electors think than they did before adjournment. The mistaken tendency of the opposition to discuss reciprocity largely as an economic question—precisely the ground on which the government prefer to discuss it—has deprived the electors of a clear lead on the national phases of the proposal; but it is not too late yet for that lead to be given, and there is abundant evidence that the people are looking in that direction very suspiciously, without much serious inspiration outside of the press.

The inspiration from the national standpoint came from the press, led by the 'Star' of Montreal and the moneyed interests of Toronto, forming themselves into a league. The 'Star' says further:

> To the plain man who loves Canada and wants above all things to see her keep her name, position and independence, this Greek gift, from a source whence we are more accustomed to receive blows, has a significance far deeper than its tabulated schedules.

The editor of the 'Star' wants to see Canada keep her good name, forsooth! Here we have the national aspect of the question propounded by the Montreal 'Star', and then taken up by the press, and advertised in all the local papers from one end of the Dominion to the other. So I say the Liberal government was defeated ostensibly on reciprocity, but from the evidence of my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), as well as from the statements of the Montreal 'Star,' there were imported into the agreement matters entirely foreign to it. To say that because the citizens of Canada trade freely with those of the United States we shall be any the less loyal or less likely to stand by our Canadian rights and Canadian interests seems to me to be beyond conception.

Now, I want to say one word in support of the amendment moved by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition. There are men in the present cabinet who were diametrically opposed to each other on the naval policy represented by the resolution adopted unanimously by this House on the 29th of March, 1909. As I understand responsible government, the advisers of the King should be at one on such grave matters as the defence of our shores, our commerce and our empire. Let me read to you a Canadian press despatch found in the Moncton 'Transcript' of November 27, as follows:

> Montreal, Que., Nov. 27.—That Canada would be almost defenceless in the event of a war with the United States, that the Atlantic ports should be defended, was the theme of C. H. Cahan, K.C., before the Canadian Club to-day. 'The possibility of war is omnipresent, despite the one hundred years of peace,' he declared. 'The authorities who are responsible for the defence of Canada, cannot longer ignore the military and naval preparedness of our neighbours to the south. They must sooner or later take adequate measures for the protection of our naval internal waterways, and great transcontinental lines of railway. Despite the 100 years of peace, there are obvious questions between Great Britain and the United States that would make war inevitable.'

At such a time we have the government of the day coming before parliament with

their proposals for the future legislation of the country without saying one word as to what they propose to do regarding the construction of the proposed Canadian navy. If it be true that in the past members of the government were diametrically opposed one to the other, is it not fair to the people of Canada that they should know how they stand on the great question of naval defence for our shores, our homes and our empire? Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in saying that I shall heartily support the amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. GEORGE H. BOIVIN (Shefford). Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will pardon the youngest member of His Majesty's loyal opposition, if he takes up a few moments of the time of this House and adds a few words to the many able addresses which we have heard in the course of the debate upon the amendment proposed to the motion that a humble address be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne. I should perhaps speak in French, but I will use the English language in order that I may be understood, not only by you, Sir, but by every one here present. I do not think that I can add much to what has been said by my right hon. leader and the other gentlemen who have preceded me, but I feel that I should give you as best I can, my reasons for voting in favour of the proposed amendment. The new government has succeeded in composing a speech from the Throne which, in the words of the Montreal Daily 'Star,' sounds well but means little. It mentions the prosperity of our country and thus gives a deserved tribute of praise to the late government. It mentions improved trade relations with the British West Indies and British Guiana. We need little of their produce, they need none of ours, and I believe that the proposed improved trade relations will not take shape during the present session. Good roads are also mentioned, and the Canadian farmer is assured that he will not be forgotten. After the fiercest election campaign in the history of the Dominion of Canada, waged and won with the object of preventing that same farmer from selling his produce in the nearest, largest, and best market he could possibly desire, it will be impossible to compensate him for what he has lost by the defeat of the late Liberal administration.

The creation of a permanent tariff commission is also announced. It may be an excellent thing, and it may not; but until we know how it is composed and what powers it will have, I do not wish to enter into discussion upon it. But that is all we find in the speech from the Throne. What about the school question in Manitoba and the new provinces, which was hashed and rehashed for the purpose of getting votes in the province of Quebec? What about the Ne Temere decree which was used by hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House for the purpose of getting votes in the province of Ontario? What about the pet hobby of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), when he occupied a seat on the left of the Speaker as the member for Jacques Cartier, the Georgian Bay canal? What about the Canadian navy, that navy which, according to the opposition speakers in the last election, was so infernally imperial in Quebec, and so damnably disloyal in the other provinces? Will the navy law be repealed, and what law will replace it? The speech from the Throne says not a word about these matters upon which the people of Canada would like to be enlightened.

Still the government is surprised to think we have anything to find fault with. The Minister of Public Works says that there is nothing to worry about. It is true, that Canada has been so well administered that it will continue to grow and prosper for years to come; but if this prosperity is to become permanent, the country must be governed by ministers who agree among themselves at least upon the great and important issues before the country. The same hon. minister told us the other day, 'We are here while you are there.' Yes, Mr. Speaker, he is there, the first lieutenant of the present Prime Minister, and parliament and the country have a right to know, how after advocating two different policies, and leading two different parties these two hon. gentlemen have buried their differences and have taken the two first positions in the government of this country.

I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of raising questions of race and creed because we found fault with the admission of three members of parliament from the province of Quebec into the Borden government. We did not mention race or creed. We would have regretted to see the province of Quebec ignored in the formation of the cabinet; but we expected to see the hon. the Prime Minister take from that province three able and competent French Canadians professing his own political faith and belonging to his own political party. We criticise him because he went outside of his party and chose three men, all able and competent, if you will, but who for years past have denounced and condemned his naval policy as being worse than that of the Laurier government. We criticise him because he took into his cabinet three followers of Henri Bourassa, whose newspaper, 'Le Devoir,' has, since the last election, but before the formation of the cabinet, published an article against the admission of the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), the Minister of

Militia (Mr. Hughes), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), into that cabinet. They are men who have accused Borden and Laurier of conspiring together to hurl the French Canadians, bound hand and foot, into the vortex of Imperial defence. They are men who did not once appear upon the same platform with their present leader during the election campaign. They are men who took charge of the French speaking voters in the province of Quebec, while the Prime Minister looked after the English speaking sections of the same province, each preaching his own doctrine upon the navy, differing even upon the question of reciprocity when it suited their conveniences, united only upon one platform 'Anything to beat Laurier,' the platform now re-formed and made over into the song of victory: 'We are here and you are there.'

The Prime Minister says they have always agreed since 1909, but 'Hansard' tells us they have disagreed and voted against each other. They may have agreed, but if so, they agreed to disagree. It may have been the game they played to obtain the victory they now rejoice over; but if so they do not deserve the confidence of the people of Canada. If differences really did exist and concessions have been made by one party or the other to wipe out those differences, parliament and Canada have a right to know who made the concessions. If those differences still exist upon the only important question before the people to-day, they have no constitutional right to be members of the same cabinet. They cannot put us off by asking for time to decide the naval question. The present Prime Minister, three years ago, wanted things done speedily. Canada and the empire, with still greater reason, want things done speedily now. The Minister of Public Works, speaking to the amendment, asked the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) to point out in British constitutional history any example of such a representation made to the Crown by the House of Commons within the last three hundred years. When the Minister of Public Works tells us where we can find such an alliance as that made between himself and the Prime Minister, during the last three hundred years we will answer his question. If the representation was not sooner made it was because it was not sooner required. The occasion first arose in Canada in 1911, and when it arose there was upon the floor of the House of Commons an old and beloved leader of a true and loyal opposition who was just celebrating his seventieth birthday, who had devoted his entire life to the welfare of his country, who had cemented together in the bonds of Canadian nationhood people of all races and all creeds, who had made Canada great, grand and prosperous, and who had just lost some of his most able lieutenants, and the reins of power, in a political struggle fighting for the increased prosperity of his country. He was overpowered and defeated but not disheartened; the day after his defeat he resumed the battle by making the amendment which has caused so much discomfiture to the party in power, an amendment which exactly meets the present situation, and which, although it may be defeated in this House, will be approved by every one of his supporters in this House, and by the majority of the people of Canada.

I referred a moment ago to the race and religious cries we were accused of raising; but it was only to deny the accusation and send it home to those who made it. We have the admission of the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that the Liberal government was defeated in his county, and throughout Ontario, because the Ne Temere decree had been promulgated and published in Canada. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was held responsible for the regulations laid down by the Catholic church, over which he had no control, and maliciously accused of being under the domination of the Church of Rome. In the province of Quebec he was proclaimed by the other division of the Conservative party as being anti-French and anti-Catholic. Even in my own county I was called a traitor to my faith by 'La Croix,' a Catholic paper published in Montreal, and distributed throughout the county, because I did not, like my opponent, undertake and promise to give to the French Canadian catholics of Manitoba and the new provinces the same rights enjoyed by the English speaking Protestants in Quebec.

Add to this the fact that the English voters were urged to vote against me because I was of French origin. Then conjure up a picture of thousands of Canadian children being disembowelled upon the distant seas of China and Japan, fighting the unjust wars of the British Empire, and you have a sample of the Conservative-Nationalist campaign in Quebec.

That is why they are there and we are here.

Coming as I do from the Eastern Townships, so ably represented in the late cabinet by the Hon. Sidney Fisher, the former member for Brome, and now without representation at the council board of our nation, I must correct a statement made in the course of this debate by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Rainville.) I owe it to the late Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Fisher, because he was largely responsible not only for my election, but also for the election of every other Liberal member from the Eastern Townships. Like the staunch Liberal he is, he sacrificed himself to save others. History

has shown us greater heroes in defeat than in victory and Hon. Sidney Fisher is one of these. The hon. member for Chambly-Verchères stated that the only things ever done for agriculture by the late government was to appoint a farmer as Minister of Agriculture. That was the first step for the benefit of agriculture, but it was not all. My hon. friend (Mr. Rainville) forgets, if he ever knew, that among other important advances made for the welfare of the Canadian farmer, have been the institution of a complete equipment of cold storage refrigeration transportation; the establishment of a complete and systematic supervision and inspection of the handling and marketing of Canadian food products from the place of production in Canada to the markets of England, the appointment of the live stock commissioners, the creation of the seed branch, the reorganization of the veterinary department, and many other reforms; besides attempting to enter into a trade agreement with the United States which would have been a benefit to every farmer in Canada. This agreement was, as every one knows, an indirect, but enormous factor in the defeat of the late government. I say indirect, because the government was defeated not upon the merits of the trade agreement, but by the ultra-loyalty cry to which it gave rise, and by the sentiment—call it something else if you like—which it awakened and brought forth from the Manufacturers' Association and other sources.

Many hon. members have said that we on this side are not all agreed upon the question of fact as to whether reciprocity is dead or not. They are mistaken. We are all agreed that Canada has refused a great opportunity which she may never again have the chance to accept, and in this sense we agree that reciprocity is dead. But the Liberal party in Canada to-day still stands for wider markets for the Canadian farmer. We believe that the free exchange of natural products would be of immense advantage to the country. We believe that Canadians are just as loyal to the British Crown as are the inhabitants of the British Isles, and that like them we can trade with the people of the United States without fear of being led into political union. We shall continue to preach the doctrine of international good will. We shall continue to be the party of the people against the trusts; of the masses against the classes. We have been called traitors and annexationists. We resent the sneers and insults levelled at our loyalty, but these sneers and those insults will not lessen our love for Canada, nor will they lessen our labours, or our efforts to make our country the greatest and grandest of all nations.

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Russell). Mr. Speaker, it is not in a spirit of mere compliance with custom that I desire to add my congratulations to those which previous speakers have tendered to the mover (Mr. R. B. Bennett) and the seconder (Mr. Sevigny) of the address for the very acceptable way in which they discharged the duties assigned to them at the opening of this parliament. In complimenting both these hon. gentlemen, I do so because I feel that they deserve all that has been said in their praise.

And, in this connection, let me express my appreciation of the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite felicitated the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon attaining his 70th birthday. The cordiality, the evident sincerity, of their felicitations reminded me of an incident that happened while the late Lord Russell of Killowen, was addressing the court as chief counsel for Mr. Parnell in his fabous case against the London 'Times.' Associated in that case with Lord Russell —then Sir Charles Russell—as junior counsel, was Mr. Asquith, now Prime Minister of Great Britain. In the course of his address Sir Charles Russell happened to disarrange his papers, and they fell unnoticed by him to the floor. Not finding them at hand when he required a reference a few moments later, he asked: 'Where are my papers?' Mr. Asquith, who was in the act of picking them up, answered 'At your feet, Sir, where we all are.' The words in which hon. gentlemen opposite conveyed their congratulations to my right hon. leader may not have been the words used by Mr. Asquith on the occasion to which I have referred; but their tributes no less accurately described the position of my right hon. friend in this parliament than did Mr. Asquith's tribute at the time it was uttered, describe Sir Charles Russell's position at the English bar.

Before passing to the consideration of this amendment, let me congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your elevation to the high and honourable position which you now occupy. I have no doubt, Sir, that you will carry out your expressed intention of preserving an impartial attitude between the parties in this House. And speaking as a member of the opposition, I can assure you, Sir, that you will always find the members on this side of the House ready and willing to co-operate with you in maintaining the decorum of debate.

Now, Sir, the principle embodied in the amendment which has been placed in your hands by the right hon. the leader of the opposition, is one of the most importast that can engage the attention of this House. In point of fact, it goes to the very root of responsible government. To object it will be to declare that the Conservative party has decided to substitute emergency rule for constitutional government in this

country and to declare that in future when a successful political leader is called upon to form a cabinet and finds himself embarrassed by the complexity of his support, he may, in the selection of his ministers, disregard their opposing views on all matters of public policy, provided that upon one question only they agree—namely the necessity, in the interest of their party, of keeping their opponents out of office. In effect, that is the position taken in this debate by members of the present coalition and by hon. gentlemen who have spoken in their behalf; and that position, I have no doubt, all the factions supporting this government are prepared to maintain.

Such a course, I submit, is without precedent in this Dominion. But it is not the only strange spectacle presented by this coalition. For the first time in the history of responsible government in any British country we have in Canada to-day a government whose leader does not occupy a seat in either branch of parliament and who, therefore, is not responsible to the people to whom the government which he leads is responsible. The titular leader of the government is, of course, my hon. friend the Prime Minister; the actual leader of the government is Mr. Henri Bourassa, the editor of 'Le Devoir,' and head of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. But, Sir, even that does not fully describe the situation as to the leadership of this government. The Prime Minister receives his orders not from Mr. Bourassa direct, but from either of his deputies, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) or Mr. Armand Lavergne, so that the titular leader sits not once but twice or thrice removed from the real seat of power.

Mr. Speaker, no greater tribute could be paid to Mr. Bourassa's political influence than his ascendancy over a party to which he never belonged, and in which, even now, he disdains membership. His success becomes all the more striking when you recall what was said about him and his party immediately after the general election by the 'Orange Sentinel,' of Toronto, a newspaper whose unwavering support of the Conservative party gives it authority to speak for that party. In its issue of 28th September last, the 'Sentinel' published a long article reviewing the election, in which it said:

> Nationalist Party to Remain Independent of Borden Government.
>
> Mr. Bourassa has declared his independence of the new government about to be formed. That is quite satisfactory. He will continue, he says, to fight for the principles for which he has struggled. Those principles, as he has explained them in his speeches, can have no support from the Borden government without alienating the people of Ontario. The Nationalist propaganda is a menace to the integrity of the empire. We have not hesitated

to express our opinion of the movement or its leader. Our opposition to Sir Wilfrid Laurier was due to his surrender to the Ultramontanes. Bourassa's complaint against him was that he had not gone far enough in the service of his race and his church. The 'Sentinel' believes he went too far.

Certainly if Laurier did not go far enough to please Mr. Bourassa, there is nothing in Mr. Borden's record to encourage him to hope for greater docility to the wishes of the Nationalists. It suits our views to have Mr. Bourassa standing aloof. Let him fight his battle in Quebec. He may have some success there. But he must understand that the harder he fights for the extension of the privileges of the French in the Dominion the more solidly will the English-speaking electors gather behind the man who resists him. If Mr. Bourassa reads the returns intelligently he will discover that for the first time since confederation there is a government at Ottawa that is in a position to defy the agitators of Quebec. That is the outstanding feature of the contest. It is one which is most gratifying to the dominant race in Canada. It means, in a phrase, that the rule of the minority will cease. The tradition that a party could not win a federal election without the aid of Quebec has been destroyed. So far as Mr. Bourassa has contributed to fix that in the minds of politicians and people he has done a real service.

Brave words, Mr. Speaker, but eaten almost as soon as they were uttered. Fond hopes, Mr. Speaker, but rudely dashed on the ground almost as soon as they were formed. For Mr. Bourassa, with a better knowledge than the 'Sentinel' of the man with whom he had to deal, laughed at the 'Sentinel's' threats, pressed his advantage, and to-day stands in the pilot-house of the government ship, with his hand upon the wheel, steering the craft to an anchorage from which he and his fellow Nationalists are determined there shall go forth no Canadian navy and no contribution to the British navy.

It has been frequently asserted in the course of this debate that no constitutional model can be found for such a coalition government as the one we have at present. Where then did the Prime Minister go for his model? So far he has not told us, but as he is a gentleman of culture and widely read, he must have found somewhere laid down, a model which he decided to follow. All the signs indicate that the Prime Minister's reading led him to take for his model a form of government which prevailed on this continent at a time when the Red man was supreme. In the absence of information from the Prime Minister it is difficult to be exact but those who remember Parkman's account of the organization of the Iroquois confederacy will notice a striking parallel between that body and the make-up of the present cabinet. Parkman tells us that, sundered by dissensions the Iroquois

separated into five distinct nations, the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas and the Senecas. Then there was a further sub-division into several clans, each of which had its distinctive name as the clan of the Wolf, of the Hawk, of the Fox, of the Bear and of the Tortoise. These clans as Parkman explains, were not really separate, but were mingled throughout the confederacy. Thus a Seneca and a Mohawk might each be a Bear. A Wolf and a Fox might each be a Seneca. This, you will admit, is not a little confusing to our modern ideas, and the confusion grows, of course, in proportion to the number of clans. But Parkman proceeds to point out that, divided and subdivided as the Iroquois were, they had one bond that held the confederacy together, namely, the common purpose of slaughtering the enemy and of waxing fat on the plunder to be found in the enemy's country. There, it seems to me, the Prime Minister got the model for his cabinet. When he first went cabinet-making and looked over his clans of the Wolf, the Fox, the Hawk, the Bear and the Tortoise, we can imagine, from what the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) told the Conservatives of Ward 6, in that city, how perplexed he was by the divergence of their views; but in the organization of the Iroquois confederacy he saw a way out of his difficulty. And so in the end it mattered not whether the men he decided to select were for a low tariff or a tariff as high as Haman's gallows, it mattered not whether they favoured a gift of Dreadnoughts, a cash contribution to the British navy, or no navy at all; so long as they were united on the policy aptly described, as: 'Anything to keep Laurier and the Liberals out of office,' they were eligible to become his colleagues and the advisers of the Crown, with collective responsibility on all matters of public policy!

The parallel between the Iroquois confederacy and the present cabinet does not stop there. Parkman goes on to explain that the clans were by no means equal in numbers, in influence or in honour. To some of the clans belonged the right of giving one chief to the nation; others had the right of giving three, or in one case, four chiefs; while others could give none. This must have been the precedent the Prime Minister had in mind when he gave three portfolios and a deputy speakership to the Nationalists, and left the great Presbyterian body without a single representative in the cabinet. For a knowledge of this latter omission I am indebted to the Ottawa 'Citizen' which, as you know, is the morning echo of the Prime Minister's voice in this city.

Speaking a few days ago in this House, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) inquired from my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) if he could find in constitutional history in the last three hundred years, any such representation to the Crown as was contained in this amendment.

My hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Boivin) supplied the answer to-day. It might well be answered 'no,' for the simple reason that a similar instance never occurred in England. But when the Minister of Public Works asked that question he forgot that the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) had anticipated it and had supplied the answer by citing the example of Lord James of Hereford, of the Duke of Devonshire, and of other gentlemen in England who had refused to enter cabinets when they could not agree with the policy of the Prime Minister.

In the further course of his speech the Minister of Public Works in replying to a criticism of the personnel of the present cabinet, cited Mr. Tarte and Mr. Dobell as examples of former Conservatives who had been included in the cabinet of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1896. But, these cases are not analogous to the present. In the first place neither Mr. Tarte nor Mr. Dobell had denounced the leader of the Liberal party as some of the present ministers had denounced the present Prime Minister almost up to the time his cabinet was formed. For years prior to 1896, Mr. Tarte had worked in close harmony with the Liberal party and in 1891, in conjunction with the Liberals he had conducted an investigation into the scandals which ultimately wrecked the Conservative government and at the next ensuing election he ran as a supporter of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In Mr. Dobell's case it is well to recall that he was returned at a by-election in 1895 and Sir Wilfrid Laurier then claimed him as a supporter because Mr. Dobell had included in his election platform a plank in favour of reciprocity with the United States. But, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier made that claim in this House what do you think happened? Why, Sir, Mr. Foster, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce repudiated the idea because, said Mr. Foster, reciprocity had been a cardinal plank in the platform of the Conservative party for many years previously. It is therefore well to remember that both Mr. Tarte and Mr. Dobell, when they entered the Liberal cabinet had not for a long time previously differed in opinion with the Liberal Prime Minister, but that on the contrary they were in entire accord with him on all matters of public policy and on all matters of minor policy as well.

Previous speakers on this side of the House have pointed out the line of cleavage between the present ministers on the navy question, and it may be interesting to pursue that subject a little further so that we may understand fully how and when these

differences of opinion arose. It is true that the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) and their parliamentary followers adhered to the resolution of March 29, 1909, for several months after that resolution was unanimously adopted by this House. In proof of that you have had cited the speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Borden in England on the 1st of July, 1909, as well as the speech he delivered at Halifax on the 14th of October of that year, after his return from England. There is, however, another speech which has not been referred to so far in the debate and that is a speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce on April 18, 1909, in the city of Toronto, before the Centre and South Toronto Conservative clubs. A despatch from Toronto to the Montreal 'Gazette,' dated April 18, 1909, says:

George E. Foster urged that a beginning be made in the formation of a navy of our own as well as taking steps to assist Great Britain in the defence of Canada. He concluded by urging that Canada should let the roots sink down into her own soil and gradually lay the foundation of a navy of our own.

And when you hear these words quoted to-day you recognize them as an old friend because they are practically the same words used by the same hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in the eloquent speech he delivered in this House on the 29th March, 1909, in support of the resolution which he and his party now profess to disregard.

It has been said that the Prime Minister and his English speaking followers adhered to this resolution until the result of the Drummond-Arthabaska election became known, and that then a change took place. This, however, is not an absolutely correct statement of the situation. Prior to the Drummond-Arthabaska election there were developments in the way of change in another direction, in regard to which some information may I think very properly be given to this House. You have heard several times in the course of this debate the view expressed that it was pressure from Toronto that forced the Prime Minister to abandon his position on the navy question. I am not disposed to question any honour that Toronto may be entitled to in this regard, but to do it justice I must say that the pressure, in this instance, came not from Toronto, but from the city of Winnipeg and from no less a person than the former Minister of Public Works in the Manitoba government, now the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) in this coalition cabinet. The first intimation that the public had that such pressure might be expected was contained in a despatch from Winnipeg to the Montreal 'Gazette' dated April 16, 1909, and purporting to give an interview with the present Minister of the Interior. I will read some extracts from the paragraph for the sake of tracing the genesis of this change. The despatch says:

Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of Public Works, to-day condemned in no uncertain manner what he called Sir Wilfrid Laurier's cheap-jack naval policy in discussing the announcement that Sir Frederick Borden and Mr. Brodeur would leave for England immediately after the session to consult the Imperial authorities.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MURPHY. I think I heard some gentleman opposite say 'hear, hear,' but I would ask him to reserve his applause for the next paragraph:

Said Mr. Rogers, 'battleships of the Dreadnought type alone can serve to uphold Great Britain's supremacy on the seas. It is for Canada to say whether she will or will not provide for one or more of these battleships. If our answer is to be no, it would be more manly, more dignified and more admirable in every way frankly to say so and not beat about the bush in wishy-washy resolutions, and——

I commend these words to my friend who said 'hear, hear.'

—and talk of sending ministers on time-killing expeditions to London.

No, concluded Mr. Rogers, I don't think the Laurier government has any intention of implementing the terms of this resolution and you will notice that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is not receiving any congratulatory messages from the King or other personages in London on the strength of his naval policy.

That, so far as my knowledge goes, is the first intimation of activity on the part of the gentleman who has turned out to be the great tempter of the English-speaking portion of the Conservative party on the naval question. You will recall that the Hon. Mr. Borden was in England in the summer of 1909, and you will also recall that while he was in England his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce made a tour of the west. There was a banquet given to him at the city of Winnipeg at which the present Minister of the Interior was a very prominent figure.

At that banquet in Winnipeg and at other functions in other places throughout the west, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), made speeches, and each of these speeches indicated that he too was gradually yielding to the spell of the tempter, and that by degrees he was making up his mind to abandon the position he had so valiantly taken in this House on the 29th March, 1909.

Then, after the return of the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Borden), from England, and after he had made his speech in Halifax, re-asserting his position on this resolution and declaring it to be the same as it was when that resolution was adopted, what took place? A very significant interview took place between my hon. friend

the First Minister (Mr. Borden), and the great tempter from Winnipeg, Mr. Robert Rogers. That interview took place in the city of Toronto, and perhaps it was the knowledge of that interview which led some people to believe that the pressure on the First Minister to change his position came from Winnipeg. The 'Mail and Empire' of November the 1st, 1909, gives some insight into what took place at Toronto. Of that interview between the Prime Minister, who up to that time had stuck to his guns, and Mr. Rogers, then Minister of Public Works of Manitoba, the 'Mail and Empire,' of November the 1st, 1909, gave the following account:

Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of Public Works for Manitoba, was at the King Edward Hotel yesterday and left for Montreal last night. He was in conference with Mr. R. L. Borden during the day, but neither gentleman would make any statement in regard to the matters under discussion.

Then after some other statements which are not material to this debate, the article continues :—

Mr. Rogers was asked what was the state of public opinion in the west in regard to the proposition for a Canadian navy, and replied: 'The west is not bubbling over with confidence in Sir Wilfrid Laurier, nor with the idea that he is going to do anything for the welfare of the empire. In the west we don't think that even a Canadian navy would be the best means of paying our obligations to Great Britain for protection and services rendered in the past.'

And a little later on the writer says :—

The talk of a Canadian navy is only a means to an end whereby they can get around the matter and end in doing nothing. If we had in Canada a First Minister in whose loyalty to the empire the country had confidence, then conditions might be different.

'How about the resolution of the House?' was asked.

Resolutions are words or dead letters until a living spirit puts life into them. If the ruling spirit in Canada is not loyal to even that resolution, conditions to my mind are serious.

Mr. Speaker, in view of recent developments, let me read that sentence over again :—

If the ruling spirit in Canada is not loyal to even that resolution, conditions to my mind are serious.

I would draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), to this :—

Many long months have passed since this resolution came down, and nothing has as yet been accomplished except the time-killing mission of two ministers who are sent to England.

From these citations it must be evident that a new policy was decided on at that time by the Prime Minister and by a certain section of his English-speaking following; and if there be any doubt as to where the pressure came from, that doubt is entirely removed by a speech delivered by the Hon. Walter Scott in the Saskatchewan Legislature on the 17th of December, 1909, when that legislature was discussing the Dreadnought resolution offered by Mr. Wylie, who was then, I believe, the member for Maple Creek. The Hon. Mr. Scott is reported to have spoken as follows :—

The movement to drive Mr. Borden from the position which he has taken on this naval question is a movement which, it is well known, has originated in Winnipeg. The knowledge of that fact, together with the motion before us gives good reason for thinking that our hon. friends opposite have at last discovered a way in which to exhibit at least a little gratitude for some of the things which occurred and were done in the Saskatchewan campaign in August, 1908, when the so-called Provincial Rights organization forces were directed from Winnipeg by the Hon. Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Wylie—Rogers had absolutely nothing to do with my motion.

Mr. Scott—Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House impose some very proper restrictions which I should be the last to disregard but we are dealing with a maritime subject and I really must suggest to my hon. friend that he tell that to the marines.

The part taken by Mr. Rogers in the Saskatchewan campaign last year cannot be disputed. The part that he is taking at the present time against Mr. Borden on this naval question is equally well known. That the underlying purpose of this motion of Mr. Wylie which we are considering is identical with Mr. Roger's purpose must be apparent event to a child. Let Mr. Wylie not imagine that the public are unable to add two and two together.

So I assert that there can be no doubt that the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), was the author of the cry heard so often in certain parts of this country during the last elections, namely, that the naval policy of the late government was not British enough, just as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), and his Nationalist associates were the authors of that cry in Quebec that that policy was too British. Is it any wonder then that we on this side should demand an explanation as to how these two hon. gentlemen came together in the same cabinet? Is it not natural that we should ask further that if when this government tenders advice to the Crown on naval matters, that advice is accompanied by two riders, one bearing the signature of the Minister of the Interior, for the imperial wing of the party, and the other bearing the signature of the Minister of Public Works for the anti-imperial wing of the party? Sir, it is only necessary to mention these conditions

to realize how timely is the amendment of the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and that it should be supported by every man who appreciates the benefits of responsible government.

So much has been said about reciprocity that it would not be showing proper consideration for the time of the House if, at this stage of the debate, the discussion on that subject were to be prolonged. However, there is one phase of the matter with which I would like to deal very briefly. When the late government took office in 1896 they were confronted with a number of outstanding questions between Canada and the United States, which had threatened, at one time or another to impair the friendly relations that should exist between two neighbouring peoples. What happened? The late government set resolutely to work to remove these sources of irritation, and in turn settled the Alaskan boundary question, the boundary waters question, the fisheries question as connected with international boundary waters, the question of the international boundary in Passamaquoddy Bay, the North Atlantic coast fisheries question and the pelagic sealing question, and it entered into an agreement for the settling of the outstanding pecuniary claims of the subjects of both countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the settlement of all these questions involved no loss of national honour and no weakening of the imperial tie. On the contrary, it increased Canadian national self-respect and the removal of all these subjects of controversy not only promoted more friendly relations between Canada and the United States, but it brought the British and the American peoples more closely together than they had ever been before.

And, Sir, having regard to these results, it was felt by the late government that it would have been a crime not only against Canada but against Great Britain as well to have rejected the friendly overtures of the United States to enter into a reciprocal trade arrangement confined to the natural products of the two countries. As a member of the late government, holding that view, I cannot too strongly condemn the tactics of those opponents of reciprocity who, with complete disregard for the future relations of Canada and the empire with the United States, and thinking only of attaining party success, distorted certain words used by President Taft in his message to Congress, and argued that because he said that Canadians were coming to the parting of the ways, that meant that we were being forced to choose between the road leading to Washington and the road leading to the capital of the British Empire. As that phrase has been referred to in the same sense in this debate, I would ask your indulgence, Sir, for a few minutes while I place the facts before you. Now, what are the facts? In the first place, the president's words, as they appear in his message to congress, are not open to the interpretation placed upon them. Just let us see what he did say. Here are his exact words:

> The Dominion has greatly prospered. It has an active, aggressive, and intelligent people. They are coming to the parting of the ways. They must soon decide whether they are to regard themselves as isolated permanently from our markets by a perpetual wall or whether we are to be commercial friends.

Nothing very alarming in that, Mr. Speaker; nothing there to justify the use of the annexation cry; nothing there to justify the stirring up of an anti-American feeling in this country. Those who led the people of Canada, or some of them at least to believe that the words 'the parting of the ways' were applied for the first time to Canada by President Taft, and then with a sinister meaning, have absolutely no defence for their conduct when all the facts are known.

What are the further facts? It happens that this very phrase, 'the parting of the ways,' was used by a distinguished American statesman in discussing international relations with a former leader of the Conservative party, and there can be no doubt that in repeating the phrase in his late message to congress, President Taft was but echoing the words used by Mr. Bayard, the American Secretary of State, in a letter written by him to Sir Charles Tupper in 1887 on the subject of our commercial relations. In that letter, which was dated May 31, 1887, Mr. Bayard said:

> The gravity of the present condition of affairs between our two countries demands entire frankness. I feel we stand at 'the parting of the ways.' In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice; on the other a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility, in which victory means the destruction of an adjacent prosperity without gain to the prevalent party—a mutual, physical and moral deterioration which ought to be abhorrent to patriots on both sides, and which, I am sure, no two men will exert themselves more to prevent than the parties to this unofficial correspondence.

There, Sir, you have almost the identical language used by President Taft, and that letter was written 24 years before President Taft sent his message to congress. When Sir Charles Tupper received that letter and read the phrase, 'the parting of the ways,' did he lash himself into a frenzy and shout

that Mr. Bayard in using it had evil designs on Canada? Nothing of the kind. Did he object to the use of those words in any way? Not he. Then you may ask, what did he do? He sat down and wrote a letter to Mr. Bayard on the 6th of June, 1887, in these terms:

My dear Mr. Bayard,—I had great pleasure in receiving your letter of May 31 evincing as it does the importance which you attach to the maintenance of the cordial commercial relations between the United States and Canada, under which such vast and mutually beneficial results have grown up. I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries.

Not one word of protest or objection, but every line of that letter constitutes a standing rebuke to our opponents who employed the tactics of which we have reason to complain. If we were seeking justification for our course in regard to that trade agreement, I submit that we could find no better justification than that which is contained in this letter of Sir Charles Tupper.

Now, Sir, if I have fault to find with hon. gentlemen opposite on matters of general policy, I have none at all to find with the candour displayed by the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou), and the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). The first of these hon. gentlemen told us that the opposition to the right hon. leader of the late government in the province of Quebec was due to the feeling that he had not done enough for the Catholics. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) told us with equal frankness that opposition to the right hon. gentleman in the province of Ontario was due to the feeling that he had done too much for the Catholics. It is true that the political vision of the average Ontario elector was temporarily obscured by some of the issues raised in the recent election; but, Sir, I have enough confidence in his sense of fair-play, in his deep-rooted love of justice, to believe that when the mists have cleared away he will see the direction in which his duty lies, and will punish the men who misled him in that election. Sir, we all remember the Gordon riots in England, and the regrettable deeds that were done by a section of the people while under the influence of religious excitement. In the account of the happenings of that time given by Charles Dickens in 'Barnaby Rudge,' there stands out one incident which I think is worth repeating in this House. When, by reason of professing the same creed as the rioters, Gabriel Varden, the sturdy old English locksmith, was urged to chalk their motto on his door and thus secure the protection of his home, he rejected the proposal with scorn, saying 'No! 'I'd neither have the protection of their leader nor chalk their howl upon my door' though for not doing it they shot me on my own threshold.' Mr. Speaker, in substance I believe that will be the attitude of the Ontario elector if in the future appeals are made to him similar to those that were made to him in the recent election.

Now, Sir, what answer has been made by the government to this amendment? The only answer vouchsafed by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce is this, that it is not just to ask the government to declare its naval policy at this time. Not just to ask the government to declare its naval policy, when only one short year ago the hon. Minister of Public Works aye and the hon. Prime Minister as well—moved an amendment to the address because the speech from the Throne contained no indication of the intention of the government to submit the naval question to the people. Why could not this government have embodied in the speech from the Throne what its Prime Minister and his Minister of Public Works professed to be their view and their desire just one year ago?

Were they not bound in honour to do so when we have it on the word of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and of Mr. Armand Lavergne, speaking to the electors in the county of Quebec, that the Prime Minister had promised them both that there should be a referendum on this subject?

Not just to ask the government to declare their naval policy!—after what took place during the recent election, when the Prime Minister at different places in Ontario, and elsewhere in the English speaking centres had been most eloquent on the subject of the navy, and had then gone to Quebec, and had suddenly become as mum as the traditional mollusc on the same subject. Have we not a right, Sir, to ask for some explanation of such a Janus-faced policy as that?

Not just to ask this government for a declaration of its naval policy!—when the Prime Minister went to Missisquoi in the province of Quebec in the recent election, and by appearing on his candidate's platform there publicly endorsed that candidate's election address which contained the following paragraph:

If I am elected I will give my word and my vote—I declare it emphatically in advance—to obtain the repeal of the Naval Bill. I will vote against any Prime Minister whether Mr. Borden, or any one else who will not repeal this Bill in its entirety.

In view of the Prime Minister's endorsement of that position during the election

have we not the right to know where he stands on that question now?

Not just to ask the government for a declaration of its naval policy!—when my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) speaking a few evenings ago in this House, approved of the Prime Minister sending telegrams during the elections outlining his policy on a great variety of matters. Surely, Sir, if that were proper for the Prime Minister to do, we are entirely within our rights in asking the Prime Minister to state his naval policy in the speech from the Throne.

Not just to ask the government to declare its naval policy!—when in this very debate, the Prime Minister told us that naval expenditures should stop, when the Minister of Marine stated that some members of the government should go to England to consult the Admiralty on this question. Could not the government have stated either or both of these things in the speech from the Throne? But I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries why should he waste time and money in going to England on what his colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) described as a time-killing mission? Why does he need to ask the views of the Admiralty? Sir, he has the views of the Admiralty. They are contained in the official reports of the conference of 1909. If he will consult those reports, and will also read the debate which afterwards took place in this House on the subject, he will find that the Admiralty favoured one of three things—first a cash contribution; second a fleet unit on the Pacific; or, third, a navy such as the late government proposed to build. If further information is required the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen) can get it by simply sending a cablegram to the Foreign Office, or other proper quarters in England. But, Sir, it may be that our friend and late colleague, Hon. Senator George Taylor, former member for Leeds in this House, let the cat out of the bag when he was discussing, with remarkable candour, before his former constituents the political huckstering that had gone on between himself and the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. W. T. White) to obtain a seat for the last hon. gentleman in the county of Leeds. In the course of that explanation he told the people of that county that the Prime Minister had informed him that he would not be losing much by giving up his seat in this House and going to the Senate because there were only going to be two sessions of this parliament anyway. Well, if that be a fact, and I have no reason to doubt it, it looks very much as if this government were trying to shelve this navy question until after the next general election, in the hope that they may obtain another favourable verdict under false pretences. Or is it, Sir, that they are like the boa constrictor, there has been so much swallowing that they must go into a long sleep to work off the effect?

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) in his magnificent speech last week, said and truly said, that this amendment involves the personal honour of the ministry. So it does, Sir. But possibly the hon. member for Red Deer did not know the full extent to which the personal honour of the ministry is involved when he made that statement. Mr. Speaker, the government has not only trifled with this parliament, but it has trifled with His Majesty the King, and with His Royal Highness the Governor General as well. In one breath this government tells the Nationalists that there will be no navy, and in almost the same breath they assure His Majesty and His Royal Highness the Governor General that there will be a navy. In the 'Canada Gazette' of November 11, 1911, there appears this announcement:

Department of the Naval Service.

His Majesty the King has been graciously pleased to approve of the naval forces of Canada receiving the style of the 'Royal Canadian Navy,' and of the ships of war of that navy being designated as 'His Majesty's Canadian Ships.'

G. J. DESBARATS,
Deputy Minister of the Naval Service.

If there are to be no ships, if there is to be no navy, did not the ministers, as loyal and honourable men, owe it to His Majesty to tell him so, instead of leading him to believe that we should have both by publishing this announcement of his royal pleasure? But that is not all. Just as these ministers have trifled with His Majesty, so they have trifled with His Majesty's representative, the Governor General of this country. The same number of the 'Canada Gazette' contains the following:

At the Government House at Ottawa,
Wednesday, the 18th day of Oct., 1911.
Present:
His Royal Highness in Council.

His Royal Highness is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered as follows:—

The regulations for the entry of naval cadets for the naval service, which provide that candidates shall be between fourteen and sixteen years of age on the 1st January immediately following the examination, are hereby suspended as regards the examination for naval cadets which is to be held in November, 1911, and it is hereby provided that candidates who are not more than seventeen years of age on 1st January, 1912, may compete at such examination, such alteration in age being applicable to this particular examination only.

RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Now, if we are to build no ships, and have no navy, as the Nationalist wing of this coalition government desire, why was the Governor General given the assurance that we should have both by the terms of this

order in council when it was presented to His Royal Highness by this government for his signature? What, in terms, is that order in council but an intimation that the naval programme of the late government is being carried on by the present coalition ministry.

Nor is that all. While assuring a section of their followers that there will be no navy this government is advertising for all kinds of supplies for the navy.

Tenders are coming in, these in due course will be accepted by order in council, and as each order in council is presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General for his signature, that will be a further assurance that the naval programme of the late government is to proceed. Surely, Sir, the ministers owe it to His Royal Highness to inform him if that is not to be the case. But, as my hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) said a few days ago, what kind of treatment can the Governor General of this country expect from the hands of men who are the political heirs of the men who stoned a Governor General through the streets of Montreal? If this amendment and the debate upon it serve no other purpose than to place hon. gentlemen opposite in their true light before the people of this country, that alone would justify the vote which I intend to give in support of the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

YEAS.

Messieurs

Bickerdike,	Macdonald,
Boivin,	Maclean (Halifax),
Bourassa,	MacNutt,
Boyer,	McCraney,
Brouillard,	McCoig,
Brown,	McCrea,
Buchanan,	McKenzie,
Cardin,	McLean (Sunbury),
Carroll,	McMillan,
Carvell,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Cash,	Marcile (Bagot),
Champagne,	Martin (Montreal,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Ste. Mary's),
Clark (Red Deer),	Martin (Regina),
Clarke (Essex),	Michaud,
Cruise,	Molloy,
Delisle,	Murphy,
Demers,	Nesbitt,
Devlin,	Neely,
Douglas,	Oliver,
Emmerson,	Pacaud,
Ethier,	Papineau,
Fortier,	Pardee,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Power,
Gordon,	Proulx,
Guthrie,	Pugsley,
Kay,	Reid (Restigouche),
Knowles,	Richards,
Kyte,	Robb,
Lachance,	Ross,
Lafortune,	Seguin,
Lanctot,	Sinclair,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Thompson (Qu'Appelle),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tobin,
Law,	Turgeon,
Lemieux,	Verville,
Loggie,	Warnock,
Lovell,	White (Victoria, Alta.) and
Low,	Wilson (Laval).—77.

NAYS.

Messieurs

Achim,	Lamarche,
Aikins,	Lancaster,
Alguire,	Lavallée,
Ames,	Lennox,
Armstrong (Lambton),	L'Esperance,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Lewis,
Arthurs,	Macdonell,
Baker,	McCurdy,
Ball,	McKay,
Barker,	McLean (Queen's
Barnard,	P. E. I.),
Barrette,	Meighen,
Beattie,	Merner,
Bellemare,	Mondou,
Bennett (Calgary),	Monk,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Morphy,
Best,	Munson,
Blain,	Nantel,
Blondin,	Nicholson,
Borden,	Nickle,
Boulay,	Northrup,
Bowman,	Osler,
Boyce,	Paquet,
Brabazon,	Paul,
Bradbury,	Pelletier,
Broder,	Perley,
Burnham,	Porter,
Burrell,	Rainville,
Chabot,	Reid (Grenville),
Clare,	Rhodes,
Clark (Bruce),	Robidoux,
Clarke (Wellington),	Roche,
Clements,	Rogers,
Cochrane,	Schaffner,
Cockshutt,	Sevigny,
Coderre,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Cromwell,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Crothers,	Shepherd,
Currie,	Smith,
Davidson,	Smyth,
Doherty,	Stanfield,
Donnelly,	Staples,
Elliott,	Steele,
Elson,	Stevens,
Fisher,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Foster (King's, N. S.)	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Sutherland,
Fowler,	Taylor,
Fripp,	Thoburn,
Gauthier (Gaspé),	Thornton,
Goodeve,	Tremain,
Guilbault,	Walker,
Haggart,	Wallace,
Hartt,	Webster,
Hazen,	Weichel,
Henderson,	White (Leeds),
Hepburn,	White (Renfrew),
Hughes (Victoria),	Wilcox,
Jameson,	Wilson
Kemp,	(Wentworth), and
Kidd,	Wright.—121.
Lalor,	

PAIRS.

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Bristol,	Charlton.
Carrick,	Lapointe (St. James, Montreal),
Crocket,	Turriff,
Edwards,	Bureau,
Forget,	Gauvreau,
Marshall,	Chisholm (Antigonish),
Middlebro,	Béland,
Sexsmith,	German,
Maclean (York).	Hughes (King's, P.E.I.)

Amendment negatived.

Motion Mr. Bennett (Calgary) agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the Honourable the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE HOUSE.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That Pierre Edouard Blondin, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Champlain, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). Mr. Speaker, before this motion is carried I desire to say a few words upon it. It has been the pride of the Conservative party as long as I can remember, that they have always declared themselves, par excellence, the party of loyalty——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PARDEE. My hon. friends say, 'hear, hear,' I would like to hear as many 'hear, hears' when I have finished. They have always declared that to the people of this country, and although we on this side have not paraded our loyalty to the same extent as the members on that side of the House, the members of the Reform party in Ontario and of the Dominion of Canada, are equally as loyal as the Conservative party ever was or ever will be. The Conservative cry of loyalty has almost become a tradition. Not long ago another party arose in this country, a party which, so far as I can see, has for its aim and object, not the binding together of the British Empire but rather the tearing asunder of that empire—that party is known as the Nationalist party. As I have said I cannot see wherein its aims will be for the good of this country or of themselves or the British Empire. That is my idea, plainly spoken, of the Nationalist party.

Mr. MURPHY

The hon. member who has been proposed by the Prime Minister and the government as deputy speaker of this House is an avowed member of that party. He belongs, as I understand, to the Nationalist party. The post of Deputy Speaker of this House is an important one; its occupant may become the mouthpiece of the House in your place, his functions in this house are most important and on appointment he becomes the second commoner in the land or on occasion may become the first commoner. Under those circumstances it does appear to me that the government should have suggested some one whose loyalty to the mother land as shown in his acts and in his speeches, was absolutely and entirely unquestioned, one who stood first, last and all the time for the solidarity of the British Empire and I am free to say that the hon. gentleman whose name has been proposed does not possess these attributes.

In order to substantiate the position taken by members on this side of the House, I shall read from some of the utterances of that hon. gentleman. My first extract is from 'L'Evénement,' one of the leading Nationalist papers in Quebec. In this connection let me say that even such a sturdy Tory newspaper as the Quebec 'Chronicle,' one of the backbones of the Conservative press in the province of Quebec, editorially has declared that it cuts itself free from the Nationalist party and will have no more of them. I quote from 'L'Evénement,' of November 3, 1910, from a report of a speech said to have been made by the hon. member for Champlain. After giving certain information regarding the then premier of this country, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, it goes on to say:

Messrs. Lavergne and Blondin delivered speeches of a very high order.

Blondin—Canada owes nothing to England declared Mr. Blondin. The English did not conquer us for love nor to plant the cross of Christ as did France, and we are kept under her flag for the advantage of the trade. She benefited by her colony of Canada. What do we owe her?

Those are his words as reported in the Nationalist organ of the province of Quebec, the organ supporting the party to which the hon. gentleman proposed as Deputy Speaker of this House, belongs.

Then, Sir, we have something further, some remarks made by the same hon. gentleman at a meeting at which he spoke, I think in Victoriaville in Quebec, on the 22nd day of November last. In that speech he used these words, and I am quoting from 'Hansard' at page 146 of the session of 1910-11:

The only liberties which we enjoy have been snatched. England has not conquered Canada for love or to plant the cross of Christ as did France, but to establish trading posts and make money, She has sowed the world

with hatred, quarrels and wars. We have had enough of England and the English.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend if he is reading that as an extract from 'Hansard' from a speech made by an hon. member in this House, or if it is an extract from a paper which he finds in 'Hansard'?

Mr. PARDEE. I am quoting it from a speech made by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PARDEE. Perhaps hon. gentlemen will wait—(reading)

Mr. BLONDIN. I did not say the—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PARDEE. Hear, hear, the hon. gentleman says. Let him listen to the rest of it. I read:

I did not say the first phrase.

He never denied saying that he had had enough of England and the English.

Mr. BLONDIN. I deny it.

Mr. PARDEE. The hon. gentleman at that time did not deny it. I read:

Mr. BLONDIN. I did not say the first phrase, and I think Mr. Beland will deny it also.

Mr. BELAND. I may say that I was present at that last meeting, and I remember exactly the words pronounced by the hon. member for Champlain, and as far as I can remember, that is an exact reproduction of his speech.

Mr. BLONDIN. I do not deny that that was said, but it was not said by me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PARDEE—(reading):

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, it is very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. After all, the Prime Minister was perfectly justified yesterday in saying that a victory won by such means was disastrous—

Referring to the Arthabaska election.

——disastrous to the Conservative party, and to-day they are ashamed of the work they have done.

Mr. BLONDIN. I am not ashamed. I will repeat them to you to-morrow.

It does seem to me, therefore, that taking into consideration the questions that were raised incidentally—if it pleases members on the other side to put it that way—to the economic discussion of reciprocity, if there was one thing above another we did hear in Ontario it was the appeal of John V. Borne who has gone to his reward, the appeal to the British-born, and the appeal to the loyalty of the people of Ontario. In view of all that has gone before, it does appear to be most extraordinary that this government which is constantly proclaiming the loyalty of its supporters from the housetops should propose for the office of Deputy Speaker a man who has said that we have had enough of England and the English. What does that mean when you come to analyse the expression—

Mr. BLONDIN. I deny that I used such language.

Mr. PARDEE. Is there a man in this House on either side—

Some hon MEMBERS. Order, take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. I draw the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) to the fact that it has been emphatically denied by the hon. member (Mr. Blondin) that he used that language, and the rules require that the hon. member for Lambton shall accept the statement of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin).

Mr. PARDEE. I should like to ask why it is—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. PARDEE. I want to ask the House how it is that the hon. member at this epoch denies it when he did not deny it a year ago?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, take it back.

Mr BLONDIN. If the hon. gentleman makes proper inquiry he will find that I have already denied that I used these very words.

Mr. PARDEE. Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling, if you rule I must withdraw these words. But, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blondin) deny that he belongs to the Nationalist party headed by Henri Bourassa. He says no; he admits he belongs to that party. I say to this House and to this country that a man who could join that party and who stands to-day for the precepts and the principles of the Nationalist party of Quebec is not a man worthy to fill the office of Deputy Speaker. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blondin) may not have used these words; well and good; but, Sir, I do say that whether he said them or whether he did not say them—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Pardee) is an old member of parliament, and he knows the rule that it is not permissible, after a denial is made by an hon. member, to suggest by any other argument that the denial is not correct. The denial of an hon. member must be accepted unconditionally.

Mr. PARDEE. Very well, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say that so far as I under-

stand the platform and principles of the Nationalist party as laid down in the province of Quebec and in part of the province of Ontario during the last campaign, it does not appear to me that a gentleman owning allegiance to that party is a fit and proper person to be the second commoner of Canada. There are many men on the government side who might have filled this position with dignity and credit, and I do therefore submit that it was the duty of the government and the Prime Minister to take into consideration certain features of the political history that was written during the last campaign. I commend this appointment to the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, speaking at a banquet in New York the other night, speaking in the camp of the enemy, boldly declared, and I admire him for it: 'English I will be to the crack of doom.' I commend the appointment of Mr. Blondin to the members in this House from the loyal city of Toronto; I commend it to all those who have the best interests of the Dominion at heart. Speaking for myself, speaking I believe for the men on this side of the House, and speaking for the Liberal electorate throughout the Dominion I say it is not such an appointment as under the circumstances I have pointed out will meet with the approval of the people.

Mr. THOMAS BEATTIE (London). It seems to make a great difference, Mr. Speaker, as to which side of the House one may be sitting on. There is no member of this House for whom I have a higher regard than my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee), but I must remind him that when Mr. M. Y. McLean, then member for South Huron, who was supporting in this House the Liberal government and sitting with my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee), rose and stated here that we owed England nothing, my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee) never opened his mouth to object. Mr. M. Y. McLean was defeated last election, and I do not think he will ever come into this House again.

Hon. R L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). The observations of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee) are very much along the line with which we have been favoured by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side ever since this session opened. They seem to be characterized by a desire to raise section against section and race against race. If that is not the meaning of this demonstration I do not know what meaning it has, because by the time my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) resumed his seat, he was obliged to take back practically everything he had said that was relevant to his contention.

And my hon. friend, who made these observations, has been sitting in parliament

—and he knows it—behind a man who uttered the very words which he regards as criminal coming, if they did come, from the mouth of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin). I quoted those very words to Sir Richard Cartwright across the floor of this House, and he admitted having uttered them, namely, that Canada owed nothing to Great Britain except Christian forgiveness for all the injuries the mother country had wrought upon us. Yet my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee), who has made these reflections on the hon. member for Champlain, sat as a humble follower eight years in this House behind Sir Richard Cartwright without ever having had his equanimity disturbed for a moment. Under the circumstances, I think we can take the utterances of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pardee) for what they are worth. They will have no more effect than has had a great deal of what has come from hon. gentlemen opposite. We are not to be moved by these sectional appeals. We are here for the purpose of endeavouring to carry on the business of the country in a reasonable efficient and honest manner, and hon. gentlemen opposite have, since the opening of this session been endeavouring to distract attention from the real business of parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN. They have been doing so by reading from day to day scraps of newspapers and going back to the pages of 'Hansard' some ten or fifteen years ago, and the best part of their speeches is to be found in their quotations from hon. members on this side.

My hon. friend has not favoured us with the observations of another one of his leaders. Why does he not enlighten the House with regard to the opinions and observations of the late Minister of Labour (Mr. King) which have been quoted in this House. Perhaps he would favour us with his comment on them now? My hon. friend does not see fit to do so. I would suggest to him in all sincerity, that it might be well, indeed, for him had he given some consideration to those utterances and many others, that I have in my mind and which I might quote to-day if my hon. friend desires to go into history of this kind.

My hon. friend the member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) has denied every material allegation made by the hon. gentleman, and the attention of the mover of this resolution had to be called to that denial before he was willing to bring it to the attention of the House. My hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Blondin) has perhaps been fervent sometimes in his utterances on the public platform, but I would like to tell the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) that men have risen

to very high positions, indeed, in this country in the ranks of the Liberal party, and occupy them now, whose utterances might be quoted this afternoon as deserving the denunciations of my hon. friend—if these denunciations were sincere, as I am bound to believe they were—even to a greater extent than those which he gave us only a few minutes ago. I do not think it is in the true interest of the people of this country that appeals should be made such as those we have just heard from the hon. member for Lambton. He has charged the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) with disloyalty. Let me tell him that I believe my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Blondin) is as loyal a man as he is himself.

An hon. MEMBER. Prove it.

Mr. BORDEN. He is ready to prove it whenever called upon to do so. I do not desire to take up the time of parliament, though I could indulge in very interesting reminiscences, and if this warfare be persisted in by hon. gentlemen opposite, they will find that we are able to take our full share.

I can only say in conclusion that inasmuch as my hon. friend from Lambton has been obliged to withdraw everything he said pertinent to the resolution. I would ask the House to accept this motion, and by its vote to record its view that my hon. friend from Champlain is worthy of the high position the House now proposes to confer upon him.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

That this House will on Thursday next resolve itself into committee to consider the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. WHITE moved:

That this House will on Thursday next resolve itself into committee to consider the ways and means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS—ESTIMATES FOR 1911-12.

Mr. WHITE delivered a message from His Royal Highness the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

ARTHUR,

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 31st March 1912; and in accordance with the provision of the British North America Act of 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 29th Nov., 1911.

On motion of Mr. White the message of His Royal Highness, together with the estimates was referred to the Committee of Supply.

QUESTIONS.

(Question answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

QUEBEC CABINET MINISTERS.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is the government aware that at the nomination meeting at Lachine on October 27 last Hon. F. D. Monk stated that the Prime Minister had allowed him to select his cabinet colleagues from the province of Quebec?

2. Was any Ontario minister accorded a similar privilege by the Prime Minister? If not, why was an exception made in the case of Hon. F. D. Monk?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.

2. Answered by the answer to No. 1.

REFERENDUM ON THE NAVY QUESTION.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Did the Prime Minister promise a referendum on the navy question, as alleged by the Postmaster General and Armand Lavergne, M.L.A., at the nomination meeting in Quebec county on the 27th of October last?

2. If not, what promise or undertaking with regard to the navy was given by the Prime Minister to the Postmaster General or to Mr. Lavergne prior to the date of the said meeting?

Mr. BORDEN. This question, I submit, is irregular in form, inasmuch as it contains an allegation of fact. If the hon. gentleman will strike out the allegation of fact, I am ready to answer it.

Mr. MURPHY. If that allegation may be considered as struck out, I shall be glad to have the answer.

Mr. BORDEN. The Prime Minister has made no promise on the navy question, except those which are to be found in his public utterances.

THE CANADIAN NAVY.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government accepted any of the tenders submitted for the construction of His Majesty's Canadian ships? If not, does the Government intend to accept any of the said tenders?

2. How many of the deposits made in connection with the said tenders are still in the hands of the government, and what is the amount of each?

3. Is it the intention of the government to return the said deposits and when?

4. Will the government pay interest on all the said deposits?

Mr. HAZEN :

1. No.

2, 3 and 4. All the deposits made in connection with the said tenders have been returned.

MR. ARTHUR HAWKES.

Mr. MURPHY :

1. To what position in the Immigration Branch has Mr. Arthur Hawkes, alias 'John V. Borne', been appointed!

2. When was the said position created?

3. What are his duties, and what remuneration is he to receive?

4. What previous experience had he in the work which has been assigned to him, and what was the nature and length of such experience?

5. In what work and by whom was Mr. Hawkes engaged at the time of his appointment by the government?

6. What was the amount of his monthly salary immediately prior to his appointment?

7. Was he the author of the pamphlets and articles addressed to the British-born, distributed by members of the government and by other members of the Conservative party during the recent general election?

8. How long has Mr. Hawkes lived in Canada?

Mr. ROGERS :

1. Mr. Hawkes has been engaged to visit the different provincial governments and ascertain their views in regard to immigration work, with a view to co-operation.

2. Date of engagement, November 13, 1911.

3. See answer to 1, as to duties. Mr. Hawkes is to be paid $250 per month, and expenses.

4. The work assigned to him is new work, in which, therefore, he has had no previous experience.

5. The government has no information as to this.

6. The government has no information as to this.

7. The government has no knowledge as to this.

8. Mr. Hawkes has lived many years in Canada.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. MURPHY :

1. Is it the intention of the government to implement the promise made by the present Minister of Labour and other government supporters in the province of Ontario during the recent election campaign, to the effect that if the Conservative party were returned to power all those who lost money through the failure of the Farmers' Bank would be reimbursed by the government?

2. In the event of such reimbursement by the government, will the amount to be paid cover any loss sustained in the transaction set forth in the Toronto 'Globe' of August 26th, 1911, as follows:

That in or about the month of June, 1908, the manager of the Toronto 'World, of which paper W. F. Maclean, Conservative member for South York, is chief owner, made an arrangement with W. R. Travers, manager of the Farmers' Bank, to solicit deposits for the Farmers' Bank, which, it is now claimed by the 'News' and other Conservative organs, was rotten from its inception.

That in return Travers agreed to loan funds of the bank to the Toronto 'World'.

That in pursuance of this understanding the manager of the Toronto 'World' procured by the exercise of influence over Col. Matheson, the Provincial Treasurer, an increase in the deposit of the province of Ontario in the Farmers' Bank from $10,000 to $35,000.

That contemporaneously with the increase of the deposit of the province of Ontario to $35,000, Travers, for the bank, loaned Dr. Beattie Nesbitt $25,000 and the Toronto 'World' $10,000, and wrote a letter to Col. Matheson, informing him that these loans had been made, a copy of which letter is now, or was recently, on file amongst the papers of the Farmers' Bank.

That Col. Matheson denies the receipt of this letter.

That with the $25,000 thus obtained Dr. Beattie Nesbitt was enabled to pay the first instalment of the purchase price of the Keeley Mine, the speculation which finally wrecked the bank and drove Nesbitt out of the country—a fugitive from justice.

Mr. BORDEN. This question will have to be remodelled. It is subject to the same objection as the other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the objection ?

Mr. BORDEN. The objection is that it contains the allegation of fact, that the present Minister of Labour and other government supporters made certain statements.

Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Has the government the intention of reimbursing the depositors of the Farmers' Bank?

2. Has any such promise been made by members of the present government during the last electoral campaign?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. The matter has not been under consideration by the government.

2. No.

LA BANQUE DE ST. HYACINTHE AND LA BANQUE ST. JEAN.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the government the intention of reimbursing the depositors of La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque de St. Jean.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The matter has not been under consideration by the government.

A UNIFORM DOMINION MARRIAGE LAW.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex) :

1. Has the government or any of its members received any petition or request asking

that an Act be passed by the parliament of Canada prescribing a uniform marriage law for the Dominion?

2. What action does the government intend to take upon such question?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. No.

2. Question has not been considered.

A PERMANENT TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. NEELY:

1 Will the government appoint a permanent Tariff Commission?

2. If so, will the labour and the farming interests be allowed to nominate a majority of the representatives on such a commission?

Mr. BORDEN. Authority from parliament will be necessary and a measure will be introduced accordingly.

GOVERNMENT BOUNTIES.

Mr. NEELY:

1. Does the government intend to renew the bounty on steel rods? If so, what will be the terms of such renewal?

2. What is the policy of the government with regard to bounties in general?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. The matter has not been considered by the government.

2. It is not the practice to make such announcements in advance of the budget speech.

THE COMPANIES ACT.

Mr. MURPHY:

Is it the intention of the government to reintroduce at the present session the Act amending the Companies Act, which stood among the Government Bills not disposed of at the last Session of Parliament?

Mr. ROCHE. The question is under consideration.

THE INCORPORATION OF COMPANIES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the government or any of its members, given the Ontario government, or any of its members, or any person acting in its behalf, any promise or intimation that the case now before the Supreme Court of Canada to determine the respective jurisdictions of the Dominion and the provinces with regard to the incorporation of companies will be withdrawn?

2. Is it the intention of the government to press for a speedy determination of the issues raised in the said case?

3. If not, what is the policy of the government with regard to Dominion jurisdiction in the matter of company incorporation?

Mr. DOHERTY :

1. No.

2. The case is now before the courts on the question of jurisdiction of the court upon the reference made and is proceeding in the usual course.

3. The government await the decision of the court upon the question of jurisdiction of the court upon the said reference.

SUSPENDED PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What are the names and locations of the public works on which operations were suspended by order of the Minister of Public Works, and why were such orders issued?

2. Has the Minister of Public Works, or any official of the government, been notified of any claim or claims against the government arising out of such suspension of operations?

Mr. MONK:

Contract works—

1a St. Joseph, N.S.
French River, N.S.
Lake Ainslie, N.S.
Meat Cove, N.S.
Long Point, N. S.
Castalia, N.B.
West Advocate, N.S.
Wheatley, Ontario.
Port Stanley, Ontario.
(a) Thornbury, Ontario.
Thessalon, Ontario.
Red Bay, Ontario.
Richibucto South, N.B.
Feltzen, South, N.S.
Owen Sound, Ontario.
Kelly's Cove, N.S.
Surf Inlet, B.C.
Prince Rupert, Digby Island, B.C.
Naufrage Pond, P.E.I.
Wood's Island, P.E.I.
Grand River South, P.E.I.
Gordon's Point, P.E.I.
Rimouski, Quebec.
River L'Achigan, Quebec.
North Bay, Ontario.
Norway Bay, Quebec.
Fort William, Quebec.
(a) Kingston, Ontario.

Public buildings under contract—

(a) Peterborough lighting, F. R. J. McPherson Co.
Lunenburg fittings, Boehmer Bros., West La Have.
Chesley public building, H. Prast, Hanover.
Moncton fittings, P. N. Leblanc.
Battleford wiring, Northwest Electric, Ltd., Regina.
Melfort public building, J. McDiarmid Co., Winnipeg.
Chilliwack public building, E. Hunt, Victoria.
Weyburn, Navin Bros., Moosejaw.
(a) Moosejaw, J. McDiarmid Co., Winnipeg.

Places marked with an (a) have since been authorized.

DAY LABOUR.

Halifax County, N.S.:—

Works actually in progress and stopped—
East Chezzetcook (breakwater).

Fox Island (extension to protection works)
Port Dufferin (wharf repairs).
Smiley's Point (breakwater).
Three Fathoms Harbour (breakwater repairs).
West Chezzetcook (breakwater pier).
Herring Cove (wharf).
Musquodoboit (wharf).
Sober Island (wharf).
East Chezzetcook (wharf repairs).
West Chezzetcook (breakwater repairs).
Sambro (wharf).
Sheet Harbour (wharf repairs).
Tangier (wharf repairs).
Watt Settlement (wharf).

NORTH CAPE BRETON AND VICTORIA COUNTIES, N. S

Works actually in progress and stopped—
Amaguadees Pond (wharf).
East Bay (wharf).
Gillis Point (wharf).
Nyanza (wharf repairs).
South Cove (wharf).
Upper Washabuck (wharf).
Baddeck (warehouse).
Breton Cove (protection works repairs).
Freight sheds on public wharfs.
Neil's Harbour (breakwater repairs).
Point Wolfe, Albert County, N. B. (harbour protection works).
L'Assomption, l'Assomption County, Quebec.
River La Guerre, Huntingdon County, Quebec.

Works where all the preliminary arrangements had been made but no actual work had been started—
Grove Point (wharf).
Bay St. Lawrence (breakwater).
New Haven (wharf extension).
Iona (wharf repairs). Foreman appointed but no returns yet received.

1b. To enable the hon. the minister to inquire into the necessity for the work in each instance.

2. No.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What are the names and locations of the public works on which operations were suspended by order of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and why were such orders issued?

2. Has the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any official of the government, been notified of any claim or claims against the government arising out of such suspension of operations?

Mr COCHRANE:

1. Intercolonial Railway—
Dartmouth to Deans—branch line. Contractor M. P. & J. T. Davis, Ottawa.
Guysborough to Country Harbour—branch line. Contractor, Nova Scotia Construction Co., Sydney, N.S.
Stone Passenger Station at Truro. Contractor, Frank W. Wilson, Truro.
Halifax Terminal Improvements—reinforced concrete pier and shed. Contractor, Nova Scotia Construction Co., Sydney, N.S.
Delivery of 7,000 tons of steel rails. Dominion Iron & Steel Co., Sydney, N. S.

Prince Edward Island Railway—
Freight shed and extension of wharf at Summerside. M. F. Schurman & Co., Ltd., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Branch line from O'Leary to West Point. Thomas Campbell, Charlottetown.

Hudson Bay Railway—
From Pas Mission to Thicket Portage. Contractor, J. D. McArthur, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Quebec Bridge—
Removal of unused material. Contractor, Dominion Steel Co.

Transcontinental Railway—
Station buildings at Transcona and Redditt. Contractor, J. J. Vopni.
Buildings on sections 10, 11 and 12, districts 'D' and 'F.' Contractor, John King.
Trainmen's houses at Edmunston, N.B. Contractor, Lyons & White.
Three trainmen's houses at Laurier, Ste. Foye and Fitzpatrick. Contractors, A. Guerard, Gignac and Marier.
Three trainmen's houses at Graham, Redditt and Transcona. Contractor, John King.
Car shops at Transcona. Contractors, Haney, Quinlan & Robertson.
Terminal Station at Quebec. Joseph Gosselin, contractor.
Delivery of 2.000 tons steel rails. Dominion Iron & Steel Co.

Canals—
Improvements—St. Peter's Canal. Contractor, W. H. Weller.
Substructure of Bascule Bridge at St. Pierre aux Liens (Rockfield) Lachine Canal. Contractors, Haney, Quinlan, & Robertson.

The works were held up in order to enable the Minister to look into these matters.

2. The Department has no information of any claim or claims, against the government, arising out of such suspension of operations.

PETEWAWA PUBLIC WHARF.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. How many tenders were received for the improvement of the public wharf at Petewawa, North Renfrew county?

2. To whom was the contract awarded, and what was the amount thereof?

Mr. MONK. No tenders received.

THE HEADQUARTERS STORE BUILDING, OTTAWA.

Mr. MURPHY:

Who is the lowest tenderer for the construction and installation of racks in the Head-

quarters Store Building, Ottawa, and what is the amount of his tender?

Mr. MONK. If any racks have been installed lately in the Military Stores Building, the work was not done by the Department of Public Works. It may have been done by the Militia Department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. John Lowery, Ottawa, was the lowest tenderer, and the amount of his tender is $1,380.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. MURPHY:

Is it the intention of the government to extend the principle of competitive examination to all branches of the civil service? If so, when?

Mr. BORDEN. The government intends to carry out the extension of Civil Service reform which was submitted as part of its policy to the people at the recent general election.

AIRSHIPS FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Minister of Militia reached a decision as to the purchase of airships for military purposes?

2. If so, will such decision be communciated to parliament before any purchase is made?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The matter has never been proposed for consideration.

ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is it the intention of the government to acquire additional land at or near Rockcliffe Rifle Range?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This matter is under consideration.

THE INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS COMMISSION.

Mr. MURPHY:

Were the appointments made by the late government to the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission ratified by the Imperial government?

Mr. BORDEN. No.

THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. MURPHY:

What duties have been assigned to the new chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission in addition to those performed by Hon. S. N. Parent, the late chairman of the commission?

Mr. COCHRANE. The duties assigned to the new chairman of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, are those defined out in the Act of Parliament, 3rd Edward VII, chap. 71, governing such appointment; no special duties have been assigned by order in council authorizing the appointment in question.

REGIMENTS OF FOREIGN-BORN CITIZENS.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Does the Minister of Militia intend to organize regiments composed of the foreign-born citizens of Canada?

2. If so, will the command of such regiments be entrusted to foreign-born or to British-born residents?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1. Nothing has been presented officially to the department on this subject. From the inception of the Canadian militia force, citizens of other than British origin have been enrolled therein and have proved themselves to be splendid British soldiers.

2. Answered by No. 1.

THE PRIME MINISTER AT QUEBEC.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. Did the Prime Minister visit certain ecclesiastical dignitaries in the city of Quebec, as stated in the following item published by the Conservative paper 'L'Evenément' on October 14, 1911:—

The Hon. Mr. Borden at the Archbishopric.

The Hon. Mr. Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, profited by his first visit to Quebec since his advent to power by going yesterday to present his homages to His Grace Mgr. Begin, Archbishop of Quebec, and to their lordships the bishops of Eleutheropolis and of Regina.

2. If the statement of 'L'Evenément' is correct, was the government's policy with regard to the navy, the Manitoba school question, or the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba discussed at the interview in question?

Mr. BORDEN. The Prime Minister while at Quebec on the occasion mentioned called upon the Right Reverend A. Hunter Dunn, D.D., Anglican bishop of Quebec and upon the other dignitaries mentioned, but did not find any of them at home. He did not on that occasion, or on any other occasion, discuss with either of them the government's policy respecting the matters mentioned or respecting any other matters.

MANITOBA QUESTIONS.

Mr. NESBITT:

1. Has the Prime Minister, or any member of the government, discussed with His Grace Archbishop Langevin the Manitoba School Question, or the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba?

2. Did any such discussion take place with any member of the government during the recent visit to Ottawa of His Grace, Archbishop Langevin?

3. When will the government announce its policy with regard to the Manitoba School Question and the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.

2. No.

3. Parliament and the country were assured more than fourteen years ago by the present leader of the opposition, then leader

of the government, that the Manitoba School Question had been settled.

The extension of the boundaries of Manitoba has been under consieration and a basis of settlement has been reached respecting the financial terms which have hitherto been in dispute. That basis adopts the principle of equality of treatment as between Manitoba and the other prairie provinces. The application of this principle to the details is being worked out.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe):

How many bushels of grain during the year 1910 were shipped from Montreal, Quebec, St. John, N.B., and Halifax, and what were the different kinds and qualities of each?

Mr. FOSTER. This is best answered by the following statement covering exports, which approximates very closely the shipments.

STATEMENT showing the Exports of Canadian Grain from the undermentioned ports for the Calendar year 1910.

—	Montreal.	Quebec.	St. John, N.B.	Halifax.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
Barley	525,138	.....	225,261	47
Beans	88	.....	105	1,531
Buckwheat	115,920	.....	60,325	
Corn	1,474	.....	704	658
Oats	3,430,956	.....	510,271	131,649
Pease, whole	37,918	.....	11,280	12,512
" split	4,289	.....	7,125	77,559
Rye	.....	.....	.....	
Wheat	16,537,149	.....	6,794,146	185,006
Other grain	.....	.....	424	
Total	20,652,932	.....	7,609,642	408,962

Mr. REID (Grenville):

THE quantity and value of Grain exported from the above mentioned ports during the Fiscal Year ended March 31st, 1910, was as follows:—

—	CANADIAN PRODUCE.		FOREIGN PRODUCE.	
	Bushels.	Value.	Bushels.	Value.
MONTREAL.		$		$
Barley	593,685	266,759	8,500	6,800
Beans	703	1,456	.....	.....
Buckwheat	192,282	116,421	.....	.....
Indian corn	289	225	489,269	367,972
Oats	521,237	267,882	.....	.....
Pease, whole	60,056	78,059	.....	.....
Pease, split	30,996	35,665	.....	.....
Rye	.....	.....	51,293	46,163
Wheat	14,140,685	15,155,002	10,689,903	11,228,436
Total	15,539,933	16,018,469	11,238,965	11,649,371
ST. JOHN, N.B.				
Barley	268,989	165,688	.....	.....
Beans	577	562	.....	.....
Buckwheat	38,740	34,659	.....	.....
Indian corn	803	866	.....	.....
Oats	278,366	142,813	.....	.....
Pease, whole	15,719	22,897	.....	.....
Pease, split	4,456	7,018	.....	.....
Wheat	7,428,459	9,279,296	.....	.....
Other grain	424	431	.....	.....
Total	8,036,533	9,654,230	.....	.....

THE quantity and value of Grain exported from the above mentioned ports during the Fiscal Year ended March 31st, 1910—*Concluded.*

	Canadian Produce.		Foreign Produce.	
	Bushels.	Value.	Bushels.	Value.
Halifax.		$		$
Barley	43	59		
Beans	918	1,530	1,067	1,727
Indian corn	1,429	633		
Oats	175,167	86,756	3,616	2,423
Pease, whole	2,236	2,472		
Pease, split	55,895	69,972		
Wheat	289,674	289,803		
Total	525,362	451,225	4,683	4,150
Quebec.				
Nil	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.

THE quantity and value of Grain exported from the Ports of Montreal, St. John, N.B., Halifax and Quebec, during the Fiscal year ended March 31st., 1911, was as follows:—

Montreal.				
Barley	500,433	268,480		
Beans	88	181		
Buckwheat	123,184	67,241		
Indian corn	1,474	1,008	2,034,420	1,243,196
Oats	3,429,933	1,302,050	38,715	15,486
Pease, whole	37,818	53,257		
Pease, split	4,289	5,524		
Wheat	16,532,349	16,459,035	3,741,369	4,107,778
Total	20,629,568	18,156,776	5,814,504	5,366,460
St. John, N. B.				
Barley	191,373	132,655		
Beans	36	50		
Buckwheat	22,669	15,868		
Indian corn	17,422	10,495		
Oats	395,565	203,636		
Pease, whole	3,414	6,159		
Pease, split	7,350	10,784		
Wheat	6,099,820	6,651,107		
Total	6,737,649	7,030,754		
Halifax.				
Barley	58	68	1	1
Beans	2,322	3,454	2,250	3,293
Indian corn	386	289		
Oats	111,867	55,452		
Pease, whole	10,818	12,166		
Pease, split	81,176	96,582		
Wheat	243,987	214,598		
Total	450,614	382,609	2,251	3,294
Quebec.				
Pease, whole	100	100		

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe):

1. How many bushels of grain were shipped from Port Arthur and Fort William during the year 1910, and what were the quantities and kinds?

2. To what different points were the same shipped in Canada and the United States, and what were the quantities and kinds?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1 and 2. The following statement shows the quantities and kinds of grain shipped from Port Arthur and Fort William during the year 1910, and the points to which shipped in Canada and the United States. These figures are supplied from the Dominion Grain Inspection Department, the figures of the ports not being kept separate. The customs do not compile statistics of grain shipped from one port in Canada to another port in Canada.

STATEMENT of Grain shipped from Fort William and Port Arthur, 1910.

——	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Flax.	Rye.	Screenings.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Collingwood	718,780 20					
Depot Harbour	1,201,827 50	377,708 32				
Goderich	5,077,135 40	1,440,543 08	114,409 16	171,641 09		1,145 40
Kingston	7,798,218 20	3,903,397 21	390,437 18	62,702 42	1,586 34	
Montreal	6,562,783 40	4,054,742 23	367,939 37	151,758 46		
Midland	314,511 50	50,169 13				
Meaford	591,160 50	88,000 00				
Owen Sound	1,516,217 30	2,660,959 18	25,000 00			
Prescott	27,878 20	70,000 00		10,443 32		
Port Colborne	2,799,308 20	210,948 16	10,000 00			
Point Edward	1,759,752 20	731,932 04	44,001 08	75,015 39		
Port Stanley	124,693 20	50,612 00				
Tiffin	8,071,356 00	1,448,668 31	69,911 10			
Thorold	289,106 40					
Walkerville	314,811 50					
Hamilton	50,896 00					
Quebec		87,190 23				
Victoria Harbour	1,053,048 40	244,878 06				
Total	38,270,487 30	15,419,751 25	1,041,698 41	471,562 00	1,586 34	1,145 40
Buffalo	17,620,472 30	924,649 33	558,633 05	2,509,657 36		
Chicago				6,662 48		510,579 80
Duluth						75,833 10
Erie	251,885 00					
Port Huron	612,595 40			22,835 32		
Cleveland				80,000 00		
Total	18,484,953 10	924,649 33	558,633 05	2,619,156 04		586,412 90
Grand total	56,756,440 40	16,344,401 25	1,600,331 46	3,090,718 04	1,586 34	587,559 10

STATEMENT showing shipments of Grain from Fort William and Port Arthur for the Crop Year ended August 31, 1910, with destination of same.

Crop year ended Aug. 31, 1910.	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Flax.	Rye.	Total.
Canadian Ports—	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Total.
Owen Sound						
Midland	2,045,891	3,214,608	93,049			5,353,548
Tiffin	542,099	1,033,820	33,674			1,609,593
Collingwood	10,961,095	2,449,593	197,897			13,608,585
Depot Harbour	355,793	99,8×1	98,238			553,912
Point Edward	3,355,566	386,849				3,742,415
Port Stanley	1,842,432	941,161	149,923	75,230		3,008,746
Meaford	101,000	65,252				166,252
Goderich	919,593	198,886	81,884			1,200,363
Port Colborne	5,100,575	2,493,724	185,627			8,031,348
Thorold	2,409,602	555,521	44,692	251,422		3,009,815
Kingston	195,000					195,000
Prescott	7,548,280	4,029,396	487,880	92,648	2,736	12,160,940
Montreal	2,078	70,000				72,078
Walkerville	6,558,060	3,378,366	464,181	253,792		10,654,399
	254,410	206,210				460,620
Total	42,191,474	19,123,267	1,837,045	673,092	2,736	63,827,614
American ports—						
Port Huron	1,526,502		84,472			1,610,974
Erie	110,000		255,275	85,926		451,201
Chicago	321,168*					321,168*
Buffalo	18,967,162	977,685	408,642	2,271,223		22,624,712
Ogdensburg						
Duluth	9,472					9,472
Total	20,934,304	977,665	748,389	2,357,149		25,017,527
Grand total, shipments.	63,125,778	20,100,952	2,585,434	3,030,241	2,736	88,845,141

* Screenings to Chicago and Duluth.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. For the crop year ending August 31, 1910, 88,845,140 bushels. The kinds are given in answer to question No. 2. The qualities are not available.

2. The following statement supplies the information asked for.

VACANCY IN THE SENATE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is it the intention of the government in filling the vacancy in the Senate caused by the death of Hon. A. H. Comeau to recognize, as did the late government, the claims of the Acadian population of the maritime provinces?

Mr. BORDEN. This question is somewhat objectionable in form. If the hon. gentleman will strike out the allegation of fact, I am ready to answer it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What is the allegation?

Mr. BORDEN. 'As did the late government,' with these words struck out the answer is, the appointment is under consideration.

PRIZE AMERICAN WHEAT.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Agriculture been called to the success of Seager Wheeler, of Rosthern, Saskatchewan, at the land exhibition held recently in New York in winning the prize of $1,000 for the best 100 pounds of wheat grown on the continent of North America?

2. Is it the intention of the minister to recognize the event in any way?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. The Minister of Agriculture learned of Mr. Wheeler's success through the press.

2. The Minister of Agriculture has already recognized the event by writing Mr. Wheeler under date the 14th instant heartily congratulating him upon the great success achieved and the honour attained by him, which has reflected upon Canada as a whole.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH IN GUYSBOROUGH COUNTY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were the tenderers for the construction of the portion of the new branch of the Intercolonial railway from Sunny Brae to

Guysborough, between Guysborough and Country Harbour and Melrose?
2. What was the amount of each tender?
3. When was the contract awarded?
4. To whom was it awarded?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Nova Scotia Construction Co., Ltd., Sydney, N. S.; M. J. O'Brien, Renfrew; James H. Corbett, Moncton, N.B.; Kennedy & Macdonald, Antigonish, N.S.; S. Pearson & Son, New York, N.Y.; M. P. & J. T. Davis, Ottawa; McArthur Bros Co., Halifax, N.S.; John W. McManus, Co., Ltd., Memramcook, N.B.

2. Nova Scotia Construction Co., $1,057,-122.19; M. J. O'Brien, $1,165,189.17; James H. Corbett, $1,145,326.10; Kennedy & Macdonald, $1,085,470.86; S. Pearson & Son, $1,446,020.98; M. P. & J. T. Davis, $1,066,-695.40; McArthur Bros. Co., $1,272,614.76; John W. McManus Co., Ltd., $1,300,947.61. These accounts are based on schedule prices.

3. Contract was awarded by order in council dated 2nd October, 1911.

4. Nova Scotia Construction Co.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH LINES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were the tenderers for the construction of the addition to the Intercolonial railway, from Dartmouth to Denus Settlement?
2. What was the amount of each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?
4. When was it awarded?
5. Has the contract for same been signed?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. James H. Corbett, Moncton, N.B.; Kennedy & Macdonald, Antigonish, N.S.; M. P. & J. T. Davis, Ottawa; M. J. O'Brien, Renfrew, Ont.; McArthur Bros. Co., Halifax, N.S.; S. Pearson & Son, N.Y.; Willard Kitchen, Grand Falls, N.B.

2. James H. Corbett, $1,914,616.25; Kennedy & Macdonald, $1,976,675.41; M. P. & J. T. Davis, $1,740,277.93; M. J. O'Brien, $1,956,105.04; McArthur Bros. Co., $2,125,375.72; S. Pearson & Son, $2,507,-740.36; Willard Kitchen, $2,040,444.71 These amounts are based on schedule prices.

3. M. P. & J. T. Davis, Ottawa.

4. Awarded by order in council dated October 2, 1911.

5. No, contract has not been signed.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—INSPECTOR AT STELLARTON ROUNDHOUSE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Was R S. Falconer dismissed from the position of inspector of the addition to the roundhouse at Stellarton, Nova Scotia? If so, when was such dismissal made?
2. For what reasons and on whose recommendation was he dismissed?

Mr. MACDONALD.

3. If dismissed who was appointed in his place, and on whose recommendation was such successor appointed?
4. Did the minister take steps to inquire into the qualifications for the position of the new inspector? If so, what are they?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. R. S. Faulkner was temporarily employed as inspector on the addition to the roundhouse at Stellarton, and his services were dispensed with on November 4, 1911.
2. For offensive partisanship. It is not in the public interest to give the name of the person who recommended his retirement.
3. John Fraser, recommended by A. C. Bell.
4. Yes. Such qualifications as render him a suitable man for the position.

THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the government contemplating the early construction of the Georgian Bay canal?
2. Have the tenders been prepared for the construction of the first section of said canal?

Mr. MONK:

1. It is under consideration.
2. No.

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL.

Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. What was, during the month of October last, the average depth of water in the St Lawrence channel between Montreal and Quebec?
2. What was, during the same month, the depth of water at Cap a la Roche at low tide?

Mr. HAZEN :

1. Average depth of water in the thirty foot channel, thirty feet, two inches.
2. Average depth of water in the twenty-seven and one-half foot channel at Cap a la Roche at low tide, twenty-six feet, five inches.

THE I. C. R. SHOPS.

Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Is it true that part of the I.C.R. shops at Moncton, N.B., will be transferred to Fraserville, Quebec?
2. If so, when is such transfer to be made?

Mr. COCHRANE :

1. It is not the intention of the department to transfer part of the I. C. R. shops at Moncton to Fraserville, P. Q. There will be plenty of work at both Moncton and Riviere du Loup.
2. Answered by Number One.

MR. GEORGE TAYLOR AND A SENATORSHIP.

Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Is the Prime Minister aware of the fact that Mr. George Taylor, ex-M.P. for Leeds and Grenville, declared publicly at Gananoque, a few days ago, that he had been promised a Senatorship?
2. Has such a promise been made?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. No.
2. Long before the recent elections it was recognized that Mr. Taylor's character and ability together with his long service and great experience in public affairs eminently qualified him for a seat in the Senate.

THE QUEBEC MINISTERS.

Mr. CARVELL :

1. Is the Prime Minister aware that the Minister of Public Works declared a few days ago that he had been entrusted with the choice of his colleagues in the Province of Quebec?
2. Who made the choice of the Quebec Ministers, the Prime Minister or the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. No.
2. The members of the cabinet were selected by the Prime Minister and their names submitted by him for approval in the usual constitutional manner.

THE MONTREAL DISTRICT JUDICIARY.

Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Has the Minister of Justice received any petition from the Montreal Bar praying for the increase of the number of judges in the Circuit Court?
2. Is it the intention of the government to create new judges in the Circuit Court of the District of Montreal?

Mr. DOHERTY :

1. No. In December, 1910, a resolution of the Council of the Bar of Montreal favouring the appointment of three additional judges for the Circuit Court was received by the Department of Justice ; on the 3rd inst., a resolution to the like effect passed by the Junior Bar Association on 27th October, 1911, was received ; and on 21st inst., a resolution by the committee named by the Council of the Bar of Montreal to take up the question of the reform of the Circuit Court was received together with a letter from the Bâtonnier requesting that nomination of new judges be deferred until a conference can be had between the Bar and the Attorney General of the province of Quebec.
2. The matter is under consideration.

ONTARIO AND IMMIGRATION.

Mr. MACDONALD :

1. Referring to an alleged statement of Sir James Whitney at Cobourg, that the Hon. Mr. Borden had promised to take steps to provide a lump sum to Ontario to be used for immigration, was such promise made by Mr. Borden?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to provide a sum for Nova Scotia to be used for immigration?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. The attention of the government has not been directed to the alleged statement.
2. It is the intention of the government to co-operate as far as possible with the government of each province for the purpose of promoting desirable immigration.

THE OFFICE OF SOLICITOR GENERAL

Mr. MACDONALD :

1. Does the government intend to introduce legislation to abolish the office of Solicitor General?
2. If not, when do they propose to fill the position?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. The matter has not been considered.
2 .The matter is under consideration.

STELLARTON POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Was one John Fraser, postmaster at Stellarton, N.S.? If so, what was the date when he became postmaster?
2. Has he ceased to hold that office? If so, what was the date when he vacated the position and why did he cease being postmaster?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Mr. John Fraser was appointed postmaster of Stellarton on the 1st of April, 1882.
2. (a) Yes. (b) 1st of May, 1903. (c) Serious irregularities had occurred in connection with the postmaster's accounts which led to his removal from office.

THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. MURPHY:

Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the erection of a new Printing Bureau, for which an amount was voted at the last session of parliament?

Mr. MONK. There is an appropriation in current year's estimates of $100,000 towards the erection of a new printing bureau. The question of site has not been decided yet. The matter of policy whether the government makes a change has not yet been considered by the government.

THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is it the intention of the government to propose that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Canada be divided and a new final Supreme Court be constituted for the portion of Canada west of the Great Lakes, or that there should be any division of any kind made in regard to said court?
2. If so, what is the division proposed?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.
2. Answered by the answer to No. 1.

THE CANADA-GREAT BRITAIN OCEAN AND MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the government taken any step for the renewal of the contract for the ocean and mail service between Canada and Great Britain, which expires on May 1st, 1912?
2. If not, does the government intend to call for tenders for a new service?
3. If the government does not propose to renew said contract, or to call for tenders, what course does the government propose to adopt in regard to the continuation of the said service?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. No.
2. The matter is now under consideration.
3. Answered by 1 and 2.

RIDEAU HALL IMPROVEMENTS.

*Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. What appropriation was made by parliament for improvements at Rideau Hall to prepare the same for their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught?
2. What expenditures were made out of such appropriation to the 1st November, 1911, and what are the various items of such expenditure?
3. What portion, if any, of the said appropriation remained unexpended on said 1st November?

Mr. MONK:

1. $50,000.
2. Amounts paid—

State coaches	$ 2,000 00
Painting coaches	1,118 00
Lumber	1,626 00
Cutlery from Lord Grey	786 80
Sand, cement, lime, &c	1,284 59
Paint, oils, paper, &c	883 59
Hardware, plumbing and heating goods	1,837 77
Electrical supplies	795 28
Dry goods, linens, glassware, flags	2,405 77
Furniture	1,401 90
Plastering, &c	1,281 22
Tiling	873 40
Plant seeds, &c	659 15
Duty on goods	222 50
Removing organ, chapel	138 00
Gasolene tanks for garage	596 82
Furnaces for cottages	$ 200 00
Sundries	2,446 68
Total	$20,547 47
Contracts—	
Garage	$15,094 40
Cottages	3,520 00
Guest assembly and waiting room.	7,280 00
	$25,894 40

3. $3,558.13.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR—TUGS ATTENDING DREDGE 'FIELDING.'

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. What tugs are now employed by the Department of Public Works to attend the dredge 'Fielding' in the harbour of St John?
2. Who are the owners of such tugs respectively?
3. What amount per day is being paid for the services of each of such tugs?
4. What amount per day was paid for the services of each tug attending said dredge on and immediately prior to the 21st September last?

Mr. MONK:

1. 'Helena' and 'Dirigo.'
2. 'Helena' owned by Department, and 'Dirigo' by G. S. Mayes.
3. Tug 'Dirigo,' $37.50 a day.
4. $37 50.

CAPTAIN PETER DECOSTE.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish):

1. Is Captain Peter Decoste, of Harbour au Bouche, N.S., in charge of the dredge 'Cape Breton? If not, when was he removed?
2. When did he first enter the service of the Public Works Department, dredging branch?
3. Who succeeded him, why was he dismissed, and on whose recommendation or advice?
4. Were there any charges made against him? If so, by whom, and what were they?
5. Was there any investigation held? I so, by whom?
6. Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to dismiss all officers and men appointed to positions on the government dredges and tugs by the late government?

Mr. MONK:

1. (a) No. (b) 26th October, 1911.
2. 8th April, 1897.
3. (a) Captain Daniel Gillis; (b) and (c)? 4 and 6. Minister.
5. No.

TEMISCOUATA—PETITIONS FOR DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the hon. the Postmaster General rereceived several petitions from the citizens of the county of Temiscouata asking for the dismissal of the postmasters in certain parishes? If so, how many?

2. What are the names of the postmasters mentioned in the said petitions?
3. Why is it desired to replace them?
4. What policy does the hon. minister intend to follow in respect to the numerous petitions for dismissal of these postmasters whether in Temiscouata or elsewhere?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2 and 3. It is asked (1) that the postmistress of Ste. Rose du Degele, Mrs. Alma Morel, should be removed from office owing to alleged unsatisfactory management and this has been referred to the Post Office inspector at Quebec for inquiry and report;
(2) That Mr. Chas. Breton, postmaster of Cabano, be dismissed for incompetency. Inquiry by inspector ordered;
(3) That Miss Seindon, postmistress of Cacouna, be dismissed as her predecessor was unjustly dismissed by the late government. Awaiting inquiry as to facts.
4. Each case will be decided on its own merits.

BRIDGE WORKS AT FRASERVILLE, QUEBEC.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Did the hon. the Minister of Public Works have an interview in the beginning of November with Messrs. LeBel and Rion of Fraserville, on the subject of the bridge works at that place?
2. If so, did the hon. minister promise to these gentlemen that the projected works for the improvement of the Lièvre would be pushed with activity?

Mr. MONK:

1. No.
2. No.

MELFORD, N.S., WHARF.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the contractor of the proposed public wharf at Melford, N. S., been notified by the Department of Public Works not to proceed?
2. If so, on whose advice has this decision been reached?
3. Does the government intend to proceed with the construction of said wharf? If so, when?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes. By wire 14th inst.
2. Advice of Mr. C. A. R. Rowlings, barrister, Sydney, N.S.
3. No decision yet made as to where work is to be located.

FISHERIES CRUISER 'KESTREL.'

Mr. STEVENS.

1. Is the fishery cruiser 'Kestrel' condemned? If so, why?
2. When and where was she built, and by whom?
3. Has this vessel been satisfactory?
4. What was the full cost?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No; owing to faster vessels now being employed in the fishing fleet, it has been decided to obtain a more suitable vessel.
2. Vancouver, 1901. Mr. A. Wallace, shipbuilder, Vancouver, B.C.
3. The vessel has done good work, but owing to altered conditions she is not considered to come up to the requirements of the service.
4. $72,500.

ALLEGED BREACH OF IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has the J. P. Murray Carpet Company, of Toronto, been charged with a breach of immigration regulations by inducing weavers to come to Canada while a strike was in progress?
2. Were proceedings commenced against this company for this alleged violation?
3. Have these proceedings been stopped? If so, at whose instance?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Some misunderstanding of instructions has taken place, but the matter is now before the Justice Department with a recommendation that case proceed.

MAISONNEUVE POSTAL STATION.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the erection of the postal station in the town of Maisonneuve?
2. If so, will the plans be accepted and work carried on in accordance with the specification submitted by Mr. C. A. Reeves, architect of Maisonneuve?
3. Will the government ask for tenders and when?

Mr. MONK:

1, 2 and 3. Plans are being prepared by C. A. Reeves, architect, and have been approved by the Post Office Department. The plans are practically completed, and the French specification is printed but the English is not yet ready. The Department will be in a position to invite tenders when this specification is completed.

WRIGHT COUNTY—DISMISSALS OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DEVLIN :

1. How many employees living in the county of Wright has the government dismissed since the 22nd of September, 1911?
2. If any, what were their names?
3. What were the reasons for their dismissals?
4. By whom were they replaced and what were the special qualifications of those who were appointed to replace them?

Mr. MONK :

Dismissed from shipyard, Department of Public Works :—

Oct. 31, 1911 : F. Laliberty, calker ; A. Tessier, calker; E. Arbick, calker.

Nov. 15, 1911 : F. Corbeil, mechanic ; J. Renaud, blacksmith ; J. B. Cyr, carpenter ; A. Milks, carpenter ; I. Gunner, calker ; A. Bazinait, labourer ; P. Canuel, labourer.

Nov. 20, 1911 : P. Couroux, carpenter ; A. Osborne, carpenter; A. Couroux, carpenter ; M. Pelletier, carpenter ; E. Beauprè, carpenter; L. Belheumer, labourer.

10 dismissed on recommendation.

6 dismissed out of 20, not being required.

Dismissed from chief architect's branch: L. DeCoeli, elevatorman, replaced by D. St. Jean, and afterwards re-instated.

HON. MR. MONK AND THE NAVAL QUESTION.

Mr. DEVLIN :

1. Did the hon. the Minister of Public Works visit the city of Hull on the 13th instant?
2. Was he presented with an address in the City Hall of Hull?
3. Did the address refer in part to the attitude of the hon. minister upon the naval question?
4. Did the hon. the Minister of Public Works promise that legislation would be introduced to vary the terms of the present law respecting the navy?

Mr. MONK :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. No.

BRIDGE BETWEEN ST. JEAN AND IBERVILLE, QUE.

Mr. DEMERS :

What sum of money was voted by parliament at the last session as a contribution to the construction of a bridge between St. Jean and Iberville in the county of St. Jean and Iberville?

Mr. MONK. Nothing under Public Works.

FARMERS' BANK AND BANK ST. JEAN.

Mr. DEMERS :

1. Is it the intention of the government to indemnify the depositors of the Farmers' Bank for the losses sustained by them by the failure of that bank?
2. If so, does the government intend to treat in like manner the depositors of the Bank of St. Jean?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. The matter has not been considered by the government.
2. Answered by reply to (1).

Mr. DEVLIN.

MILITARY CONFERENCE.

Mr. ETHIER :

1. By whom was the military conference held at Ottawa on the 15th, 16th and 17th instant, convened?
2. Who were the persons invited to attend such conference and who invited them?
3. Was Canon Dauth, of Montreal, among the number invited?
4. Who did Canon Dauth represent at such military conference and what were his credentials?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1. The Minister of Militia and Defence.
2. Brigadiers, and, in outlying districts, regimental commanders, specialists on cadet training and on rifle shooting, besides representatives of universities, educational institutions, and prominent citizens of the country interested in military matters. They were invited by the Secretary of the Militia Council, under instructions from the Minister.
3. Yes.
4. Canon Dauth was invited as a representative of Laval University.

CANADIAN NAVY—STATEMENTS AT PUBLIC MEETINGS.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Does the government know that during the last electoral campaign, and especially at St. Scholastique, on the 24th June last, and at St. Therese de Blainville on the 18th September last, one of its present members, then a Nationalist candidate in Terrebonne, and now Minister of Inland Revenue, is said to have denounced the attitude of the chief of the opposition, Mr. R. L. Borden, on the question of the Canadian navy, and repudiated him as his leader?
2. Does the government know that the Nationalist candidate, now a minister, had then pledged himself that if elected in Terrebonne, he would demand the repeal of the navy law?
3. Does the government intend to carry out the promise of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, and when will it be done?

Mr. BORDEN:

That will have to stand to be amended. The allegation of fact must be struck out.

DOMINION LANDS AGENT AT MEDICINE HAT.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the agent of Dominion Lands at Medicine Hat been suspended or dismissed? If so, for what reason or reasons?
2. By whom was the recommendation made that he should be suspended or dismissed?
3. Has any person been appointed to fill the position temporarily? If so, who was so appointed and was he an official of the department?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Has been suspended to permit of an investigation of the office.

2. By the minister.
3. Yes. George H. McDonell. No.

STATEMENTS AT ST. EUSTACHE, COUNTY OF TWO MOUNTAINS.

Mr. MARTIN (Montreal):

1. Is it within the knowledge of the government that, in an assembly held at St. Eustache, county of Two Mountains, in the summer of 1910, in the presence of five thousand people, the persons hereinafter named are said to have made the following declarations: —The Hon. Minister of Public Works, that he had broken with his chief, the present First Minister; the Hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and the hon. member for Champlain, that they recognized no other chief but the member for Jacques Cartier, and repudiated the present First Minister?
2. Is the government ready to tell us if these gentlemen had retracted before accepting the different places which they occupy at the present time?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.
2. Answered by the answer to No. 1.

CONTROL OF NATURAL RESOURCES OF WESTERN PROVINCES.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina):

1. Is the government aware that the present Prime Minister during the last election promised to favour a policy of handing over to the western provinces their natural resources?
2. If so, what steps does the government intend to take toward implementing such promise?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. The steps will be announced in parliament in due course.

VOTERS' LISTS—REPORTED STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina):

1. Is the government aware that the Montreal 'Gazette' has reported the Minister of the Interior as having made the following statement referring to the province of Saskatchewan:—'We will have proper lists prepared under federal supervision and then when the election takes place, the result will be the choice of the people and not the screaming farce it was before.'
2. Is the government aware that the Minister of the Interior made such a statement?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.
2. No.

INCREASE OF BRITISH PREFERENCE.

Mr. BICKERDIKE:

Is it the intention of the present government to grant a further preference to Great Britain in the near future?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

It is not the practice to make announcements with respect to tariff in advance of the budget speech.

HARBOUR OF MONTREAL.

Mr. BICKERDIKE:

1. Is it the intention of the government during the present session of parliament to constitute the harbour of Montreal a national and free port?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The government intends, at the earliest opportunity, to make a thorough study of the needs of all the Canadian national ports.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CONNECTION WITH MONTREAL.

Mr. BICKERDIKE:

Is it the intention of the government to immediately take the necessary steps to construct the branch lines connecting the city of Montreal with the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

By Chapter 99 of the Acts of 1906, the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company was authorized to construct the lines referred to.
2. The question of constructing these lines by the government to the exclusion of the company has not been under consideration.

POSTMASTER AT NOTRE DAME DES ANGES, PORTNEUF.

* Mr. DESLISLE:

1. Has the Postmaster General received a petition asking for the dismissal of the post master at Notre Dame des Anges, county of Portneuf?
2. Has the Reverend S. Garou, cure of Notre Dames des Anges, written to the Postmaster General asking for this dismissal?
3. If so, what person has the Reverend Mr Garou recommended to replace him?
4. What does the department propose to do in this matter?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2 and 3. A petition to that effect has been received by the department from the Rev. Mr. Garou asking for the removal of the present postmaster at Montauban (formerly Notre Dame des Anges) on the ground that his predecessor was unjustly dismissed for political partisanship by the late government. It is requested that the office should be placed in charge of Mr. Joseph Gingras.
4. Under consideration.

CHANCE HARBOUR, N. B.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

What action is being taken by the Department of Public Works with regard to the improvements at Chance Harbour, St. John County, N.B.?

Mr. MONK. The department is proceeding with improvements to wharf at Chance Harbour by day labour. Amount expended up to October 20, $2,007.26.

GOOSEBERRY COVE, N.B.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

What is being done with regard to the improvements at Gooseberry Cove, St. John County, N.B.?

Mr. MONK. The department is proceeding by day labour with the construction of the wharf at Gooseberry Cove, N.B. Amount expended up to October 20, $2,005.37.

LORNEVILLE, N.B., BREAKWATER.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. What do the borings recently made at Lorneville, St. John County, N.B., show as to the nature of the foundation?

2. Is it intended to proceed with the work of completion of the breakwater at that place? If so, when is the work likely to b resumed?

Mr. MONK:

1. Test borings made at Lorneville show fine sand and clay down to solid rock at 10 feet below low water.

2. Matter still under consideration.

SARNIA, ONT., ARMOURY.

Mr. PARDEE:

Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the erection of an armoury a the town of Sarnia, according to the plan and specifications on file in the Public Work Department?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The matter is under consideration.

JAPANESE AND CHINESE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What is the Japanese population of British Columbia according to latest census?

2. What is the Chinese population of British Columbia?

3. What number of Japanese have been naturalized during the past five years in British Columbia?

4. Did the late administration appoint two commissioners to naturalize Orientals in British Columbia? If so, who were they, and at what salary?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. The number of Japanese in British Columbia according to the latest census is being compiled at the present time, but the results are not yet available.

2. The number of Chinese in British Columbia according to the latest census is being compiled at the present time, but the results are not yet available.

3. The number of Japanese on record as naturalized British subjects in the province of British Columbia during the past five years, 1906-10, inclusive, is 1,269.

4. In the prvoince of British Columbia the following persons have been appointed commissioners to take and administer oaths under the Act respecting Naturalization and Aliens: E. A. Haggen, Revelstoke; John Ridington and John McKinnar, both of Vancouver. An appointment as a commissioner under the said Act does not carry a salary. By order in council, under clause (k) of section 38 of the said Act, commissioners may take a fee of forty cents on a declaration of alienage, or an oath of allegiance.

MANUFACTURE AND IMPORTATION OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. BLAIN:

1. What quantity of cigarettes were manufactured in each province for the fiscal year 1905 and each subsequent year?

2. What quantity of cigarettes were imported into each province for the same year?

3. What was the total revenue from all sources for cigarettes in each of the above mentioned years?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. No record of the quantity of cigarettes manufactured in Canada.

2. The quantity of cigarettes entered for consumption, by provinces during the fiscal year 1905 and each subsequent was as follows:

—	1905.	1906.	1907. (9 months)	1908.	1909.	1910.	1911.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Ontario	3,348	4,214	4,599	6,172	7,339	6,901	9,029
Quebec	10,128	12,859	15,573	22,019	17,537	16,593	22,776
Nova Scotia	3,127	3,010	2,259	3,006	2,680	3,413	4,360
New Brunswick	10	87	.....	.....	.....	91	.....
Manitoba	279	474	621	605	948	912	1,254
British Columbia	4,307	3,436	3,781	6,539	7,117	6,971	7,186
Alberta	.....	14	19	177	200	136	154
Saskatchewan	.....	4	.....	.....	.....	20	11
Yukon	.....	21	3	75	61	12	.....
Total	21,199	24,119	26,855	38,593	35,882	35,049	48,770

3. The total duty collected on imported cigarettes during the above mentioned fiscal years was as follows:

1905	$ 76,261 75
1906	86,553 50
1907 (9 months)	96,720 75
1908	137,761 58
1909	128,985 25
1910	127,047 00
1911	177,326 50

COPYRIGHT.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

Is it the intention of the government to introduce the Copyright Bill, Bill (No. 184) of the last session of the last parliament, which had its first reading on 26th April, 1911, or to introduce an analogous Bill during the present session?

Mr. BURRELL. At the time of the introduction of the Canadian Copyright Bill there was before the British parliament a Bill to give effect to the resolutions of the Imperial Copyright Conference of 1910. One of the main objects of the Canadian Bill was to make the Canadian law on the subject uniform with the law to be enacted by the British Bill. Since the introduction of the British Bill substantial amendments have been made and it is still before the British parliament. It is not the intention of this government to introduce a Bill this session.

WHARFS AT ILE BEZARD AND STE. GENEVIEVE.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

Are the repairs to the wharfs of Ile Bezard and Ste. Genevieve completed, and have their works been accepted by the government?

Mr. MONK:

1. (a) No. (b). No.

SESSIONS OF PARLIAMENT—ALLEGED STATEMENT BY MR. TAYLOR.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Did the Prime Minister inform Mr. George Taylor, ex-M.P., that there would be only two sessions of the present parliament, as alleged by Mr. Taylor at a public meeting in Leeds county?

2. Is it the intention of the government to limit the life of this parliament to two sessions?

3. If so, will a re-distribution Bill be passed before dissolution?

4. If not, when will a re-distribution Bill be introduced?

Mr. BORDEN. Stand to be amended.

EMBARGO AGAINST CANADIAN CATTLE

Mr. BICKERDIKE:

Does the government intend immediately to take the necessary steps to induce the British government to abolish the embargo against Canadian cattle?

Mr. BURRELL. The embargo is receiving the attention of the government in connection with the consideration of the further development of the live stock industry of the Dominion.

AGREEMENT AS TO EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. OLIVER:

What were the financial terms agreed upon with the Premier and Attorney General of Manitoba as a condition of the extension of the boundaries of that province, which they have announced to the press?

Mr. BORDEN. The basis adopted was equality of treatment as between Manitoba and the other prairie provinces. The application of this principle to the details is being worked out.

TENDERS FOR VESSELS FOR NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. How many tenders were received for the naval vessels in the Naval Service Department?

2. Who are the tenderers and what was the total amount of each tender?

3. Were the plans for each of the proposed vessels submitted to and approved by the British Admiralty?

4. How much sooner could the proposed vessels have been built had permission to build in England been given?

5. Was the fact that it would take a longer period to build these vessels in Canada one of the reasons why the tenders were not accepted?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 7.

2. For building ships in Canada: Wm. Beardmore & Co., $13,055,804; Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., $12,842,000; Vickers, Sons & Maxim, $12,712,152; The British and Canadian Shipbuilding and Dock Co., $12,464,518; Swan, Hunter & Wigham, Richardson, $12,174,000; Cammell, Laird & Co., $11,280,000.

For building ships in England: The Thames Iron Works, $8,532,504.

These tenders did not include armour plate, armament, or certain fittings usually supplied by the Admiralty, but included the fitting of these articles on board the vessels.

3. The plans were prepared by the British Admiralty.

4. The first ships of the programme could probably have been delivered in England within about fifteen months of the placing of the order.

The total programme could probably have been completed within about three years.

5. The present government is not acquainted with the reasons which prevented the late government from placing the orders for these vessels.

CONFERENCES WITH THE BRITISH ADMIRALTY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has there been any change made in the terms of the memorandum of conferences between the British Admiralty and representatives of the Dominion of Canada and Australia, as set out in page 461 of the Minutes of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 1911?

2. Have any representations been made by the Canadian government asking that the terms of the said memorandum should be changed?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No.
2. No.

CONTRACTS IN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many contracts have been awarded by the Department of Public Works since the 10th of October ultimo?

2. To whom have such contracts been awarded, and for what amount in each case?

3. Have any tenders been called for in any case? If not, why not?

Mr. MONK:

1 & 2—

Port Perry, Ont., Public Building, W. J. Trick, $22,475.00.

Brooklyn, N. S., supply of 20,000 barrels of cement, Canada Cement Co. Ltd., $1.97½ per barrel.

Quebec, Que., Immigration Building, C. C Deakin, $348,000.

St. John Harbour, N. B., Deep water wharfs, M. Connolly, $760,285.

Tenders called for in all cases.

I ask that the contracts be made a Notice of Motion. The information is being collected, but there is quite a lot of it. It will be brought down as soon as it is ready.

PURCHASE OF EXCAVATORS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the Department of Public Works purchased any excavators from Mr. Harris, of Montreal?

2. If so, at what price and for what purpose?

3. Have any tenders been called for?

Mr. MONK:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by answer to first question.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH JAPAN.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Minister of Trade and Commerce taken notice of the following remarks made by the Japanese Consul at Vancouver and published in the Montreal 'Witness' on the 23rd November ult:—

Mr. HAZEN.

CANADA FOR JAPAN.

Japanese Consul makes strong plea for greater trade relations.

Toronto, November 23rd.—'Canada has not realized by half the opportunity she has of building up a great and profitable field of trade with Japan,' is the opinion of Mr. Chonosuka Yada, Japanese Consul at Vancouver , given in an interview here yesterday.

'In spite of the fact that the reciprocal trade between the two countries has increased nearly sixty per cent within the last ten years, the Consul said Canada is still allowing the United States to send over to Japan by far the largest part of the wheat Japan has to import every year. Japan's population of fifty millions is rapidly becoming a wheat-eating instead of a rice-eating people. Her wheat lands are strictly limited, Japan being a mountainous country, and we are already importing wheat from the United States, India and other countries to the annual amount of three to four million dollars. 'We get most of our wheat from the United States, and I am surprised that Canada is not taking a bigger share of this business.

'As the elder daughter of Great Britain, we look to Canada,' said Mr. Yada, as a country not only to which we may send goods but from which we may become large purchasers of manufactured and natural products.

'Not only must Japan import a large part of the wheat she requires, but she also needs great quantities of paper, of which she is now getting from Norway, Germany and other countries one million dollars worth annually. There are over two thousand periodicals published in Japan, which consume thousands of tons of paper every day; the paper mills of Japan cannot supply half the quantity required.

'There is a large trade to be done, too, by Canadian manufacturers of machinery, hardware, cycles and cycle parts and other manufactured products.'

2. Will the Minister take any steps totowards improving our trade relations with Japan?

3. Who is the Canadian Trade Commissioner in Japan?

Mr. FOSTER: (Toronto).

1. Yes.

2. The minister will bend his best efforts towards improving our trade relations with all suitable countries, including Japan.

3. Mr. Harris.

QUEBEC HARBOUR BOARD.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have the three members of the Quebec Harbour Board been removed from office?

2. If so, by whom have they been replaced, and at whose request was the old board removed?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.

2. The new board consists of Messrs. Victor Chateauvert, J. B. E. Letellier and Neuville Belleau.

The old board was removed on the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

POST OFFICE AT ST. JACQUES.

Mr. LAFORTUNE:

1. Are the plans made for the post office to be built at St. Jacques, in the county of Montcalm?
2. If so, will tenders for its construction be asked for and when?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. A question affecting the rights of proprietors, adjoining the site purchased, which may interfere with the building line, has delayed the preparation of plans.

EXPORTS TO ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

1. How many stoves, ranges and heaters respectively were exported from Canada to the Argentine Republic during the last fiscal year?
2. What was the value and style of said stoves, ranges and heaters?
3. How many incubators were exported from Canada to the Argentine Republic during the last fiscal year?
4. What was the value and style of said incubators?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. The number of stoves exported from Canada to the Argentine Republic during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1911, was 39. (The different styles or kinds of stoves not separately enumerated.)
2. The value of stoves exported from Canada to Argentine Republic during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1911, was $1,158.

3 and 4. Incubators not separately enumerated in classification of exports.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the number of persons, male and female, over the age of sixty-five years, in Canada, according to the last census returns, and for the number of persons over the age of seventy in Canada, according to the last census.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all papers, telegrams, reports and other documents in connection with the proposed erection of a public building in the town of Aurora.—Mr. Armstrong (York.)

For a return showing the special increases in salary granted to all officers and clerks in Division 1, grades 'A' and 'B'; Division 2, grades 'A' and 'B,' and Division 3, grades 'A' and 'B' in the inside civil service at Ottawa since the Civil Service Act of 1908 came into operation, and previously as far back as and including the year 1900, giving in each case the date of first appointment.

2. The names of all clerks standing at the head of their respective classes, at the reclassification, about two and a half years go, who had previously qualified for promotion by passing the examination under the law as it then stood, but who were not then given promotion, and who have not since been promoted, giving in each case the date of first appointment.—Mr. Aikins.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams and other documents in connection with the acceptance of a tender of the McDiarmid Company, Limited, for the construction of the Moosejaw public building, and the cessation of all construction thereof.—Mr. Knowles.

For a copy of all correspondence since the first of July, 1896, to the present date between the government of Canada and the governments of the several provinces on the subject of assistance to provincial railways and other provincial public works.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all correspondence consisting of letters or telegrams between the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company or any officer thereof or any other person, and the Minister of Railways or any other member of the government or any official of the Department of Railways and Canals, relating to the reopening of that portion of the railway of the said company between Hillsborough and Albert, and the supplying of rails and other materials for the purpose of repairing and improving the same, and also of any Orders in Council, agreements and other documents relating thereto.—Mr. Pugsley.

For a copy of all correspondence between His Majesty's government in Canada and His Majesty's government in England subsequent to the last Imperial Conference concerning the naval service of Canada or in any way connected with it.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a statement showing the amount of money paid by the Dominion government to each of the railways in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and in the Northwest Territories by way of subsidies and adding thereto the value of lands given as subsidies on the basis of one dollar per acre.—Mr. McCraney.

For a return showing—

1. The number of messengers in the House of Commons during the last session of the last parliament.
2. The names of the said messengers and the dates of their respective appointments.
3. The number of these messenger who have been relieved from service, their names, at whose request, for what reason and on what date.
4. By whom have they been replaced.
5. Where are the residence of the new messengers and by whom were they recommended.
6. How many French Canadians have been dismissed and by whom have they been replaced.—Mr. Ethier.

Order of the House showing—

1. What persons were appointed to positions in the several departments between the date of the dissolution of the last parliament and the 31st September last.
2. On whose recommendation were such appointments made, and what is the salary attached to each position.
3. What appointments were made in the several departments between the 21st day of September last and the date of the resignation of the Laurier ministry, on whose re-

commendation in each case and what is the salary of each appointee.—Mr. Edwards.

CENSUS ENUMERATION AT REGINA.

Mr. KNOWLES moved:—

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, memorials, resolutions and other documents in the hands of the government, or any department thereof, in connection with the taking of the census in the city of Regina, and all complaints and protests in connection with the same; also all departmental instructions, momoranda, reports and other documents.

He said: In making this motion I do not wish to be understood as in any way interfering in the business of another city, but it is the business of every city in Saskatchewan to see that the other cities have their correct proportionate census. No harm would be done to one city by the inflation of the census of another city if all cities were similarly inflated, but any business man will agree that if you double the size of one city in your census returns, and keep another city at its correct and honest figure, you have done that other city a great injustice. Men are looking about in that western country with a desire to obtain information with a view to locating, and if they find the city of Regina on record as having a population 6,000 larger than the population of Moosejaw and Saskatoon together that constitutes a reason and an unfounded reason for them to settle in Regina and you have done Moosejaw and Saskatoon an injustice. The records will show that the census enumerators in Regina, I will not say were intentionally dishonest but were lax in their interpretation of the term 'residents of Regina." Once you define a resident in a loose way, you open the door to great inflation of the census returns. It should not be interpreted in such a way as to include every one who visited the Dominion fair held in Regina this summer or to include people on the construction gangs on railways working out of Regina, who perhaps never slept in Regina a night. I am credibly informed that men have been enumerated who were on the Grand Trunk Pacific construction 38 miles from Regina who had never slept there and who were working within six miles from Moosejaw so that they should have been enumerated in Moosejaw if they were to be counted in either city, although I think they should not have been counted in either city. It is generally agreed in the west that the figures given for Regina are many thousands too much. It is, therefore, only for the purpose of ascertaining all the facts which the department must have on its records, and to show if there has been any inflation of the census in Regina and if there has been such an inflation to have every possible step taken to rectify it, that I make this motion. Complaints and documents have been presented to the department and when they are brought down I think it will be found that there is ample material to justify my asking for a copy of the papers.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be understood as opposing the motion of the hon. member who is no doubt perfectly within his rights in bringing this matter to the attention of the House although I think he will find when he gets any information on file that he has little justification for any statements he has made in respect to the population of the city of Regina. In Regina we have very little interest in what the population of Moosejaw or Saskatoon or Prince Albert may be. My hon. friend has made some statements about the enumerators in Regina not doing their duty, or doing their duty too well as far as Moosejaw was concerned. I am personally acquainted with a number of the enumerators in Regina and I do not believe any of these men would be guilty of such dishonesty as my hon. friend from Moosejaw has attributed to them in his remarks. Every person knows that in Saswkatchewan and in the west in general cities grow by leaps and bounds. Some hon. gentleman may not credit the statement, but I do not believe there is any city in Alberta or Saskatchewan that has grown faster in proportion to its population in 1906 than Regina has grown within the last five years.

The object of my hon. friend must be to have the census of the city of Regina taken again, but unless the hon. gentleman can bring home to the city of Regina some wrong-doing on the part of the enumerators no case can be made out for the retaking of the census especially in view of the fact that the people of Regina are not asking it. The responsibility will of course rest on the government, but it would be a most unheard-of thing for the census of Regina to be taken at the instance of the city of Moosejaw. I believe, however, that if the census of the city of Regina is taken again the returns will show a greater population than they did last June.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture). It is a strange fate that has brought my friends from Moosejaw and Regina into a controversy on a matter as to which the late government which they both supported is entirely responsible and for the sins of which the present government cannot be held to account in any shape or form. Apparently my hon. friend from Moosejaw takes the ground that the enumerators in the city of Regina did not do their duty and apparently he also means that the enumerators in the city of Moosejaw did not do their duty either.

I did not quite understand that hon. member for Moosejaw as the hon. member for Regina indicated to wish that another census of Regina should be taken. I must say that I have every sympathy with those places whether cities or districts either in the east or in the west which feel that their population has been under-estimated. It is easy to understand why sympathy is due in such a case. However, this is a very involved and difficult question for this government to consider. I have pointed out to the different deputations that have approached me on this matter the difficulties that confront the government in dealing with such a question and I promised to give the matter my careful consideration, as I shall do. I cannot say what action the government may finally take on such an intricate and controversial subject. I have no objection to the order going for the return which my hon. friend from Moosejaw asked for.

Motion agreed to, and house adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 30, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

By Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

Receipts and Expenditure of National Battlefields Commission to 31st March, 1911.

Receipts and Expenditures of Ottawa Improvement Commission to 31st March, 1911.

Statement of Affairs of Royal Society of Canada for the year ended 30th April, 1911.

By Mr. ROCHE:

Report of the Secretary of State for the year ended March 31, 1911.

Statement of Bonds or Securities registered since last return, November 29, 1910

Annual Return respecting Trade Unions.

By Mr. NANTEL:

Reports, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenue Department for the year ended March 31, 1911: Part I, Excise; Part II, Inspection of Weights and Measures, Gas and Electric Light.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH LINES.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Is the government aware that there appeared in the 'Standard,' a Conservative paper published in the city of St. John on the 9th September last, being eleven days before the general elections, what purported to be a copy of a telegram from the Hon. R. L. Borden, then leader of the opposition and now Prime Minister, addressed to Mr. George W. Fowler, the Conservative candidate for Kings and Albert, as follows:

'From Summerside, P.E.I., Sept. 8, 1911.

'To George W. Fowler.

'Am convinced that interest of Intercolonial railway demands acquisition of branch line railways as feeders, and we purpose to acquire them on reasonable terms if returned to power.

'(Sgd.) R. L. BORDEN.'

2. Was such telegram sent by the honourable the present leader of the government? If so, at whose request and with what object?

3. Does the government intend to carry out the promise contained in such telegram?. If so, when?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.

2. Yes, except that the word 'proposed' instead of the word 'purpose' was used in the telegram sent. In reply to requests for information as to the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party respecting the acquisition of branch lines.

3. The telegram was merely a summary of previous declarations of the Prime Minister in parliament. Each case must be dealt with on its merits under the conditions mentioned.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

*Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Is the government aware that there appeared in the 'Standard,' a Conservative paper published in the city of St. John, New Brunswick, on the twentieth day of September last, the day before the general elections, what purported to be a despatch from the Hon. R. L. Borden, then the leader of the opposition and now Prime Minister, as follows:

Mr. Borden's special message to the people of St. John.

Halifax,N.S,. September 19, 1911.

Special.—On the 5th April, 1904, I moved a resolution in parliament declaring that the public interest demanded a thorough and efficient equipment of our national ports and terminals on the Atlantic and Pacific. That has ever since been the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party and has been so declared on repeated occasions. The thorough and efficient equipment of St. John harbour is part of our policy. I desire to emphasize what I declared at St. John on the 5th September, namely, that the defeat of the Laurier government will not retard, hinder or prevent in any way the construction of terminal facilities at St. John, or the equipment and development of that port as one of the Atlantic national ports of Canada.

(Sgd.) R. L. BORDEN.

2. Was the said despatch sent by Mr. Borden?

3. If so, at whose request was it sent?

4. Was such request made by letter or telegram? If so, what were the words thereof?

5. Was the present Prime Minister aware, when he sent such despatch, of the nature of the improvements which the late government intended to make at the port of St. John, and especially of the fact that tenders had been called and received for the construction of wharfs, as breakwater, and the dredging of a channel and basin to and in Courtenay bay, with a view of affording terminal facilities for the Grand Trunk Pacific railway at the port of St. John, together with an obligation on the part of the contractor to build a dry-dock of the first class, and the providing of a ship-repairing plant under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act of 1910, and also that tenders had been called for wharf construction on the western side of the harbour?

6. What action, if any, has the government taken to carry out the promise made to the people of St. John by the leader of the Conservative party in said despatch 'That the defeat of the Laurier government would not retard, hinder or prevent in any way the construction of terminal facilities at St. John, or the equipment and development of that port as one of the national ports of Canada?

7. Does the government still retain the security deposit of $500,000 of the Norton, Griffiths Company, Limited, the lowest tenderers for the harbour works at Courtenay bay?

8. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with said works? If so, when?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. In reply to citizens of St. John, interested in the development of that port.

4. Answered by the answer to No. 3.

5. The Prime Minister is not highly confident that he ever thoroughly understood the actual intentions of the late government with respect to the port of St. John. The telegram referred to the policy of the present government, rather than that of the late government.

6, 7, and 8. These matters are under the consideration of the government. The deposit mentioned has not been returned.

THE WESTERN MINERS' STRIKE.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the following despatch published by the Montreal 'Star' on October 28, 1911:

Strike of the Western Miners settled at last. Hon. Robert Rogers obtains complete settlement of difficulty.

Special to the Montreal 'Star.'

Ottawa, October 28—The western coal strike, which has been in progress since last spring, and in which thousands of men were involved, has been settled. Hon. Robert Rogers, who went west to conduct the negotiation with the men, last night wired the Minister of Labour: 'Have succeeded in getting full and complete settlement of strike signed by both parties.'

The following reply was sent to Hon. Robert Rogers by Deputy Minister Ackland: 'I am directed by the Minister of Labour to convey to you his most cordial congratulations on the splendid success resulting from your efforts in the cause of industrial peace in thus bringing to a close the prolonged dispute in the western coal mines. I am also to request you will kindly convey the minister's best wishes to both parties and an expression of his desire that the settlement effected may bring a season of extended prosperity and good feeling.'

2. Is it not a fact that the western coal strike continued for weeks after the Minister of Labour had congratulated the Minister of the Interior on his splendid success in settling it?

3. Has the government been advised by either of the parties interested in the strike that it has been settled? If so, when?

4. Why did not the Minister of Labour, instead of the Minister of the Interior, try to settle the said strike?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. No.

2. After the basis of settlement was reached some time was required to refer it to the various local unions concerned.

3. (a) The government has been advised that after the referendum the agreement was confirmed.

(b) The government is advised that the mines will be re-opened Monday, November 20.

4. The course thought the wisest was adopted.

Mr. WARNOCK:

Is the government aware that on November 11 the supply of household coal in Lethbridge city, as well as other parts of the west, was inadequate, owing to the fact that householders and dealers had not ordered in advance of their immediate needs, in the belief that the strike had been settled by the Minister of the Interior when he visited Lethbridge on or about October 27?

Mr. CROTHERS. The government is aware there has been some shortage of household coal at various points in the west because of industrial disputes in the coal mining industry, but they are not aware that it is due to the reason assigned.

Mr. WARNOCK:

1. Is the government aware that there occurred on November 2 at Fernie, B.C., a riot of striking miners? If so, has the government been furnished with the particulars of the same, and will the government furnish the House with a statement of such particulars?

2. What number of miners have been at work in the coal mines of Southern Alberta and eastern British Columbia since October 24th, and what has been the output of coal during that period ?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. No offical information has been received.

2. No returns have been made.

SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. How many sessional employees have been dismissed since September 22, 1911?

2. By whom and under what authority were such dismissals made?

3. How many new sessional employees have been engaged?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Thirty.

2. In case of those in the Sergeant-at-Arms' branch, by the authority of the Sergeant-at-Arms. In the Clerk's branch, by the authority of the hon. the Speaker.

3. Twenty-four.

FRANCO-CANADIAN PARCEL POST CONVENTION.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the parcel post convention between France and Canada been signed by the French government?

Mr. PELLETIER. The agreement for the direct exchange of parcels by post between France and Canada has been signed on behalf of France by the Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telegraphs, of France.

INTERCOLONIAL BRANCH LINES.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation at the present session of parliament empowering the government to acquire the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial railway with a view to operating the same as a part of the government system of railways? If so, at what date will the same be introduced?

Mr. BORDEN. Legislation for the purpose is already on the statute-book, chapter 25 of the Acts of 1910. The question of further legislation has not yet been under consideration.

MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Is it the intention of the government to continue in existence and operation in connection with the management of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways the Government Railways Managing Board? If not, when is the same likely to be abolished?

2. Is the government aware that the Conservative candidate in the electoral district of Westmoreland, New Brunswick, at the last general election announced and pledged to the electors of the city of Moncton, and to the electors elsewhere throughout the constituency during the said election and before the 21st day of September last, that, should a new Conservative government eventuate as a result of the said election, the said Government Railway Managing Board would cease to be and would be abolished so far as it related to the management of the Intercolonial railway?

3. Was such announcement and pledge authorized by the Prime Minister or any member of the present government?

4. Has the government since the 21st of September last received any communications, verbal or otherwise, from the said candidate or from any other party or parties, or from any organization, political or otherwise, requesting the abolition of said Board, or making representations respecting its abolition? If so, by whom were such requests made or representations preferred, and what was the nature of the latter, if any?

5. Is the government also aware that a promise was made by the same candidate to the electors of Westmoreland during the pendency of such election that in the event of a new Conservative government being formed as a result of the said election, the Minister of Railways and Canals therein would be selected from among the representatives elected from the maritime provinces; and that if this were not done he could not and would not support any government which did not have a maritime representative holding the portfolio of Railways and Canals?

6. Was any such promise or announcement authorized by the Prime Minister or by any member of the present government?

7. Has the government or any member thereof since the said election received from the said candidate, or from any other party or parties, or from any organization, political or otherwise, any request or representations, verbal or otherwise, as to the appointment of a maritime province representative to the portfolio of Railways and Canals? If so, what was the nature of such representations or communications?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The matter has not yet been considered.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. No.

5. No.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Any communications with respect to such matters were of a confidential character.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—WORKSHOPS AT RIVIERE DU LOUP.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Did the hon. the Minister of Railways have an interview in the beginning of November with Messrs. Luc LeBel and S. C. Rion, of Fraserville, in Temiscouata?

2. If so, did these gentlemen then present to him a written report on the subject of the workshops of the Intercolonial railway at Rivière du Loup?

3. Did they ask for a reorganization of the personnel of the said workshops and the removal of certain emplyees?

4. What are the names of those whom they desired thus to remove?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

4. None.

ST. JEAN-IBERVILLE BRIDGE.

Mr. DEMERS:

What sum of money was voted by parliament at the last session as a contribution to the construction of a bridge between St. Jean and Iberville in the county of St. Jean and Iberville?

Mr. COCHRANE. $40,000 in the main estimates of last session and five-twelfths of $12,000 in the supplementary estimates 1911 and 1912, in all $45,000.

THE WESTERN MINERS' STRIKE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Did the Minister of the Interior make a statement to the Medicine Hat 'Times' on October 27 last, to the effect that 'the coal strike is now a thing of the past and the men will go back to work at once?'
2. Is the Minister of Labour aware that on October 27, the Crowsnest Pass Coal Co. at Fernie, B.C., posted notices to the effect that the strike was settled and the men could return to work?
3. Was the company warranted in posting such a notice?
4. Is the Minister of Labour aware that riots occurred at Fernie as a result of men attempting to work following the announcement?
5. Did the memorandum of agreement signed by the Minister of the Interior at Lethbridge contain the following clause?

'In the matter of settling the prices on work, which was not determined at the expiration of the last agreement, and of the differential on pillars which was to be determined by mutual consent, it is understood that the committee for each side appointed to complete this agreement, determine these prices at once. If they fail to agree an independent chairman shall be called to do so. If the committee fail to agree on a chairman, the Minister of the Interior shall be asked to appoint one immediately?'

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. ———
2. No.
3. The company has not informed the government as to the grounds for posting any such notice.
4. No.
5. No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—THE GUYSBORO BRANCH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of a line of railway known as the Guysboro branch of the Intercolonial railway, projected and in part contracted for by the late government? If so, when?

Mr. COCHRANE. The government has the matter under consideration.

Mr. COCHRANE.

THE LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What steps have been taken by the Department of Labour to settle the strike of the longshoremen at Montreal?
2. Has an application been made for a Board of Investigation?
3. How many vessels are being affected by the present strike?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. The Minister of Labour was notified of the dispute at 5 p.m. Friday, November 17. Two officers of the department reached Montreal Saturday morning, November 18. A conference was immediately arranged by the departmental officers between the disputing parties. A tentative agreement was effected and the employees resumed work at 7 p.m. Saturday, November 18. At a meeting of the employees on Sunday, November 19, at which the officers of the department were present, the tentative agreement was confirmed. On Monday, November 20, the agreement was signed by both parties and the dispute was formally closed.
2. No.
3. There is no present strike. Sixteen vessels were affected by the dispute of the existence of which the department was notified on the 17th instant.

HAMPTON SPUR LINE.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Is it intended to proceed with the work of constructing the spur line of railway from Hampton station to Hampton village, for which an appropriation was made by parliament last session?
2. Who submitted the lowest tender for the work, and has the contract yet been let?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No, not at present.
2. Only one tender was received which was not dealt with and contract not awarded.

THE AMERICAN SHOE MACHINERY COMPANY.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. For what reasons were the proceedings under the Combines and Investigation Act against the American Shoe Machinery Company discontinued?
2. Have proceedings again been started and is it the intention of the government to continue them?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. The government has given no instructions to discontinue any such proceedings.
2. The government is informed that the next meeting of the Board of Investigation will be held December 4.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY BRANCH TO MONTREAL.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Montreal):

1. Have any subsidies been petitioned for, granted or promised by the government to any company or persons on behalf of any branch line or lines of railway to connect Montreal with the National Transcontinental Railway?

2. If so, to whom, and how much per mile or otherwise?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes; a subsidy is petitioned for; for a line of railway from Montreal to a point on the National Transcontinental Railway, in lieu of subsidy granted by Cap. 63, 1908, section 1, item 49, not exceeding 200 miles. Such subsidy has not been promised to any railway company or other persons on behalf of the above branch line.

2. First part of No. 2 answered by No. 1. $3,200 per mile, and an addition depending upon the cost of the railway not exceeding in all $6,400 per mile.

BRITISH COLUMBIA SUBSIDY.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

Does the government propose to consult with the other provincial governments and obtain their views thereon before proceeding to deal with the question of additional subsidy to the province of British Columbia?

Mr. BORDEN: The matter has not yet been considered.

THE MARRIAGE QUESTION.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Has the government taken cognizance of the following question asked the last ministry on 12th April, 1911, by the member for Haliburton, Victoria, Mr. Hughes, now the hon. Minister of Militia?

Is the government or any member thereof, aware that the Hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Courts of Quebec Province, are said to decline to recognize as valid a marriage between a Roman Catholic man and a Roman Catholic woman if solemnized by other than an ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic Church?

2. Is the government, or any member thereof, aware that as alleged, ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church declare invalid marriages solemnized between a Roman Catholic and one of another faith, throughout the Dominion of Canada, unless the ceremony be performed by an ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic Church?

3. Under the British North America Act, section 91, does not marriage come under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada.

4. Is it the intention of the government to enact legislation which throughout Canada will make a marriage legal in any and every province, if performed between persons of the same creed or faith, or of different creeds or faith, in any province by any official or officials recognized for such purpose in any other province; in short, to enact a Dominion of Canada marriage law which will accept for every part of Canada, and make lawful in every province a marriage consummated under the law or form of any province?

5. Is it the intention of the government to make it a criminal offence, and to prescribe punishment, for any persons, ecclesiastic or other, who intrudes, or promulgates or publishes, or declares any rule or dogma of any ecclesiastical organization casting doubt upon, or declaring invalid, or in any sense reflecting on the legality of a marriage performed by any official recognized as entitled to perform a marriage ceremony, or setting up any such ecclesiastical dogma or rule as overriding the law of Canada?

6. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to declare valid a marriage solemnized in Quebec or in any province of Canada between two persons of the Roman Catholic faith, providing the officiating clergyman be a Protestant, and for the removal of doubt to make the law retroactive?

7. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to permit any ecclesiastical dogma or rule to override the laws of the people of Canada?

8. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to restore to legitimacy every woman who supposed her marriage legally consummated and also the children born of such marriage?

9. Will the government enact legislation compelling alimony to the woman where the man has left her under the ecclesiastical dogma of any church?

2. Does the government know the replies given to the questions thus asked by the hon. Minister of Justice at that time, Mr. Aylesworth, and which are as follows:—

1 and 2. Neither the government nor any department of the government has any knowledge in relation to the matters referred to in these questions other than such as may be gathered from newspaper articles or references to the subject?

3. Under the British North America Act the subject of marriage and divorce is one in regard to which parliament may legislate, but everything to the solemnization of marriage in the provinces is within the exclusive powers of the provincial legislature.

As to the remaining questions, other than question No. 7 legislation of the character indicated in the questions would appear to refer wholly to the persons by whom, or the form of the ceremony by which, marriages in any province could be validly solemnized, and in that view such legislation would seem not competent for the parliament of Canada to enact.

Legislation such as is indicated in questions 8 and 9 would seem also to relate to property and civil rights in the province, and on that ground as well to be matter for the exclusive consideration of the provincial authorities.

7. The government is not acquainted with any law of the people of Canada which has been overridden by any ecclesiastical dogma.

3. Does the government agree with the opinion expressed by Mr. Aylesworth? If not, what are the reasons?

Mr. BORDEN: In reply to the first question, the government has no doubt

that 'the following question' appeared in 'Hansard' as stated.

In answer to the second question, the government has no doubt that the replies were given as set forth.

In reply to the third question, the matter has not been under consideration.

MR. L. A. SAUVE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has Mr. L. A. Sauvé, superintendent of the Soulanges Canal, been relieved from his duties? If so, by whose request?

2. Was there an investigation and was it asked for by Mr. Sauvé.

3. What are the alleged causes for the removal of Mr. Sauvé?

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Sauvé was dismissed for his active partisanship during the recent elections.

MONTCALM POSTMASTERS.

Mr. LAFORTUNE:

1. Has the hon. Postmaster General received any petitions asking for the removal of postmasters in the county of Montcalm? If so, who made these petitions?

2. Who are the persons whose removals are requested, and what are the reasons given in each case for asking these dismissals?

Mr. PELLETIER. Communications have been received from Mr. J. E. Marion of St. Jacques, county Montcalm, Que., charging Mr. Edward Rowan, postmaster at Rawdon; Mr. Theophile Lapierre, postmaster at St. Alexis de Montcalm; Mr. Daoust, postmaster at St. Emile de Montcalm; Mr. Joseph Lacroix, postmaster at Moulin Lacroix, and Mr. O. Payette, postmaster at St. Esprit, with political partisanship.

THE MARRIAGE QUESTION.

Mr. BOIVIN:

Has the Dominion government power to legalize or validate any or every marriage solemnized anywhere in Canada.

Mr. BORDEN. This question is, strictly speaking, a question of law and, therefore, not usual under the practice of the House of Commons. For the information of the hon. gentleman I may say that the Dominion government has no legislative power whatever in such matters. So far as the Dominion parliament is concerned,—and perhaps the question was directed to the power of parliament rather than to the power of the government—the jurisdiction of parliament is fixed by section 91, subsection 26 of the British North America Act, which confers upon it the right to legislate with reference to marriage and divorce. The jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures in such matters is conferred by section 92, sub-section 12, of the British North America Act, which confers upon the provincial legislatures jurisdiction with respect to the solemnization of marriage in the provinces.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is safe.

Mr. BORDEN. It is not only safe but accurate.

AUSTRALIAN PACIFIC CABLE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is the government aware of any proposals being made to lay a branch of the Pacific Cable from Auckland, New Zealand, to Sydney, Australia?

2. If so, has the government any information regarding the nature of such proposals?

3. If the government has such information, what action does it propose to take to protect Canadian interests in the enterprise?

4. Is Canada paying a proportional or any share towards annual deficits, if any, arising out of the operation of the said cable?

Mr. PELLETIER. 1, 2 and 3. Lord Strathcona, one of Canada's representatives on the Pacific Cable Board, submitted to the Postmaster General a proposition adopted by the Pacific Cable Board that a direct cable should be laid between Australia and New Zealand, to supplement the existing line between the two colonies by way of Norfolk Island. As the reasons given for the additional line seemed to the Postmaster General to be good, the approval of the Canadian government was conveyed to Lord Strathcona. The interests of Canada in this as in all other matters dealt with by the Pacific Cable Board are looked after by the two Canadian representatives, Lord Strathcona and A. Lang, Esquire, the London manager of the Bank of Montreal.

4. Canada pays five-eighteenths of the deficit of the operations of the Pacific Cable.

I.C.R. BRANCH LINES.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Who are the tenderers for the construction line of the Intercolonial Railway from Estende to Baddeck in the County of Victoria?

2. What was the amount of each tender?

3. Was the contract awarded?

4. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of that line with all reasonable speed?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. D. Grant Kirk, Antigonish, N.S.
   James H. Corbett, Moncton, N.B.
2. D. Grant Kirk, tender at schedule prices.. .. .. $982,011 50
   James H. Corbett, tender at schedule prices.. .. .. 1,033,413 50
3. No contract is awarded.
4. Not at the present time.

CRUISER 'NIOBE.'

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. What steps are being taken towards repairing H.M.C.S. 'Niobe.'

Mr. HAZEN:

An order has been placed for the bronze castings required for the stern post and rudder.

Tenders are being asked for repairs to the hull.

SPRY POST OFFICE, N.S.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has any request been made to the Postmaster General for the closing or removal of the post office at Spry Bay, Halifax county, N.S.?

2. Is it proposed to close or remove said post office at Spry Bay, Halifax county, N.S.?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. Yes, satisfactory evidence having been presented to the effect that the post office at Spry Bay was unjustly removed by the late government from the charge of Mr. W. C. Henley, it has been decided to remove the present incumbent and restore the office to Mr. Henley.

ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals signed the contract or made any arrangements in reference to the construction of the St. John Valley railway?

2. Can and will the government inform the House if and why the provincial legislature of New Brunswick has changed its views in connection with the building of the St. John Valley railway to Grand Falls, N.B., instead of to Quebec?

3. Is the contractor, Mr. Gould, still interested in the construction of the St. John Valley railway? If so, to what extent?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Department of Railways and Canals has not signed any contract for the construction of the St. John Valley Railway.

2. The Department has no information.

3. The Department has no information.

UNGAVA TERRITORY.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

Does the government intend to have an Act passed at the present session to extend the limits of the province of Quebec and to annex the territory of Ungava to it?

Mr. BORDEN. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that the question has not been considered.

STE. ANNE EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Does the Department of Agriculture intend to have erected immediately the necessary buildings for the improvement of the Experimental Farm at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière?

2. Will tenders be asked for this purpose and when?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. It is the intention to erect the necessary buildings on the Experimental Station at Ste. Anne de la Pocatiére early next spring.

2. Tenders will be asked for during the present winter.

RESIGNATION OF S. N. PARENT.

*Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Has the hon. S. N. Parent been removed as President of the National Transcontinental Commission? If so, when was he replaced?

2. Why was not his successor chosen so that the province of Quebec should continue to be represented on this important commission?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Honourable S. N. Parent tendered his resignation, as member and chairman of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, which was accepted by Order in Council to date from October 6, 1911. His successor was appointed, by Order in Council, on the 23rd October 1911.

2. The selection of his successor was made from the point of view of well recognized qualifications for the position.

THE PAPAL ZOUAVES.

*Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Does the hon. the Minister of Militia intend to have an inquiry made as asked for by Colonel Samuel Hughes, member for Victoria and Haliburton, of date the 8th February, 1911, in the House of Commons of Canada? (See page 3219 of the Revised 'Hansard' as follows):—

1. Is the government aware, as alleged, that a body of the Canadian militia from the 10th Hussars, in uniform and armed, as well as a corps authorized and armed under the Militia Act, the Papal Zouaves of Quebec, both turned out and received the Papal Legate with a salute, and acted as a guard of honour to the ecclesiastic on the occasion of his visit to Quebec during the past summer?

7. Is it the intention of the government to inquire into the irregularities which occurred during the past summer in the use of troops in connection with sectarian demonstrations and discipline those who have transgressed the law?'

2. Does the hon. Minister of Militia intend to punish the officers whom the member for Victoria and Haliburton then found guilty of having violated the law on that occasion?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). These matters were disposed of by the late Minister of Militia.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

*Mr. LACHANCE :

1. Have Messrs. Jean Baptiste Laliberté, Roger Larue and George Tanguay, members of the Quebec Harbour Commission, ceased to act as such? If so, when and for what reason?
2. Have they sent in or been asked to send in their resignations.

Mr. HAZEN :

1. Yes. 21st November, 1911. In the interests of the service.
2. No.

MARINE WORKSHOPS AT QUEBEC.

*Mr. LACHANCE :

1. Has the government decided to close the yards and workshops of the Marine Department at the city of Quebec temporarily or permanently, and were instructions given to the proper parties in this matter?
2. If so, what instructions have been given and to whom?

Mr. HAZEN :

1. No.
2. No instructions have been given.

DOMINION ARSENAL QUEBEC.

Mr. LACHANCE :

1. Is it true, as alleged, that the workmen employed at the Dominion Arsenal at Quebec have not been paid their wages for more than two weeks?
2. Did the government give orders or instructions to stop the payment of the wages of these workmen?
3. If so, (a) when were such orders given and (b) for what cause?
4. When will the workmen receive the wages due them?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1. Wages of workmen at Dominion Arsenal have been paid up to and including November 4, 1911.
2. There were no funds available.
3. No such orders were given for no funds were available.
4. When funds are voted by parliament.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. LACHANCE :

1. What are the names of the persons who formed part of the Harbour Commission of Quebec on 1st June, 1896?
2. What persons formed a part of it since the 1st June, 1896 up to this date, and what are the years and dates in which these persons became members or ceased to be so?

Mr. HAZEN :

1. John Sharples, E. Giroux, Victor Chateauvert, Arthur J. Turcotte, Felix Corbray.
2. J. B. Laliberté appointed 3rd Oct., 1896, appointment cancelled 21st Nov., 1911 ; Narcisse Rioux appointed 3rd Oct., 1896, deceased 1st January, 1907 ; Dosithee Arcand appointed 3rd Oct., 1896, resigned June, 1910 ; Harold Kennedy appointed 3rd Oct., 1896, resigned 1st August, 1907 ; Wm. M. Macpherson appointed 3rd Oct., 1896; Roger Larue appointed 19th January, 1907, cancelled 21st Nov., 1911 ; J. S. Thom appointed 31st Aug., 1907 ; Geo. Tanguay appointed 29th June, 1910, cancelled 21st Nov., 1911.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. LACHANCE :

1. Does the government intend to reorganize the Harbour Commission of Quebec in the same manner as that of the Montreal Harbour?
2. If so, how many members will comprise this commission and when will the government so reorganize it?

Mr. HAZEN :

1 and 2. The matter is receiving the consideration of the government.

MILITIA DEPARTMENT CIVIL ENGINEERS.

Mr. LACHANCE :

Does the government intend to recall the company of civil engineers stationed at Quebec, for the works of the Militia Department, and to entrust the execution of these works to the contractors and workmen of Quebec?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no such company in Quebec.

MR. EMILE DUMELONG.

Mr. SEGUIN :

1. Has Emile Dumelong, postmaster at L'Assomption, been removed?
2. If so, at whose request and what are the reasons for his removal?
3. Who has been appointed to replace him and on whose recommendation?

Mr. PELLETIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman to make his question clearer. According to the English version it is the postmaster, and according to the French version it is the caretaker of the post office he asked about. I would like to know which he means.

REGINA ARMOURY AND DRILL HALL.

Mr MARTIN (Regina):

Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the erection of an armoury and drill Hall at the city of Regina according to plans and specifications on file in the Public Works Department?

Mr. PELLETIER. No. The plans and specifications on file in the department are not suitable for the needs of an important centre such as Regina. New and more adequate plans are being prepared.

MANITOBA QUESTIONS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. NESBITT. I desire to point out to the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) that his reply to the third part of the question that I asked yesterday, reported at page 545 of 'Hansard,' is not an answer to the question asked.

Mr. BORDEN. I will look over the question again. I am sorry if I have not been able to grasp the hon. gentleman's question. I will look over it again and see if any further answer can be given.

CARETAKER OF PUBLIC BUILDING AT CANSO, N.S.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I ask permission to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) to a complaint I have received from Canso, N.S., about the dismissal of the caretaker of the public building in that place. It is reported to me that the caretaker has been dismissed without any investigation or notice. He has simply been asked——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SINCLAIR—to walk out of the building——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think this is the proper time to introduce any question of controversy or to make utterances that would call for discussion. But a simple question on any important and urgent matter would be in order.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I simply want to ask the Minister of Public Works, after stating the facts to him, if he would be so kind as to consider the question of giving this man an investigation. That is my purpose in mentioning the matter now; I did not rise for the purpose of criticising what has been done. The man says that he has not done anything——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SINCLAIR—and he thinks he has the right to an investigation.

Mr. MONK. I do not know the facts. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair), has any representations to make, they will be taken into consideration. And, in regard to the facts, it would be better to put a question on the Order Paper, for then we could get the facts precisely. and give a proper answer.

BILLS STANDING IN MR. LANCASTER'S NAME.

On the order being called: Second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Marriage Act—Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. LENNOX. I am requested by the mover of this Bill. who is the mover also of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Dominion Elections Act and Bill (No. 5) to amend the Railway Act, to state that he is unable to be here to-day through illness, being confined to his house. He requests that these Bills be allowed to stand.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers, telegrams, letters, &c., between the Postmaster General and any other person respecting the closing or removal of the present post office at Spry Bay, Halifax county.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a detailed statement of the expenses incurred and paid for the Exposition at Paris in 1900, under the title of payments of the Colonial Committee for space, &c., $87,000 (see report of the Auditor General, 1899, D—15.—Mr. Paquet.

For a copy of all documents, &c., necessary to bring up to date the statement regarding the matters covered by sessional paper 109 of the session of 1910-1911 in reference to Canadian-Australian trade.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all orders in council, petitions, telegrams, letters, agreements, correspondence and all other documents generally in connection with the proposed branch line or lines of railway to connect Montreal with the National Transcontinental railway.—Mr. Lapointe (Montreal).

LUMBER DUTIES—INTERPRETATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw) moved:

For a copy of all papers, telegrams, reports and other documents in connection with the interpretation and enforcement of the duties on lumber, together with a copy of all instructions or other communications addressed by circular or otherwise to collectors of customs, and a copy of any minute or minutes or rulings or decisions of the Board of Customs.

Mr. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs). I assume that the hon. member (Mr. Knowles), does not wish to go back over a period of years. If he wishes to cover only the present year, would he agree to add the words 'during the year 1911'?

Mr. KNOWLES. That would be all right.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLES. The House has had the pleasure and the profit of listening for a great many days to discussions of matters national, economical, and political in their nature. I desire to call the attention of the government and the House this afternoon to a question which is a very practical one, a question which means dollars, especially to the people of the prairie provinces who are so directly

affected in pocket by any change, either up or down, in the duties on lumber. We were surprised to learn, after this government had been in office a few days. that they had acceded to the request, had gone down under the pressure of the lumber combine, and had given to its representatives such a sympathetic audience when they came to Ottawa to present their views that they issued some sort of instructions to collectors to the effect that there should be a more strict interpretation—that is an interpretation more unfavourable from the consumer's point of view—of the classification of lumber coming into this country.

It is to ascertain exactly the conditions so far as the records of the department will show them, that I took up the time of the House this afternoon to make my motion. I will read first a paragraph from the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' which I am sure will command the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), of date the 10th October. And to give it further validity and authority, it has on the front page almost a life-size portrait of the Minister of the Interior. On page 10, if any person cares to look, he will find the following account of a meeting of the lumber combine in the city of Calgary on the 9th of October. After I have read it I think you will agree that I would be justified in saying that there has never been given to the press of Canada an announcement, or a report of a meeting of a great financial concern, containing a more brazen or flagrant proposition than that I am now about to read. It is headed 'Coast Mountain Lumber Mills to Close Until 1913'.

Camps in B.C. will be abandoned, and 200 travellers dismissed.

Calgary, Oct. 9.—Far reaching changes were decided on at the conference held in Calgary over the week-end by the members of the Coast Mountain Lumbermen's Association. It was decided among the members that they would close down a large number of their mills this coming season, and in some of the Mountain mills not a wheel will turn until 1913. Horses are to be sold off, camps will be abandoned, and generally the lumbermen will mark time for about a year.

Only One Selling Agency.

Another important change which was agreed upon was that the lumber at present in stock in the various mills will be sold through one office, to be located in Calgary.

Possibly the Mountain and Coast Associations would have separate offices, but there will not be more than two selling agencies at the outside.

It is said that the dealers and mills are all pretty well stocked, and the idea in selling through one office is that the mills will get cleaned out of their surplus lines.

As the business has been conducted for the past year there has been some cutting in prices. If a mill had a large stock of one particular line on hand it would tell its travellers to make a cut of from $1 to $3 a thousand on this particular article.

All Competition Removed.

Under the present arrangement all competition is to be removed. The dealers can only buy from the head office in Calgary and only at one price. The effect of the new arrangement will also be to bring all the mills into the association.

It can easily be seen that independent owners will not have any chance against the members of the association, which would put the lumber in at a cut price and put the independent man out of business in short order.

The trade for the past year has been somewhat annoyed by the encroachment of the American mills. It was decided at the meeting Saturday that the association would meet all cuts that the Americans might make, and put them out of business at all costs.

Flings Lumber Travellers Out.

In the meantime an effort will be made to have the government put a duty on American lumber that will give them protection in the rough lines of lumber in which they have to meet the keenest competition at present.

As a result of the placing of the lumber from one office alone, there will be nearly 200 lumber travellers out of employment.

The individual salesman that the millmen had on the road will now be out of employment, as it is anticipated that through the new arrangements probably 10 or a dozen travellers will be able to handle all these orders.

Those in close touch with the lumber business say that there is not likely to be any advance in the prices of lumber until next spring at least.

Dealers Yards Cleared.

It is not known whether there will be even then, but it is reasonable to suppose that when the dealers yards are fairly cleared and the mills have their surplus stock disposed of, there will be another meeting of the Association and a new price will be set for some at least of their output.

I think if the House has followed what I have read, they will agree that the press of Canada has scarcely ever had the duty to report to the people a more glaring and flagrant case of a confessed combine than that which I have just read, even if they did not mix up the name of this present government with it. They make it a part of their business not only to announce this as a combine, but at the same time to say that they are coming to Ottawa to get further protection. I think it would be the duty of the government, especially of the Minister of the Interior, who has no doubt the duty of guarding the rights of the great mass of homesteaders and farmers in the northwest, to look into this matter and see what this combine really means, and what steps can be taken to end it. Our friends in the lumber combines are, of course, practically all British Columbia men, in fact I think I am within the mark in saying they are all British Columbia men. The province of British Columbia has great claims on this government, the combines have great claims on this gov-

ernment, and I have no doubt the lumbermen's combines supported this government almost to a man. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) knows nothing about combines. But he was not long a member of the government until he found this government approached by a combine which succeeded in getting the sympathetic attention of this government, which has granted their request; and now at least he should have some knowledge of combines if he never had before. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, and those who were in the parliament before last will recollect that we had a very full investigation into the matter of lumber combines. That investigation was initiated from the then opposition side, and was supported from the government side. Mr. John Herron, then member for Alberta, made representations before this House, asking that a special committee be appointed to make an investigation to see whether there really was a lumber combine. The Hon. Thos. Greenway was chairman of that committee, other gentlemen were chosen to act upon it, some from the mountain district, like Mr. Sloan and Mr. Galliher, who then represented Comox-Atlin and Kootenay respectively. Men were chosen to represent the consumers on that committee, I was a member of the committee myself. We examined many witnesses, and made a report to parliament, which report was adopted, that there was a combine in that business. I propose to read some remarks made by hon. gentlemen then supporting the opposition, with regard to this question. First, I will read from 'Hansard' of 1906-7, page 1816, where Mr. Herron made these remarks:

The people of that country believe that a combination exists between the manufacturers of lumber of such a nature that it comes under the Criminal Code of 1892 of which section 516 reads as follows:

Mr. Herron then read that section and proceeded:

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the lumber business today is in the hands of a combination of such a character as to bring it under the provisions of the law I have just read.

Mr. McCarthy, who was then representing Calgary, said on page 1820:

There is no doubt that there exists in that country today a combine, or combination, or association of gentlemen who have their heads together in that business to keep prices up and keep competition down.

Mr. Lake, then representing Qu'Appelle, said, on page 1828, after reading evidence in a certain case:

It seems to me that that surely was sufficient proof of the existence of a combine in regard to price.

My hon. friend the present Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) spoke on that occasion, on page 1835:

If, therefore, there is anything that unduly enhances the price to the consumer, if by reason of the millmen taking advantage of this great demand, or by reason of an illegitimate combination in that trade, or by any other illegitimate cause, the price is increased, then it is not at all surprising that there is a very great outcry against the price charged to the consumer, and that an investigation is demanded at the hands of this parliament.

On that occasion I myself shared the views uttered by those hon. gentlemen, and I believe they were single minded in what they had to say; I shared the view of the committee which had made the report. I wish to read one paragraph from the report of that committee, taken from the 'Journals of the House,' volume 42, 1906-7:

Your committee find that there has existed for some years past and still exists an association known as 'The Western Retail Lumbermen's Association.' This association included all three provinces until recently when the dealers of Alberta formed a similar association of their own called 'The Alberta Lumber Dealers Association.' These two associations amount, in the opinion of your committee, to a combination, and the objects and results of the operations of these two associations have been to unduly enhance the said prices as appears from the price lists themselves and the bylaws, minute books and correspondence and evidence of witnesses in regard to the said operations.

That report was accepted and adopted by the House. It is to me a matter of regret that one of the very first steps of this government, when they came into power, was to give an encouraging hand to that combination that had been found by a committee of this House, as shown in this report, to exist; and that report, remember, was adopted as the voice of this House. I say I regret that one of the very first things which this government did was to encourage and strengthen the hands of that combination, that was found to be acting contrary to the Criminal Code. The Alberta government, after that report came out, proceeded to take criminal action against the men who were in that combine. I am not at the present moment aware how many prosecutions were taken; but I do know the matter was taken before the criminal courts of Saskatchewan, and they found the men guilty of an infraction of that clause in the criminal code, and those men were penalized. Being a member of that committee myself, and having lived in the west, I know that the Lumbermens' Association and combine would take the last ox away from the homesteader, they would take his store out of his house if they could, they have no heart; and I think little of this government for having been in such a rush to strengthen that monopoly, when they have it in their power to check it. The old government made a certain interpretation of this clause

with regard to lumber. I will read the clause, it is number 504 in the tariff :

The following are free: planks, boards and other lumber of wood sawn, split, cut and dressed on one side only but not further manufactured.

Our friends the Lumber Manufacturers' Association had their meeting in the city of Calgary, as I have read, the very day this government was sworn in. Knowing their friends were in power they said to themselves : 'The new government will strengthen our hands,' and immediately they decided to close up their mills. A great many mills, the 'Telegram' tells us, would not have a wheel turned in them until 1913, a great many more had sold their horses, a great many more had reduced their stocks, there was a desire to minimize and to lessen the supply, one of the first acts of a man who wants to have a combine and a monopoly on the poor public. Not only would they do that, but they would lessen the field of competition. They said to themselves : 'Our friends are in power at Ottawa, and we will hie down to that city and see if we cannot keep out competition from the United States.' As the 'Telegram' says in the article I have read, American competition was keen, and my constituents and the homesteaders generally of the three provinces got the benefit of that. Now I am enough of a free trader to think that we Canadians ought to get the benefit of a lower tariff, not only by avoiding an increase of the tariff but in obtaining a reduction of the price. Why should the farmers of the Northwest not get the benefit of a reduction in the price of lumber that comes in from the United States? Because there is no doubt that if that lumber did not come in prices would be raised to the consumers of the Northwest. We find that in five months there were imported from the United States lumber to the value of $2,033,620—I have not the returns for the whole year, but only of five months. But supposing that return covered half a year, at the same rate that would make about $5,000,000 worth for the whole year. Now 25 per cent of $5,000,000 is a pretty penny to some people. And not only will they have to pay that in one year, but they will have to pay an enhanced price on what the lumbermen will put on their backs afterwards. This afternoon I have the honour of standing face to face with gentlemen whose cry has been : 'Let well enough alone.' Could not this government let the poor homesteaders and the consumers alone? If they did not reduce the burden of taxation, could they not at least refrain from placing a still greater burden upon them by making them pay increased prices on their lumber ? 'Let well enough alone,' they said. Another cry of theirs was : 'Let us keep our resources for ourselves, let us keep out the Americans lest they come in and hew down our own resources.' My idea would be that we should allow the American resources to come in for the benefit of our western farmers, and get all the lumber we can from the United States, so long as we can get it cheaper than our own lumber costs, while at the same time we should be husbanding our own resources in the shape of lumber. There is nothing more essential in our country than lumber. No man has a riding more typical of that new country than myself. In my riding the population has increased three times in the last four years, practically all rural. My constituency extends 175 miles north and south, with only one railway through the middle of it. During my election I spent practically all my time in the remote parts distant from that railway. Many of the homesteaders have to draw their lumber and their supplies forty or fifty miles, or more, and the greatest burden they have to bear is in regard to lumber. Many of them, good, honest Canadians, have to live in sod shacks because they cannot afford to buy the lumber. It will be bad news to them to learn the announcement that practically one of the first things this government did was to lend a sympathetic ear to the lumber combines. Our friends will say that they have not changed the tariff. Of course they have not, they have not had a chance to do it, but goodness knows what they will do unless we put up some kind of a protest on behalf of our constituents.

But, I will tell you what they have done, in so far as they have the power; they have laid an additional burden on the homesteader. I have no doubt they will say that they have not changed anything. I would think more of them if they would come out and say that they have changed it, and if they would take the responsibility for having done it. Their friends, the manufacturers' combine, came here and got something, and they went away triumphant and successful. I do not want to use the word cowardly, but it was done in a subtle way; they were not brave enough to come out and say: Yes, we want to protect our friends, but in this subtle, underhand way they pretend that they have not changed anything. I would think a great deal more of them if they would come out and say: Yes, we are going to protect our friends, and we are willing to take the responsibility for doing so. Their friends came, they piped and the Conservative party, with the big interest behind them, danced. The manufacturers had been down here before during my short life in parliament, and they had made requests to the government. Many and many a time have I met the manufacturers of British Columbia. I do not know any men who sought protection

more than they did, and I do not know any who met with a firmer refusal, from my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition and Mr. Fielding, then Minister of Finance, than did these gentlemen every time they came here. As a member representing probably 90,000 constituents who must purchase this raw material in any event at a high cost I enter my protest against any steps, whether they be subtle, or whether they be above board, which will result in granting greater protection to these combinesters, and which will also result in placing greater burdens on those whom I am honoured to call my constituents.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say at the outset that I have no objection whatever to the passing of this motion, and will be glad to bring down the papers as soon as the department can have them ready. I would say that the government have not changed the tariff or done anything in any way, shape or form.

Mr. KNOWLES. They cannot change it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit they cannot change it, and the hon. gentleman knows it. What surprises me is that the hon. gentleman admits that there has been a combine in lumber not only now but for several years, and he has never taken any action to have that combine dissolved.

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not admit that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Let me say what did happen, and what the position of affairs is so far as I can remember it without having the papers before me. It is true that a deputation of lumbermen from British Columbia did come to Ottawa and interviewed me with respect to lumber coming into this country. They called my attention to item 504 of the customs tariff which reads:

Planks, boards and other lumber of wood, sawn, split or cut, and dressed on one side only, but not further manufactured, free.

There could not be any possible dispute about that and they did not ask for any change or that any new interpretation be placed upon that item. The next item was:

505. Sawn boards, planks and deals planed or dressed on one or both sides when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, 25 per cent.

You will observe that the item reads 'when planed or dressed on one or both sides.' If the lumber were planed on two sides or on what is called the edge and the flat side, it would be entitled to pay duty as specified in the item. I do not think that any hon. member will dispute that fact. But, in so far as I was concerned as representing the department, I would not even take the responsibility of interpreting that item. I found in the Customs Act that had been placed on the statute-book by the government that was in power in 1907, a provision that if there was any possible doubt in the minister's mind in interpreting an item the matter could be referred to the Board of Customs. The Minister of Customs at that time had appointed a Board of Customs, and he was, therefore, at liberty to refer any question to the Board of Customs whose decision would be final. My predecessor appointed this Board of Customs. The members of it were his appointees, not mine, because the same Board of Customs is still in existence. I have not changed the Board of Customs. Rather than assume the responsibility I referred this question to the Board of Customs, and they unanimously decided that lumber planed on two sides must pay the duty. Those who asked for this interpretation produced it before the Board of Customs. It was shown that there were parties importing cargoes or shipments of lumber, planed on one side only and, mixed with it lumber planed on two sides, and endeavouring in this way to escape the payment of the duty. The orders that the Customs Department gave to all customs collectors were that they should examine the carloads of lumber, that where lumber was not planed on two sides it was to come in free, but that any importer who tried to violate the law by smuggling in lumber that was planed on two sides should pay duty. We could not do anything else than that. The law was put there by our predecessors, and there was nothing for the Customs Department to do but simply to carry out the law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carry it out as your predecessors did.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Carry it out as our predecessor's did.

Mr. LENNOX. As our predecessors ought.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If there was smuggling going on before we came into power it was the duty of this government to prevent it. If my predecessor did not prevent smuggling or if he winked at it he was not fit for the office that he held. If it is brought to my attention that some person is smuggling or violating the law, I will not allow it to go on, because I shall insist that every person shall pay the proper duty on that which he imports.

Mr. KNOWLES. Was not the matter brought to my hon. friend's attention that the edge was being sawed with a fine saw, or practically a plane, and afterwards roughed? That is as I understand it. I have seen the sample's in the department. The allegation of the combine, as I understand it, is that the lumber has been trued up on one edge and then roughed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the lumber that comes into this country is sawn on

three sides and planed on one side it comes in free. I know what the hon. gentleman means. They have probably sawed the lumber over to try and take the planing off, but have left some of the planing on. If the lumber comes in sawn with a fine saw, or anything else, it comes in free. Will the hon. gentleman tell me where there is any difference from the condition that existed before?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, it makes a difference of about $12,000,000 a year to the west.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman suggests that we have changed the interpretation of the clause. There is no change whatever; unless the lumber shows that it was planed on more than one side it comes in free.

Mr. KNOWLES. The interpretation of the department is going to be this, that they are going to do a kind of detective work for the combine, and I will tell the hon. gentleman how.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could decide. He has asked a question, perhaps he could look after his own business. The point is that it matters not how the condition is arrived at, the combines say they will inquire how that state is arrived at, and if they conclude it ever had been planed and afterwards roughed, it will be the same as planed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman perhaps knows more about the department than I do. If the lumber comes in here sawn on three sides there is no doubt about it coming in free, but if it comes in planed on more than one side there certainly is a duty on that lumber. I do not think there is any doubt that it should come under this item. I am surprised that the hon. member who has been in this House for some time did not take this matter up before and deal with it in so far as the combines are concerned. There was a way of dealing with the combines during the last three or four years while he was a member of this House but he has never taken any steps. I feel myself that the protection put on that kind of lumber is pretty high for the farmers of the west, but the hon. member never moved in the House that the item of 25 per cent on lumber be reduced. The hon. member knows that the farmers of the west have paid a great deal of money for duties under that very same item of 25 per cent in the last three or four years, yet he never made a motion in this House that the duty under item 507 be reduced or removed. He was willing to have the farmers in the west pay the duty until there was a change of government when he could make it appear that this government had made a change. I want to tell the hon. gentleman and the farmers in the west that there has not been any change whatever or any other interpretation placed on the items in the tariff by this government or the Customs Department or any member of this government since we came into power, and we shall give the farmers in the west every advantage we can under the tariff; but if the hon. member is willing to admit here that my predecessor in office winked at smuggling into this country, and was willing to see the laws violated. While I fill the office of Minister of Customs, I shall see that the law is carried out even although the statute was made by my predecessor.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). The Minister of Customs has given to the House exactly the answer to the remark of my hon. friend that we all expected he would give. The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has demonstrated that there has been a different interpretation put upon item 504 of the tariff law than what was put upon it by the late government. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs tells us that when this matter was brought to his attention by the lumbermen of British Columbia he would not take on himself the responsibility of deciding whether or not the late government had placed the proper interpretation upon the statute, but he turned this matter over to his Board of Customs, the same Board of Customs that held office under the late government. But he did not undertake to explain how that Board of Customs—because this matter was undoubtedly brought to their attention again and again by the lumbermen of British Columbia in days gone by—after his few weeks of office could give a certain interpretation when they had given a different interpretation for a great many years, and when, in accordance with their interpretation, the practice of the late government was to permit certain kinds of lumber to come in free. If there is any explanation of that change of view on the part of the Board of Customs the difference must have been brought about by the realization of who their new masters were, and in that event possibly those gentlemen who constitute that Board of Customs were following out the first law of nature, which is self-preservation.

My hon. friend (Mr. Reid) charges my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) with never having done anything to protect the western farmers and homesteaders from excessive prices for lumber. Evidently he was not listening to the remarks of my hon. friend when he mentioned that in 1906-7 a committee of this House was appointed to investigate the lumber combines

operating in the western prairies, and that as a result of the finding of that committee the governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta—I do not know about Manitoba—took action under the findings of that committee so that the combines were broken up and the men who formed those combines were penalized under the law.

I cannot see how the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) is going to expect that this House or the country or the men of the west who have to buy lumber at high prices, and who will have to pay higher prices if this new interpretation of this item of the tariff is allowed to stand, can justify himself by the very inadequate excuses that he has given to-day for the change in the manner of dealing with this lumber that hitherto has come in free from the United States of America. If I cannot say anything that will appeal to the Minister of Customs to continue this interpretation, which he himself must admit was in the interests and to the benefit of the men of the west who have to pay high prices for lumber, I shall have to turn my attention to the hon. gentleman who represents the west in the present government, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) who, I am sorry to say, has just left his seat. We in the west look to that hon. gentleman to protect the interests of the western farmer, seeing that he is, par excellence, the man in the cabinet representing western interests. We know that he has great sympathy for the men who toil and labour as evidence the spontaneity with which he offers his services whenever we have any strikes or labour troubles in the West—in fact so well has he taken this part in the past that he has almost come to be known as the professional peacemaker in these difficulties. We look to the Minister of the Interior to use his influence with the Minister of Customs to see that the same classes of lumber that came in free under the late administration will still continue to come in free in the interest of the farmer and homesteader of the west. My hon. friend from Moosejaw has mentioned the very great cost of lumber in the west. That is something that is known to every man from Lake Superior westward, and this item permitting certain kinds of lumber to come in free, as my hon. friend from Moosejaw has pointed out, has in the past been of very great benefit to the consumer of lumber in our western provinces. For that reason I would again urge upon the Minister of Customs that he go over this matter once again carefully with his Board of Customs and find out from that Board if it is not possible for them to give the same interpretation of the statute under the present government as it gave under the government that has just left office.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. gentleman give the House an instance in which a different interpretation was put on the law by the Board of Customs to that now put on it?

Mr. NEELY. As I understood the remarks of the minister, they answered my hon. friend's question.

Mr. MEIGHEN. He said there was no difference of interpretation.

Mr. NEELY. There is a difference in the practice, and no one has said that the late Minister of Customs went contrary to the advice of his Board of Customs in this matter.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It was never admitted.

Mr. NEELY. The late Minister of Customs must have had more confidence in his judgment in these matters than the present minister. I say the practice has changed, because on this classe of lumber duties were not collected under the late minister. The matter was undoubtedly brought to his attention, and the Minister of Customs said he had never submitted it to the Board of Customs. He took the responsibility upon himself. He must have known that the statute could be so interpreted as to be a benefit to the homesteader of the west; but my hon. friend, although responsible for his department, will not take that responsibility. He will rather give all the benefit that can possibly be derived from any interpretation of the statute to the lumber combines, who are now going to bleed the farmers an extra $2 a thousand. Now, I am free to say that when this matter was first brought to my attention, it caused very grave feelings of alarm within me. It seemed to me, Sir, that the electorate of Canada were just getting the first taste of that medicine for which they voted on the 21st of September, and I am afraid that if the present protest is not heeded by the government, there is many another and probably much more bitter dose in store for the electors of Canada from the present administration.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it is a pleasure to every person, on this side of the House at least, to witness the maiden efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite at bearding the lions in their path, even though in this case the lion be only a wooden one. I thought, when the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution brought it up, that he did so in ignorance of the facts, and that he would be well advised to wait for the return for which he asked before he offered his remarks to the House. But I learned from the questions which he addressed to the minister

during the course of the minister's reply that he had seen the departmental correspondence connected with this matter and was fully posted on the subject.

Mr. KNOWLES. I never saw any of the correspondence. I saw merely the samples of lumber.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman had seen the correspondence, or had made the most elementary inquiries as to the facts surrounding this matter, I doubt if he would have been standing in this House to-day as a champion of smuggling. My special interest in this matter is that I represent perhaps the principal lumbering constituency in British Columbia, the one more than any other affected by the smuggling operations which were carried on, as I believe, with the knowledge and consent of the late administration. I visited the department to verify my belief in that respect, and although I had been informed from sources that seemed to me authoritative and trustworthy that strong remonstrances had been made to the department from several quarters as to the extent of this smuggling and as to the desirability of doing something with respect to it; nothing of that correspondence appeared on the files of the department. I learned from my inquiries that so far from the Board of Customs having given under the late government a decision which they since have been so mean-spirited, as the hon. member for Humboldt has suggested, as to reverse, there is no warrant whatever for reflection on a body of men whom we must regard as honourable servants of the public; but, contrary to what we might have expected, in view of the strong remonstrances addressed to the former Minister of Customs, that gentleman preferred to treat this as a purely political affair, and never referred it to the Board of Customs, who might have given him an authoritative and expert opinion on the matter. Now, so far from this matter having originated in trusts or combines, the origin of the protest made to the government was the desire to protect the labouring men who produce the lumber in British Columbia that would be sold to the consumers in the Northwest Territories if they were not purchasing the lumber smuggled from the United States, as these gentlemen must know; because these representatives from the Northwest Territories who have been offended by the decision of the Customs Department to put a stop to the smuggling, if smuggling it be, must have had their information not from any aggrieved consumer, but from the representatives of the American lumber dealers throughout the territories. It is well known that these dealers have been trying very hard to secure by any means whatever a champion of the operations they have been carrying on; and if my hon. friends opposite had learned the facts from them, they would have known that the smuggled lumber——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Why does my hon. friend call that smuggled lumber? Because no duties were paid when the department decided that such importations were duty free, it does not necessarily follow that such importations were smuggled, and I think it unfair for the hon. gentleman to use that term in that sense, and he should withdraw it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry to offend the hon. gentleman's keen sense of propriety on behalf of those for whom he speaks by referring to what I must still regard as the smuggling of lumber. So far from the ruling which is the subject of discussion to-day affecting in a material degree the toal lumber consumption in the Northwest Territories, I will read to the House the figures to show what a small proportion of the total consumption is affected, indicating that there must be some other reason than the protests of the consumers, who have hardly had time yet to be heard from. The figures which I will read show the relative proportions of the lumber brought into Canada rightly free and that brought in free because it was smuggled under a description which it was not entitled to bear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why does my hon. friend refer to it as smuggled?

Mr. TAYLOR. I call it smuggled because it was passed through the customs house fraudulently under a description to which it was not entitled. For instance, if, in my business, I imported paper subject to duty and entered it at the customs under a description entitled to come in free, and if anyone were to lay information with the nearest collector of customs, that collector would come to my office and examine the paper, and if he found it dutiable he would confiscate it and fine me. In connection with this lumber, the attention of the government was called to these frauds by its own officers. The government was informed that this lumber was entered under a false description, and no doubt these officers did ask instructions as to whether they should follow up that lumber and make those who wrongly imported it pay the penalty prescribed by law. Nothing, however, was done, and I am compelled to believe that the late government exercised political rather than technical customs jurisdiction. They certainly took no steps to put a stop to this fraudulent practice. In 1910-11, the quantity of lumber properly brought in free from the United States had risen from 77,000,000 feet, the import of the previous

year, to 183,000,000 feet, and in the same year the quantity improperly entered had risen from 7,000,000 feet to 17,000,000 feet. In the following year, while the lumber properly entered diminished to 147,000,000 feet, the lumber improperly entered had increased from 7,000,000 feet in the whole of the preceding year to 21,000,000 feet in five months of this year. So you will see that if those who were injuriously affected by the importations of this lumber took resolute steps to see that the attention of the government was called to it in a way that could not be disregarded, it was not necessarily because of any change in the government, but because of a realization of the rapid proportion in which these wrong importations were being multiplied. But in the end we have for this year—the year regarding which hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken and made so much protest on behalf of the consumers—in five months 147,000,000 feet of free lumber which, under every interpretation, must continue to be free, and only 21,000,000 feet of dutiable lumber imported in evasion of the duty.

Mr. KNOWLES. Where does the hon gentleman get his authority for the figures of this improper importation?

Mr. TAYLOR. I might ask my hon. friend whether he disputes the figures?

Mr. KNOWLES. No, I do not. I am an agnostic on that point.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am giving these figures on my responsibility as a member, and have every reason to believe that they are correct. So far from this being an accident or anything else than the plain evasion of the law, one has only to go across to the American side and remain a day in any lumber centre to find out how this evasion of our custom laws is practised. We on the Canadian side are a laughing stock to the lumbermen on the American side. The American lumberman will refer, with a broad grin, to what they call the Canadian planer, which is a planer that gives a rough sawn effect to lumber which is really jointed and planed. With their usual shrewdness and enterprise the Americans have made what is known as Canadian planer, which is a planer that joints the lumber in such a way that it appears to be rough sawn and thereby comes in free contrary to our customs law. This practice is notorious south of the border and they pretended to no concealment, simply because they relied on the protection afforded by the Canadian government, and did not realize that that protection which was given them in early September might be taken away by the changed conditions in October or November. But while those who were improperly sending lumber into Canada were making their gibes against us, we were gathering material to proceed against them whenever we could get a government which would administer the customs law free from politcal considerations. I think we have such a government now. It was my duty and pleasure to come to Ottawa with this delegation alleged to be representatives of this huge combine. As to the combine, I know nothing. I am not the servant of any combine. I have no retainer to work for them nor have I been offered any from any person profiting by operations in lumber, legal or illegal. I came here in pursuance of my duty to protect the livelihood of the large number of lumber workmen in my constituency in British Columbia, who, if these importations had continued—importations amounting at the time of our protest to about 50 car loads per day—would have been deprived of perhaps two months work during the dull winter season.

These two months' work they now look forward to, because this government has been sufficiently alive to its responsibility to order that the provisons of the customs law shall be carried out. I might explain further that a proper enforcement of our customs law would not injure the consumer in any way. Let me point out that the price of lumber in the northwest territories has been kept up, not by the Canadian manufacturers, to whom my hon. friend referred this afternoon, but by the American selling agents, the men for whom he has so tender an affection, who have a combine of their own, and have been holding up this lumber which they have been allowed to bring into this country free of duty, to the full price of the lumber of similar grades produced by our Canadian mills. So that, as I have said, the consumer has not received any benefit from this evasion of our customs law.

But, apart from this, the minister was offered a guarantee—not necessary or not called for, and not exacted as I am glad to say, for I think that to exact a guarantee would have been to imply a weakness, a want of decision as to the real meaning of the law which did not, and should not exist. However, on behalf of the manufacturers of lumber and on behalf of their employees, the guarantee was offered from mills turning out to the extent of three million feet per day, that no increase in price would follow the request made to the government. Now, in view of that, we can see how flimsy is the pretext that any person in the Northwest territories has been or is likely to be, injured by this operation;—no person, that is, except the American lumber dealers who have a combine, and who are at the back of any protests which have been made against the ruling of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, I think that a very great deal of importance is to be attached to what I hope will be the short debate in which we are engaged. A great deal that fell from the lips of my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has been justified by the course the debate has taken. He said, and very truly, that this government owed a great deal to British Columbia— it owed a 'plumper'. Of course, one would naturally expect, in that case, evidence forthcoming that the government was grateful to British Columbia. My hon. friend traced that gratitude in their action in regard to this interpretation of the customs and this method of collecting the duty. And, in due course, of course, my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Taylor), in his turn, is put up to defend the government.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Michael Clark) to withdraw that.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has just made a speech; perhaps he will allow me my turn; perhaps he does not want to make both my speech and his own.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled to have that statement withdrawn—'that I was "put up to defend the government"'.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) should accept the denial of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). In using the term 'put up' I used a phrase with which I have been familiar ever since I could read the English language, a phrase that is used in every discussion which one reads in an old country paper on parliamentary debate. As a matter of fact, we know that every member of the House speaks more or less in consultation with his leader whether he be on the government, or on the opposition side of the House. But, if my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) prefers it, I will say, he got up. And according to my particular way of looking at things, he incurs the greater guilt in that respect, in that he is a voluntary defender of combines.

Now, Sir, I am not surprised at the course of events in this matter. In my own contest, I pointed out to the electors in various parts of my riding that one thing would follow the defeat of the Laurier government, and that was the defeat of reciprocity. But I told these electors also: You will be under a very great mistake if you think that things will remain as they were; something more will happen and happen very speedily. And in that connection I quoted speeches delivered by Conservative candidates in British Columbia, in which speeches it was clearly enunciated that when our commissioners went to Washington what they should have done was not to endeavour to get the duty taken off lumber going into the United States, but to get a duty put on lumber coming into Canada for the protection of the lumber of British Columbia. I warned them of that, and they accepted the warning; they were frightened that things would go in that direction. From the paragraph in the 'Daily Telegram' of Winnipeg which has been read in the House, it seems that I am likely to be, in this case, only too successful a prophet.

My hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Taylor) has defended the government. He has denied that there is a combine. That may go for what it is worth; he has, at any rate, defended the new interpretation. I wish some of the hon. gentlemen from Manitoba who have been so much interested in tariff matters in past years in this House had got up to say something on this matter. I should have liked to hear something about the views of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). Doubtless he is reserving his low tariff sentiment to resume his excellent efforts in the direction of free agricultural implements.

Now, the question before the House has an important bearing upon the statement with which one has been deafened throughout Canada for years past. The electors have been told, all over the west, that there is no difference between the two parties, and that it is all the same old National Policy. Still, at the present moment, it is difficult for one to know whether hon. members on the other side believe that there is a difference or that there is not a difference. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) says that strong remonstrances were made to the late government in favour of an interpretation of this matter which would have done—what? Would have raised the price of lumber to the settler in favour of those who produce the lumber. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) on the other hand, said, in so many words, what my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) prophesied he would, that there had been no change whatsoever. Well, it does appear to me that the hon. minister (Mr. Reid) was not the more accurate in the matter; I think my hon. friend from New Westminster is the more accurate. It is very clear that there has been a change in interpretation; and what is of the last importance to the farmer is that there has been a change in absolute fact, in that duties have been collected where they were not collected under the previous government. Now, I am rather surprised that that change should have taken place. For we heard the other day that the victory at the polls on the 21st of September was a victory for sentiment. But there is not

much sentiment about the collection of duties—especially to the person who pays them. There is not much sentiment about increased prices of lumber to the settler——

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar) Have prices been raised to the consumer?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My hon friend (Mr. Sharpe, Lisgar), if he knows anything about tariffs——

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I am asking for facts.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My hon. friend is like a great many other people—he is very anxious for information, and he stands very much in need of it. Let me quote to him, in answer to his question, an authority that, I am sure, he will not dispute—the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster):

He once said in this House that, if you put a duty upon an article, the effect of that duty would be to raise the price of the article by the amount of the duty. That is not the authority of a mere tyro and a free-trader like myself, but the authority of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who knows perhaps as much, if not more, than any one on that side of the House about this particular matter. He went on to say: If it did not raise the price of the article, what would be the good of the duty? I look at it in a little different way. I would say: As it does raise the price, what is the good of the duty, especially to the man who uses the article? The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) put in a plea which was no surprise to me. He did not tell us that we wished to protect the combine, or the manufacturers of lumber—oh, no. Protection is a kind of good Samaritan institution. It is the labourers that he is anxious about. I very well remember reading Henry George's work twenty-five years ago and I was struck at that time with the chapter in which he shows what good Samaritans protectionists are; how they are always trying to protect the poor labouring-man. He said, and said very wisely and truly, that to talk about the poor workingman in that way is to insult him. The workingman whether in this country, or in any other civilized country, and especially in any Anglo-Saxon country, does not need protection; all he needs is fair-play and one of these days the workingmen will stand side by side with the farmers in knowing that they are both victims of this system, and when that time happens there will be short shrift for combines and governments that stand behind them both in Canada and in all other countries of the world.

The point in this whole discussion is this: I think we have elicited the fact, even before the papers are brought down at all, that there has been a change in interpretation, an undoubted change, and that there has been a change in the method of collecting the customs. Duties are collected now where they were not collected previously, and the country is within two months of this government coming into power, finding out that so far from there having been no difference between the two governments as to their tariff policies, the Liberal government and the Liberal party did stand for the farmers and for the consumers, while the present government apparently are going to stand for the combines, the trusts and the mergers by whose influence they were returned to power.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). It is one of the attributes of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that he is able to conceal a paucity of argument, indeed the very absence of fact and reasoning, behind a very skilful and interesting manner and an intense earnestness of countenance which I would I could imitate. With the hon. gentleman's forcefulness of diction he has in the past been able to interest this House to a considerable degree. It is because the skill which he usually exercises is particularly absent from the speech which I have heard this afternoon that I rise to call attention to it now, because, without it, it appears to me that the hon. gentleman would lose the slim chance he has yet of immortality. If I have been able to catch anything of his argument it is that the government now in power is entitled to the censure of parliament, because, forsooth, it collects duties where duties were not collected before. Have I misinterpreted his argument? If I have I would like him to interrupt me.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). That is only half of what I said. I said that they collected duties now because they gave a different interpretation to the law with respect to the way that the lumber is pianed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; take it back.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not mean to suggest what the hon. member (Mr. Clark) said was not true. I say it is not a fact that the Customs Department are collecting duties in a different way from that in which they were collected before.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). That is my understanding of the case.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then the hon. gentleman's argument has two parts, or two halves, as he states it. The first is that

duties are collected now when they were not collected before and hence the government is censurable, and the second is that these duties are collected by virtue of an interpretation now that did not exist before. Three hon. gentlemen have spoken from the opposition benches. Each has been asked to say where there has been a difference in the interpretation and each has failed to point it out. It has not only been denied by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) but it has been shown not to be the fact by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor); so that, at least the second half of the hon. gentleman's speech is based upon pure fiction. What is the first half?—that duties are collected now where they were not collected before and therefore he, the lone champion of free trade, stands up in this House and censures the government. The hon. gentleman would be engaged in as reasonable and just a mission if he would go from one end of Canada to the other and uphold the smuggler from coast to coast. There was not a word that the hon. member for Red Deer uttered that could not be said in defence of the most disreputable smuggler that ever disgraced the shores of Canada. The hon. gentleman says that he would like to ask the hon. member for Portage la Prairie if he is for a low tariff or the lowering of the tariff. This matter has nothing to do with low tariffs or the lowering of tariffs. This matter concerns, as I apprehend it, only the enforcement of the law, and if he wants to know where the hon. member for Portage la Prairie is to be found on that question he will be found behind the enforcement of the law while it is law. If I am convinced, and no one does less to convince me than the hon. member for Red Deer, that it is in the interest of the people of this country to lower the tariff, I want it lowered, not by permitting smuggling, but by plain honest legislation in this House.

The case of the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) stands in this position; he charges that by an interpretation permitted by the old government a large class of lumber came in free which now does not come in free, and he attributes that, or indeed it must be attributed, to one of two causes, the first one being that a different interpretation has been given by the Board of Customs commissioners, or, secondly, that that which was smuggled before is not smuggled now. It is impossible for the ingenuity of man or mind to take another view of the question.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Is smuggling not a defiance of the government of the country? How could smuggling be done by a government?

Mr. MEIGHEN.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Might it not be smuggling by virtue of the compliance or complicity of the Minister of Customs?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). That is not smuggling.

Mr MEIGHEN. I cannot see that smuggling is any less reprehensible when done under the guise of law by virture of a plain misapplication of the law by the Minister of Customs. For instance, if machinery is brought into this country for agricultural purposes, it is subject to a certain duty; if it is brought in for other purposes it is subject to a higher duty.

If my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) is to have his way it would would be a right and proper thing for every importer of machinery in this country to import machinery stating it to be for agricultural purposes when it is not, and thus getting it in at a lower duty. If the Minister of Customs were to give his assistance in that he would conclude that the Minister of Customs was rendering a great service to the cause of free trade. I reject as unworthy a member of this House the imputation that a Board of Customs Commissioners, appointed by this government, or by any government, will alter its interpretation of a plain matter of law or reading at the dictation of any minister and in the face of a pronouncement uncontradicted, not attempted to be contradicted, that there never was any interpretation different from the present interpretation, then I think it becomes the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) to retract their statements.

Mr. KNOWLES. What have I said that I should retract?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member for Moosejaw should retract for this reason that unless he attributes what he complains of as wrong to the improper action of the Board of Commissioners, he has nothing to attribute it to at all. While he does not state it as plainly as the hon. member for Humboldt, he stands on the same footing or on no footing.

Mr. KNOWLES. What will I retract?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Retract the allegation that there has been wrong-doing in the department.

Mr. KNOWLES. I did not make that allegation.

Mr. MEIGHEN. In other words retract his whole speech. There are two ways of reforming legislation. The government now in power, in contradistinction to the government that once was in power, prefers to know the facts before it legislates, and having known the facts it prefers to legislate in the public interest but having

legislated, it is its purpose, as now evidenced, to enforce the law as it stands. The method apparently adopted by the late government was to fix a certain rate of duty, to command their followers to abide by that rate of duty even although there was a combine, and then to allow a band of American speculators or exporters to evade that duty. I know of no method so likely to contribute to the enhancing of a campaign fund, as to place a law on the statute book in a certain form and then illicitly permit that law to be evaded. The question is not what the duty should be, I do not think that question is raised. When the question is raised, I will be prepared to discuss it, and I venture to say that if a motion is made to reduce or to abrogate the duty in any way in this House, it will not be shelved by the present leader of the government, as was a similar motion made by me in the last session by the then leader of the government. I think the hon. leader of the government to-day, (Mr. Borden) will face openly and squarely the question of reduced duty on lumber as he will the question of reduced duty on agricultural implements, and whatever decision is come to will be come to openly and every man will have the right to express his views and after the decision is come to and put on the statute-book, it will be enforced and not evaded.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION—APPOINTMENT OF MR. HAWKES.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton) moved:

For a copy of all orders in council and other papers relating to the appointment of Arthur Hawkes as a special commissioner in the immigration branch of the Interior Department.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution I wish to discuss at some length the subject of immigration generally. I think the House will agree that there is no subject of greater importance to the well being of the country, both present and future, than that of immigration, and it seems to me that the occasion of a change in government is a proper time to take stock of the policy that has prevailed in regard to immigration in the past, so that we may understand clearly any differences in policy introduced by the government that assumes office. The subject of immigration and of immigration effort is something that must be considered in the light of changing circumstances, of existing conditions, and of the conditions of the country which is under consideration. It has for many years been agreed that the immigration policy for Canada should be active and energetic, a policy looking to the securing of a substantial increase in our population. I know that that position has been countered by some of our public men. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, when in opposition, took occasion several times to state a somewhat different view, but notwithstanding that fact it has been in accordance with the settled policy of the people of Canada that there has been an active effort to secure an increase in population by drawing people from other countries,—what is generally spoken of as immigration effort. I need not refer at length to the fact that during many years this policy, while it was always the policy of the government, was not, to any great degree, successful.

The increase of our population which took place in the years from 1867 to 1896 was comparatively small, and it was not until the year 1896 and succeeding years that the policy which had always been the policy of the country was given successful effect to, and the increase of population that had always been hoped for, but until then had never been attained, began to be achieved. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, let it be thoroughly understood that this agressive and active and successful immigration policy which began in 1896 did not involve assisted immigration. The feature of assisted immigration was included in the policy of the preceding government at times; but under the government which took office in 1896 there never was a policy of assisted immigration. The policy was a policy of publicity as to the advantages of Canada and a policy which took due regard of the requirements of the immigrants upon their arrival in Canada, provided for their reception, and as far as possible within reasonable limits for their distribution to the fields which were most suitable for their efforts. For a number of years this policy was pursued, and with a great deal of success. Members of the House who were members in the parliaments of 1896 and 1900 will remember, what my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works reminded them of on occasion, that I took some exception from time to time to the policy of immigration that was then pursued. The point I took was against indiscriminate immigration. I held that no matter how great the need of our country was for people, the need was still greater that the people who were permitted to share with us the advantages of our country should be such people as would be an advantage and not a disadvantage to our citizenship. I need not say that at that time and under the conditions then prevailing, with our vast prairie country remaining vacant, as it had remained vacant for many years, and with eastern Canada standing still for the lack of the development of the western country, my views did not receive favourable consider-

ation. As time went on, the advantages of a vigourous immigration policy came to be thoroughly understood and appreciated. We were able to change the country that had lain in grass during the centuries, that had lain vacant during the decades after it had come under the control of the Canadian government, from a non-producing to a producing country, with the result that what the so-called National Policy had been unable to do for Canada, what the great constructive work of building the Canadian Pacific railway had been unable to do for Canada, was done by an active immigration policy which secured occupation and settlement and cultivation and development of those fertile prairies, to the vast benefit and advantage of every interest in eastern Canada, whether it be industrial, financial, commercial, transportation or any other kind. It was with the development of an active immigration policy, applied if you like especially to western Canada, that Canada found herelf, that Canada began to grow, that Canada began to take the place she now occupies. It will be conceded, Mr. Speaker, that to the success of the immigration policy of the government of Canada a tremendous proportion of the advancement and the success that Canada has achieved must be ascribed, and I am sure that it will interest the House to know that the success of immigration effort, so far from diminishing in recent years, has increased, and increased to a most satisfactory degree. While our immigration in the calendar year of 1897 was 21,700, and in the fiscal year 1904-5 was 146,000, in the year 1910-11, 6 years afterwards, it was 311,000, and in the first six months of the present fiscal year the immigration of British people has been 104,000 as compared with 83,000 in the corresponding six months of last year, an increase of 25 per cent, that of continental Europeans has been 54,000 against 45,000 last year, an increase of nearly 20 per cent, and that from the United States 83,000 against 75,000 last year, an increase of 10 per cent. So that while our immigration, which had reached the high point of nearly 150,000 in the year 1904-05, and had doubled in the year 1910-11, has shown a still further percentage of increase in the first six months of 1911, the fact being that at the end of the administration of the late government the success of immigration effort was at the highest point that it had ever attained in the history of Canada.

I said a little while ago that when our aggressive immigration policy was first entered upon, I took exception to the fact that it was a policy of indiscriminate immigration.

Then I would like to call attention to the fact that although our immigration has doubled in the past six years, that increase has taken place under a policy of restricted and selective immigration, probably more drastic than that imposed by any other country in the world. So that while we have been enabled to secure such an enormous increase to our population, we have been able to secure that increase while insisting on a standard of immigrant such as we never had in Canada before—in recent years at any rate.

Mr. THOBURN. Does the hon. gentleman remember that last session I drew his attention to the negro immigration into our northwest. He speaks of the restrictions placed upon what we might call an inferior class of immigrants, and I would like to know whether anything has been done to stop the negro immigration from the southern states into our Canadian northwest.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps it will serve the hon. gentleman's purpose if I inform him that that immigration has, to all intents and purposes, ceased. I was saying that while we had achieved the greatest success in the volume of our immigration, we had achieved that success under conditions of selection and restriction more drastic than are imposed by any other country in the world, not excepting the United States, whose example has frequently been cited in this House.

I wish to say a word with regard to the bonus system, which has attracted more or less attention and been discussed unfavourably without due consideration of the facts. The bonus system is a means of advertising the advantages of our country and is not in any sense the bonusing of immigrants to come to Canada. That bonus system has been a part of the immigration policy of Canada for a number of years, and I might give the House a few words with regard to it. At one time an arrangement was made with the North Atlantic Trading Company which involved the paying of a five dollar bonus to that company on each immigrant of certain defined classes who landed in Canada from certain specified countries of Continental Europe. At the same time a bonus of $1.75 was paid on every English, French and Belgian immigrant of the same class. That bonus was paid to the booking-agents in those countries who had booked these immigrants to Canada. On taking office and reviewing the situation, it appeared to me that the time had come for paying a greater amount of attention to securing British immigration than had hitherto been paid. In line with that idea and with the view of spending our money in Great Britain rather than on the continent, and of encouraging British rather than continental immigration, we cancelled the contract with the

North Atlantic Trading Company, and increased the bonus on British immigrants to five dollars per head. This five dollars per head paid the booking-agent in Great Britain induced a great deal of activity on the part of those agents, and we had a large increase in our British immigration. In 1904-5, we had 65,000 British immigrants; in 1905-6, we had 86,000; in the nine months of 1906-7, we had 55,000; and in 1907-8, we had 120,000 British immigrants, showing that our bonus system to the booking-agents in Great Britain had produced a very important effect.

This brings me to another feature of our policy. Up to this time our policy had been one of aggressive effort to secure immigration, but we had changed that to some extent so as to restrict our most aggressive efforts to the British isles. But now there came a time when it was necessary to apply the restrictive and selective features which mark the policy in force. It will be remembered that the conditions in Canada in 1907, were what might be called boom conditions, and these were followed by a financial collapse, with the result that while the boom conditions had been a great factor in bringing out an enormous number of immigrants, the financial collapse left those immigrants stranded without employment. Facing the condition that we found to exist, finding that Canada was being used by certain agencies in Great Britain for the disposition of undesirable elements of the population in that country, finding that our demand for labour had diminished, it became necessary to restrict the influx of people, and consequently in December, 1907, a money qualification was imposed upon immigrants. Each immigrant was required to have $50 in his possession.

If he came during the winter months, when spring came it was found that the industrial conditions were still unfavourable and it was necessary to continue the money qualification. The policy became established of a fifty-dollar requirement during the summer months for all immigrants landing in Canada, with certain exceptions. These exceptions include immigrants who are coming to engage in farm labour, female domestic servants coming to employment, and certain relatives of people already resident in Canada. Aside from these special cases, every immigrant landing in Canada is required to have money enough to carry him over the first period of his residence in this country. This restriction, I need hardly say, caused a great deal of adverse comment. It was objected to very strongly by philanthropic societies in the Old Country and by many people of influence and standing there. But from time to time it became evident that it was necessary that Canada should, in her own interest, impose this restriction, and the restriction was accordingly maintained, with the exceptions I have mentioned and some other exceptions made from time to time as occasion arose. In view of the fact that railway construction was proceeding at a very rapid rate in Canada and that there was such a great demand for railway labour, the money requirement was removed, so far as those labourers were concerned, during the working season of the year. It will be noticed, of course, that this money qualification is not imposed to keep people out of the country; it is imposed so that people who come into Canada shall be able to shift for themselves after they come. And, when they are coming to engage in work which is necessary for the development of the country, they have been permitted to enter without the money qualification. In this connection, I may point out the reasons against the removal of these requirements. Labour for industrial purposes is not admitted without the money qualification. The principle is this,—that when an immigrant is coming to enter upon an employment in which the demand for labour exceeds the supply and in regard to which there is no question that the development resulting from his work will be to the benefit of the country at large without exception, we admit the immigrant free of the money qualification. But when the immigrant comes in to enter into competition with the ordinary industrial workers of this country then we say he should have money in his pocket so that he may be able to shift for himself until he secures employment. There have been many complaints as to this restriction in the cases I have mentioned, and it is because of these complaints and of the consequent pressure, I may say, to have this money qualification withdrawn in these cases, that I lay so much stress on it in presenting the matter to the House. The fixed policy of the late government was that the immigrant coming into Canada to enter into industrial competition with the workers of Canada must be able to shift for himself on his arrival.

An important feature of the policy of the late government was the imposition of restrictions along the international boundary line. Up to the year 1908, although we had restrictions on the admission of immigrants by ocean ports, we had no restrictions upon the passage of immigrants from the United States into Canada. The United States, however, had restrictions against Canadian immigrants going into the United States. They had a very numerous body of inspectors posted at important points all along the boundary line, whose business it was to exclude from the United

States undesirables who might attempt to cross over from Canada. Our effort had always been to get desirable settlers from the United States, and we had never thought it necessary to impose a corresponding restriction on our side. But the conditions which arose in 1907 made it absolutely necessary that Canada should take similar measures on her side of the line to those taken by the United States on their side of the line. The necessity of self-protection imposed that duty. The fact was that when an undesirable arrived in a town on the United States side of the boundary, and it was thought desirable to get rid of him, the municipal officers merely suggested that he could cross over to the Canadian side. And when our municipal officers desired to get rid of him and desired him to pass back to the United States side, then the United States federal officers stood in the way and said: 'Oh, no; our duty is to see that undesirables do not come into the United States.' This system was carried on for so long and to such an aggravating extent that it became absolutely necessary for the government of Canada to post exclusion officers at all important points along the international boundary, and to take action corresponding to the action of the United States officers in preventing undesirables from crossing the boundary. In order that the House may note to what extent the exclusion service has been employed, I may state that in 1908-9 4,580 persons were rejected at boundary points by Canadian officers; in 1909-10, the number of such rejections was 8,997; and in 1910-11, the number was 15,404.

Mr. FOSTER. Were many of those duplicates?

Mr. OLIVER. Very likely some would be, but not many. I think it desirable to give a somewhat full explanation of this point, because the expense of maintaining these boundary officers is considerable. We have 103 officers employed at salaries ranging from $1,000 a year up. Besides, we have 116 customs officers employed in the same service who receive an addition to their customs salaries of from $50 to $100 per year.

Now this question of the exclusion of United States and Canadian citizens at the boundary points has been up for consideration on several occasions in this House, and the suggestion has been made that this was a most unfriendly attitude for the respective countries to assume towards each other's people, and that it would be wise if it could be dispensed with, and if a mutual arrangement could be made whereby this boundary inspection could be done away with. There is nothing more true than that this inspection is a detriment to travel, and is an aggravation to the people who travel, and is undesirable from many points of view. It is especially undesirable because of the difficulty in securing suitable men to carry on the very difficult and delicate work that is involved. There is no possibility of any government in either country getting men in all cases who are able to handle such questions without friction of some kind. The most either government can do is to get the best men possible for that duty. But let me point out also that this service is an absolute necessity to the well being of both countries, and so far from increasing friction, it works towards goodwill, towards friendship, and towards a desirable condition on both sides of the boundary line. So long as the boundary line was a protection to the evildoer, so long was it the haunt of evil-doers on both sides. But with the boundary line eliminated in respect to undesirables and evildoers, which is the case now, so far as we are able to do it, under this arrangement the territory in both countries adjacent to the boundary line is relieved from the special presence of these undesirables who formerly used to haunt that territory. Formerly the undesirable in Detroit, when Detroit became too warm for him, simply stepped across to Windsor, or the Windsor crook stepped across to Detroit. To-day the Windsor man who undertakes to go to Detroit is stopped by the United States officer, and the Detroit crook who wants to go over to Windsor is stopped by the Canadian officer. The consequence is that the people of this undesirable character find that the hunting is not nearly as good in those localities as it formerly was and the credit of both countries is in that respect improved.

Now, I would like to say a word or two in regard to Oriental immigration. For one reason or another, possibly for the same reason that produced the great rush in 1907 on the Atlantic coast, there was a similar rush on the Pacific coast. In the fiscal period of nine months ending March 31, 1907, there landed at British Columbia ports some 2,700 Hindus, and in the year 1907-8 there landed 7,601 Japanese. I have not the figures of Chinese immigration for those years, but there is no doubt that was at any rate normal, if not abnormal. But this large influx of Hindus and Japanese in those years raised a new question in regard to immigration which had to be dealt with. It is not necessary for me to discuss the merits of either Japanese or Hindus as immigrants, nor to discuss the wisdom of a policy of excluding such immigrants. I will only say that it is a fixed principle that the people of Canada have the right to say who will be admitted to the advantages of residence and citizenship in Canada. In the exer-

cise of that right it became necessary to deal with the question of Asiatic immigration. In the case of Japan, an arrangement was made with the Japanese government whereby they undertook to restrict the movement of their own people to the shores of Canada, with the result that while, in 1907-8, 7,601 Japanese came to Canada, in 1908-9 the total number was 495; in 1909-10 it was 271; in 1910-11 it was 437.

Mr. MONK. Is my hon. friend in favour of Japanese immigration?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I am not. I think the figures I have read to the House will show my hon. friend that the late government was not in favour of Japanese immigration. But it was in favour of maintaining amicable relations with the empire of Japan while at the same time conserving the interests and well-being of the people of Canada. In the case of Hindu immigration, as a result of the action taken by the government, while the number of Hindus who arrived in 1907 was 2,124, and in 1908 the number was 2,623; in 1908-9 it fell to 6; in 1910 it was 10, and in 1911 it was 5. So it must be conceded that the government standing on its right to restrict and select the people who should come and live in Canada, exercised that right to the satisfaction, I believe, of the majority of the people of Canada, and placed the matter beyond any reasonable ground of complaint.

The action that was taken did not wholly affect the people of Hindustan; it applied to all Asiatics, except Japanese and Chinese, and required that the Asiatic immigrant should have $200 in his possession on landing in Canada. This action was taken for the reasons set out, but it alone would not have produced the result that is shown in the return.

Further action was taken and what is called the indirect passage provision was made by order in council and afterwards by statute, which provided that the Governor in Council had the right to exclude any immigrant reaching Canada by indirect passage. The effect of this was to practically exclude the Japanese who had settled in the Sandwich Islands and who were thereby free from the jurisdiction of Japan, but who had been expected to add largely to the population of British Columbia by immigration. It also had the effect of excluding the people of Hindustan who where settled in Hong-Kong. The reasonableness of this provision whereby an immigrant was excluded because he did not come direct from the country of his birth or citizenship was this: If an immigrant was found to be undesirable after his arrival in Canada, and if he did not come from the country of which he was a citizen, he could not be deported because the country from which he came, if he was not a citizen of that country, would have the right to refuse him. We, therefore, claimed the right to say, before a man landed on our shores, that we would not allow him to land if we could not return him to the country to which he belong. The effect of these restrictive and selective regulations has been to keep our immigration at a high standard of excellence, while the energy with which immigration effort has been pursued has brought our total immigration up to the highest point that it has ever been in the history of Canada, and to a point at least double what it was six years ago. It may be of interest, speaking of British immigration,—and as I have pointed out it is British immigration that the late government bent its greatest efforts to secure—to state that in the period from 1890 to 1900 of immigration from the British Isles, 72 per cent was to the United States, 13 per cent to Canada, 7½ per cent to South Africa, and 5¼ per cent to Australia. In the period from 1900 to 1910, of British immigration, there was to the United States, 50 per cent, to Canada 30 per cent, Australia 9 per cent, and South Africa 11 per cent. It will be found that the returns for the last year or two will show that instead of Canadian immigration from Great Britain being less than to the United States, it is a great deal more. It may be interesting to the House to know that during the years from 1902 to 1911, there were 7,520 immigrants rejected at ocean ports and there were deported, after having been admitted, in the same period, 4,667 immigrants, I think it was been thoroughly established that we have in force to-day in Canada an immigration policy under which the government of Canada has the right to say what shall be the character of the immigrants who shall be allowed to land upon our shores, that we have in force an aggressive immigration policy which has resulted in stupendous material advantage to Canada as a whole, and that in addition to that aggressive immigration effort we have a policy of selection and rejection which ensures, in so far as such a policy reasonably can ensure it, that the standard of our citizenship will not be degraded, but will be improved by the immigration that we receive. As I have already said, immigration effort must be governed by circumstances as they arise. I want to say to my successor in office that so long as the government is prepared to follow an aggressive immigration policy and is successful in that policy, while keeping closely to the principle of selective and restrictive immigration, we will be glad to give him our co-operation and support.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, my hon. friend the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) had resumed his seat after making an interesting statement regarding the administration of a branch of the department over which he presided, the Immigration Branch. I have little fault to find with my hon. friend's statement. He has undertaken to make a statement of the conditions of that department covering a number of years and with part of that statement I am free to confess I am bound to agree. In the short time I have been in charge of the department, I have discovered, as was stated by my hon. friend this afternoon, that a very considerable difficulty is to be met in dealing with undesirables coming across the International boundary. I recognize, after looking into this question, that it is indeed a difficult one for the Department of Immigration to treat with advantage to the people and with satisfaction to all concerned. In respect to the statement made by my hon. friend that his immigration policy was directed entirely in the interests of western Canada, I may say that the Immigration policy of the present government will differ somewhat in that respect from the policy followed by hon. gentlemen opposite during their term of office; our policy will be one calculated to assist and promote immigration in all parts of this Dominion of Canada irrespective of western Canada or eastern Canada.

I shall not attempt to deal with any statements and figures quoted by my hon. friend this afternoon as I do not consider it necessary for me to do so. The policy which this government proposes to undertake in regard to immigration will indeed be a vigorous policy from every point of view, believing as we do that the conditions in Canada warrant such a policy, that Canada has reached a point of marked economic development, and my hon friend this afternoon supplied the evidence as to why we had reached that stage of development. He recognized, as every good citizen of Canada must recognize, that our development has been due to the great policy laid down by our leader in 1878, the National Policy, upon which we have been building from that time down to the present. Under that policy we have reached a point of development that excites the admiration of every good citizen of our common country, a position that entitles us to make clear to the people in all parts of the world from which we hope to receive desirable immigration just what our financial condition is and it will be the duty of the department over which I preside to immediately undertake this task. We shall undertake this policy regardless of race, creed or nationality, and in doing so we will endeavour to have our policy a general policy for all parts of Canada.

I have no objection whatever to the resolution proposed. I shall bring down all the papers asked for at the earliest possible moment. We selected Mr. Hawkes believing that he was capable to fill this important position. We have reached a period when it is necessary to have co-operation in our immigration policy between the different provinces of this Dominion and the Dominion government, and we have selected Mr. Hawkes to make a report upon this particular matter in order that we may have all the best information possible in regard to the best policy to be adopted to bring about the best results in the interest of the people of this country.

Mr. NEELY. What does the hon. member think of the special qualifications of Mr. Hawkes for this position?

Mr. ROGERS. I am glad to tell my hon. friend that I think Mr. Hawkes has undoubtedly very special qualifications for the position. I am supported in that belief by the leading Liberal organ in the great province of Quebec, 'The Montreal Herald.' That paper said, a day or two after Mr. Hawkes' appointment was made:

> This announcement was made by Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of the Interior, when in Montreal on Saturday. He intimated that he had in contemplation important reforms in connection with the immigration work of the government and Mr. Hawkes' appointment marked one of the first steps in the new government.
>
> It has not been definitely announced what will be the exact functions attached to the new office, but it is probable that Mr. Hawkes' work will largely consist in devising plans for greater co-operation between the Dominion and the province in the work of promoting immigration. To this end Mr. Hawkes will personnally visit the western provinces, and after thoroughly investigating immigration questions from the western standpoint will probably spend sometime in England.
>
> It is probably the case that there has not been as much co-operation between the Dominion and the provinces as there might have been, and the new commissioner will be doing excellent work if he can devise plans for ensuring this co-operation. Several of the provinces maintain independent offices in England and the work done in these offices must be in some respects a duplication of that performed by the offices of the federal government.
>
> Mr. Hawkes is peculiarly well equipped both by natural ability and by experience for the work which he has undertaken. An Englishman by birth he has spent many years in the Northwest and thus understands the conditions which the immigrant has to face when he takes up the task of making himself a

home upon the prairies. After this experience Mr. Hawkes spent several years as publicity agent of the Canadian Northern railway, and in that position gained a large amount of knowledge as to the most practical ways of promoting the interests of a great transportation company, the success of which so largely depends upon the rapid settlement of the land through which its lines run. About a year ago Mr. Hawkes established the 'British News of Canada,' in which he has maintained an active propaganda for the movement of British people desiring to improve their fortune from England to Canada. The page which he writes each week in his paper is one of the brightest and most entertaining editorial pages in Canada, and proves that he has not only an observing eye but a facile pen, and his powers of definition and expression, backed as they are by a large fund of common sense, should make his reports to the government extremely valuable. Taking into consideration Mr. Hawkes' special knowledge, his training and his keen interest in the subject of immigration, it would have been hard for Mr. Rogers to find a man better qualified for the work which the new commissioner is being asked to perform.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is Mr. Hawkes still editing the 'British News'?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not know if he is still editing this paper or not, but I understand he is not.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would the minister consider it proper for Mr. Hawkes to hold the office he has and at the same time continue the ownership and publication of a newspaper which he started to encourage immigration into Canada in view of the further fact that he solicited support from the Department of the Interior in the way of advertising in this paper and that he solicited similar support from the various provincial governments?

Mr. ROGERS. I quite agree that it would not be proper, and as an evidence of that I have already refused his paper any further support from the department over which I preside.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not think that would be quite sufficient.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not know what would satisfy the hon. gentleman. I think that is as plain and definite as it can be; action has already been taken. Mr. Hawkes has been appointed to that position, and I have communicated with every Premier in every province in Canada, and have received replies from them all expressing their desire and willingness to meet Mr. Hawkes, to render him every assistance, and to co-operate with the Dominion government in the effort to promote a more vigorous and a more active immigration policy in the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. ETHIER. Did Mr. Hawkes take an active part in the last campaign on behalf of the hon. Minister of the Interior?

Mr. ROGERS. I am not aware of the special services that my hon. friend refers to as having been rendered by Mr. Hawkes; but I believe that Mr. Hawkes, in common with hundreds and thousands of other good Liberals, believing that the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite was injurious to the national life of our country, put his shoulder to the wheel as a good Canadian and rendered good service to Canada. I am sure that the work of any Canadian under such circumstances is not such as to disqualify him for a position of trust at the hands of this or any other government, in the carrying on of work so important and necessary as our immigration, and I accept with gratitude the congratulations of the leading Liberal organ of the province of Quebec on my selection of Mr. Hawkes for the important position he is filling to-day.

Mr. ETHIER. May I ask what newspapers of Quebec approved of that nomination?

Mr. ROGERS. I have quoted the leading organ of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec, and I do not know what more the hon. gentleman may want. Now, I have nothing to complain of in regard to the statement made by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), this afternoon. In some respects I entirely agree with him. Further than that I have nothing to say other than that I shall be pleased to bring down the papers and furnish hon. gentlemen opposite with all the information in the possession of the department in regard to this matter.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Before the hon. gentleman concludes I want to ask him one question. For the last two sessions I have endeavoured to press on the previous minister the necessity of having the inspection of immigrants made before they go on board the steamer instead of having it after they arrive in Canada. A family arriving here is liable to a great many hardships. One member of it is perhaps found to be diseased, and then either the whole family or a part of them are sent back. I have been trying to impress on the previous minister, and I think the Minister of Public Works backed me up, that the inspection, if possible, should be made before the immigrant goes on board the steamer instead of at this end.

Mr. ROGERS. This is a point which has not been raised with me since I took charge of the department. I quite appreciate the importance of my hon. friend's suggestion, and I shall be glad to take the matter up and meet his wishes if I can possibly do so.

Mr. PAQUET. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior if it is his intention to favour the repatriation of French-Canadians ?

Mr. ROGERS. This, too, is entirely a new question so far as I am concerned, and I shall be glad to take it up with my department and ascertain the facts for and against the suggestion which has been made, and give it the fullest consideration that its importance deserves.

Mr. PROULX. Is the hon. Minister aware that during the last campaign Mr. Hawkes said at Halifax that one Englishman was as good as seven French-Canadians ?

Mr. ROGERS. I am not aware that Mr. Hawkes made any such statement, and knowing him as well as I do, I would not like to credit him with having done so.

Mr. PROULX. Will the Minister inquire ?

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Charges of management — Public debt, $188,941.66.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. the Minister of Finance inform the committee what changes have been made from the estimates laid before the House by the former Minister of Finance?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend will remember that of the estimates of the late government a portion was voted in full. Of the balance five-twelfths were voted, leaving seven-twelfths still to be voted. The estimates now brought down are practically the same, the total difference being $11,725. This is made up of several items. Civil government, Secretary of State, various clerkships aggregating $4,316.67. Administration of Justice, $408.33. Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, steam service between Sarnia and Sault Ste. Marie, calling at way ports, $5,833.33. Miscellaneous, $1,166.67.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Census and statistics, $700,000.01.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. minister please tell us whether this amount covers the Governor General's warrants issued in connection with the census?

Mr. BURRELL. Yes, I understand that the amount covers the Governor General's warrants.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). In some of the constituencies there are claims of the census enumerators that have not been paid. I would suggest that that be done as soon as possible.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. BURRELL. It is the ordinary practice to keep back ten per cent to cover certain rules that may not have been complied with, certain regulations; and in some cases twenty per cent has been kept back, because of the fact that certain expenses in connection with the enumerators' work have been thought a little too big. But when all the census returns are in, the matter will be settled up.

Mr. NESBITT. Will that item include enough to pay up the arrears?

Mr. BURRELL. I think so.

Military buildings and works, $192,791.67.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before we pass the items under Militia and Defence, I would like to call attention to a matter which I know has been more or less under consideration for some time. It has reference to caring for and beautifying some of the old forts in the country, some of the old battlefields, the idea being to restore the forts and build fences around them, to improve the grounds, and generally to beautify them. I think myself that would be a very desirable thing to do. I have in my mind what is known as Fort Howe, in the city of St. John, and which could be made into a most charming park. At present, however, it is simply a waste piece of land, though it occupies perhaps the most sightly position in the city. I think it is worthy the attention of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes). The same remark might be made with reference to old Fort Cumberland on the boundary between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. There are quite a number of others which I need not mention. I feel sure my suggestion will commend itself to the minister. The expense would not be very great, and people would appreciate the improvement.

Mr. ROGERS. I know this is a matter which the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes) has had under consideration. I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) that it would be very fitting for the government to undertake such an expenditure as he suggests. I will at least draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before going into the items for public buildings and harbour works, might I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) if we may fairly assume that by reason of the estimates of the late government being adopted, and the committee now being asked to approve of these items, the intention is, speaking generally, to proceed with the various works for which parliament is now asked to make appropriations.

I do not understand that even after the general assurance which we are given, the minister will be debarred from taking

adverse action in some particular case which might be brought to his notice, and where he seemed clear that it would not be desirable to proceed. I think he should be left entirely free as to that, but. speaking generally, may we understand, as I think we do understand, that it is the intention of the government to proceed with the works for which parliament is now asked to make appropriations?

In this connection I may say that I congratulate the Minister of Public Works by reason of his having adopted the estimates which were prepared by the late government after very great consideration, and after taking very great pains to ascertain that the various expenditures which were proposed would be in the interest of the country. With regard to public works, it is gratifying to me to believe that after the two months' consideration that my hon. friend has been able to give to the matter he has felt justified in coming before the House and asking us to approve of all the estimates which were brought down by the late government.

Mr. MONK. Even two months, if they had been concentrated entirely to the examination of each of the public works begun under the previous administration, could scarcely have been sufficient to arrive at a sufficient judgment on each one of these works, but I am happy to say that it is the intention of the government, except under very special circumstances, which, of course, must be reserved, to carry out the works for which credits are asked. In many cases the works have been begun and it is a question of finishing them, but even in the cases where that has not taken place, where the item has been voted without any objection, and no objection arises, it seems to me that it would be the duty of the government to carry out the wish of parliament as expressed during the previous session. I quite enter into the idea of carrying out all these works which have been sanctioned, and in regard to these, even considerable ones, unless something unforeseen occurs, we intend, as we apply for the votes contained in the estimates of last year, to complete them and to apply the appropriations to the purposes for which they are intended.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). I would like to ask the minister if the explanation that he now presents to the committee may be taken as an answer to the question that the minister asked to stand to-day, concerning the dredging in Rivière la Prairie.

Mr. MONK. Oh, I think there is no difficulty about that particular work. It it a small work, it is eminently desirable, and it is going to be executed. To-day the delay in answering the question was due to the fact that there were some small questions, and we did not know about the depth of water or the amount spent, these details having to be obtained from the office in Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could imagine that there would be no question about that work, because I remember that when that work, at the urgent request of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Wilson), was put in the estimates the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), claimed some considerable credit for the vote being in the estimates.

Mr. MONK. I claimed a great deal of credit for it being in the estimates because it was I who asked for it in the first instance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman claimed that, but my memory did not serve me the same as the hon. gentleman's memory served him. I did not remember that the hon. Minister of Public Works was entitled to that credit, but I rather thought it was due the hon. member for Laval.

Mr. MONK. We had not the advantage of having my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) in this House when I began.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may be, but I am glad the work will go ahead.

Railways and Canals, chargeable to capital—Intercolonial railway, $1,429,924.97.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like this item to stand as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) is not present.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member can discuss that item on some other item.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I prefer to have the item stand, because I desire some explanation from the Minister of Railways and Canals respecting the items providing for the construction of some branches of the Intercolonial railway in Nova Scotia. I think it would be well that the minister should be here himself.

Mr. MONK. Stands.

Hudson Bay railway—Construction, $1,166,666.66.

Mr. NEELY. I think this item might be allowed to stand. I have a motion on the order paper asking for certain information in connection with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. This is a vote that was put through last session, and I believe a contract was let for a certain part of the work. That work, I understand, has been held up. I do not propose to discuss that now, but I propose to discuss it on the motion which stands in my name on the

order paper. Before allowing this vote to pass I want some information from the Minister of Railways as to what the intention of the government is in reference to the prosecution of this work.

Mr. MONK. I think there will be a further vote for the same purpose. Perhaps we might pass this one and reserve the discussion to which my hon. friend refers until the further item comes down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think there is any further item in the estimates.

Mr. NEELY. I do not see any other item in these particular estimates.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We might allow it to stand. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals may be here this evening; if not, to-morrow.

Item allowed to stand.

Public buildings, $765,333.32.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would point out to the Minister of Finance that under the head of public building there is an item which ought not to be there but ought to be under the heading of miscellaneous, that is, the item for surveys to ascertain the practicability and cost of a tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the mainland.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It does not make a great deal of difference.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) Might I ask the Minister of Public Works if during the recess he could have the tops of desks in this chamber made flat? I notice one or two that have been changed, and they are very comfortable indeed, while the sloping top desks are almost useless. I am sure every hon. gentleman in the House will appreciate the change.

Mr. ROGERS. That is a very good suggestion. I had mine changed the very first day I was here.

Mr. MONK. We will do that during the recess.

Harbours and rivers, $2,055,666.63.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to call attention for a moment to the vote for harbour improvements at St. John. The total vote is $950,000, chargeable to capital account, of which $395,833.34 were voted, leaving a balance of $554,166.66. That is made up of two items, one of which was in the main estimates and the other, amounting to $500,000, in the supplementary estimates. While the amount did not appear otherwise than as a grant for improvements in St. John harbour, I had asked council for that vote especially for improvements at Courtenay Bay, and I intend so stating to parliament when the matter came up, and I kept the amount in the supplementary votes intact to enable the contract for the improvements at Courtenay Bay to be let. I therefore sincerely trust that my hon. friend will see his way clear to utilize that amount of $500,000 for the purpose of beginning improvements at Courtenay Bay. If the contract were let now, under the tender of the Norton-Griffiths Company received on August 10, this amount would be more than sufficient to carry on the work to the end of the current year, March 31 next As representing the city of St. John and also, I trust, taking a national view of this question, I cannot urge too strongly upon my hon. friend the carrying out of what was the settled policy of the late government in regard to the creation of terminal facilities at Courtenay Bay for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I observe by 'Hansard' that in answer to some remarks I made on the address, my hon. friend stated that the whole question of transportation would have to be considered together. I trust that my hon. friend will not insist on that, if it would involve delay in the commencement of this most important and most urgent work. My hon. friend said that the improvement of the harbour of Quebec would have to be considered in that connection. The late government had a well defined policy with regard to the improvement of the harbour at Quebec. When we went out of office we were engaged in the construction of a deep water wharf on the south side of the St. Lawrence at Lévis, and we had done a great deal of dredging in the harbour, near the mouth of the St. Charles river. We had built, I think, about 1,500 feet of wharf; and in connection with the Transcontinental railway it was well understood and thoroughly agreed upon that large improvements were to be carried on which would involve an expenditure of several million dollars. It does not seem to me that it is necessary, in order to determine what is to be done at St. John, that the minister should wait until the government has decided what they are going to do throughout the whole country because, as I have said, my hon. friend need only look at the estimates to see what has been done each year for several years past in the various harbours throughout the country with a view to improving what I may call the national transportation. We have been developing Halifax in connection with the Intercolonial railway; we have been developing St. John and Quebec, improving the harbour at Three-Rivers, improving the channel of the St. Lawrence, improving, through loans to the harbour commissioners, the great port of Montreal, improving the harbour of Toronto; we had items in the estimates for

improving the harbours of Kingston and Hamilton, and in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway we have been for several years carrying on a very large expenditure at the ports of Victoria and Midland or Tiffin on the eastern shore of the Georgian bay. We have been spending millions at Port Arthur and Fort William on the western coast of Lake Superior. On the Pacific Coast we had appropriations for improving the Fraser river to give a navigable channel for ocean steamers from New Westminster to the sea. We have purchased dredges to improve the harbours at Vancouver and Victoria. We had a well-defined transportation policy applying to all sections of the country. I am anxious, as I am sure my hon. friend is anxious, that these great works throughout the Dominion should be continued, but I am sure that upon reflection my hon. friend will see that it is not in the public interest that the improvement, the development, of any one of these great harbours should be delayed for the reason suggested by him. I may say to my hon. friend that there appears on the order paper a telegram which was sent by my hon. friend the Prime Minister as a special message to the people of St. John; I think a very proper message. I do not complain of it at all if that was the policy of the Conservative party. In that message he gave to the people of St. John the assurance that if the Conservative party was successful in the recent election, the return of that party to power would not in any way retard, hinder or prevent the work of improving the harbour of St. John. I asked my hon. friend in the question on the Order Paper whether, when he sent that telegram, he was aware of the work which the government was proposing to carry on at St. John. The Prime Minister has not, I think, given a quite satisfactory answer to that question. He states that he is not highly confident that he ever thoroughly understood what were the intentions of the late government, but he intended his telegram rather to indicate what would be the policy of the incoming government. I do not think my hon. friends opposite ought to forget that it was well known: it had been published in the newspapers and was well known to everybody, it was well known to the gentlemen who, as the Prime Minister says, requested him to send the telegram for the information of the people of St. John, that the government had advertised for and had received tenders for this great work of developing Courtenay bay as one of the national works.

When my hon. friend the Prime Minister sent that telegram to the people of St. John, they had a right to understand, and they did understand, that if the Conservative party were returned to power there would be no delay in going forward with that work, and I am satisfied that many of the people of St. John voted cheerfully for the candidates of the Conservative party because they relied on the assurance contained in that very strong and very clear telegram of the Prime Minister. I make the remarks which I have made in all kindness. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is sympathetic with these movements for the development of our country. The great difficulty under which Canada has been labouring in the past has been that we have been developing the interior of the country and have not been paying sufficient attention to our ocean ports; we have been giving the opportunity for getting out the grain from our fertile prairie lands, and have not been giving as much opportunity as the country should give to ocean steamers to come to our ports and have the cargoes transferred from the railways to the steamers in the most expeditious and cheapest manner. It will not be long before the Grand Trunk Pacific will be completed, and will be knocking at the door of the government for accommodation at Canadian ocean ports, in the winter season at all events. If you begin to-morrow, you cannot get these facilities ready in time for the Grand Trunk Pacific. To do the dredging works and build the breakwater and the wharfs is going to take at the least three or four years and long before that time the Grand Trunk Pacific will be completed, and it will not have an ocean port which for heavy freight can compete with the port of Portland in the state of Maine. The great effort of our people for a quarter of a century has been to divert Canadian trade in the winter season from American ports to Canadian ports. Again I make the most earnest and sincere appeal to my hon. friend to look into the matter carefully, to look at the tenders which have been received, and if he does I am sure that he will realize that it will be in the public interest that this work should go on, and go on without delay. I was extremely pleased to learn from the Prime Minister, in answer to my question, that the deposit of $500,000 which had been made to the government as long ago as the 9th or 10th of August last was still in the hands of the government. I hope I can take that as an assurance that the government intends, during the coming winter, to carry out the work which we contemplated, and for which we called for tenders. St. John is admirably circumstanced in that respect. There is no ice at any season in St. John harbour, even in the most severe winter, so that the work of dredging can go on in all the months of winter, and a great deal of work can be accomplished during the months of the winter now before us.

Mr. FOWLER. Before the hon. Minister of Public Works answers the pathetic appeal of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), I would like to have a thorough understanding of what the hon. gentleman means by asking that a portion of this vote be reserved for work in Courtenay Bay. As I understand, there is to-day a considerable amount of money in arrears to the company that has been doing the work on the west side of the harbour. and this total vote will not be more than sufficent to pay those arrearages. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that this $554,000 should be reserved for work in Courtenay Bay, and that these gentlemen who have performed the work, and who are friends of his, should go without their money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the amount that was due for dredging on the west side at the time the late government went out of power would not amount to a quarter the amount of this vote. There will be ample money for beginning the work in Courtenay bay as well.

Mr. FOWLER. I have been informed that on the 1st of October there was due $200,000 or $300,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no, unless there has been a very unexpected increase in the dredging since that time.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the work should be stopped on the west side for the purpose of reserving the vote to begin the work in Courtenay bay, which could not be done before next spring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but I will tell my hon. friend what I suggest. There were formerly three dredges at work on the west side; latterly there have been two. I have been told quite recently that arrangements have been made for putting at work a third dredge. If it were a matter of apportioning the money, I think this $500,000 should be kept for Courtenay bay, and if necessary a supplementary estimate should be brought down to provide for the payment for dredging work on the west side.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it would be exceedingly foolish to allow this money to be used for that purpose when it is required to pay what is due for work that has been done.

Mr. MONK. It was hardly necessary for my hon. friend to impress on me quite as strongly as he did the necessity of following up these very important works. I have been in the House for some years since we received the report of the Transportation Commission, and I am not aware that I have failed in any one year to urge on the government the necessity of carrying out the suggestions of that commission, particularly as regards our national ports.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Every year when we were asked to vote large sums in the aggregate for small local improvements — improvements very often of no urgent character—I insisted that we should, if possible, lay aside for the moment those small local works in order to carry out the more urgent and essential recommendations of the Transportation Commission. One of the first of those recommendations was the establishment of free national ports. That report was made as far back as 1903. These ports are enumerated at page 31 of that report. They are Fort William, Port Arthur, Depot Harbor, Midland, Port Colborne, Kingston, Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax, Sydney, Vancouver, Victoria, the terminus on the Pacific ocean of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the terminus on the Pacific of the Canadian Northern ; and I ventured the observation the other day that it would have been a bold but proper policy at the time, when we first had communication of that report, to have gone to work and carried out its recommendations, even if they had cost us $25,000,000 or $30,000,000. Even if it cost us more than twice that amount, we should have undertaken these works, and we would have been far more advanced than we are. That was the opinion to which I gave expression every succeeding session. When I heard this year, on assuming office, that my hon. friend had made an effort for the purpose of carrying out the recommendation of that report as regards the harbour of St. John, so far from showing hostility, I gave the matter all the attention I possibly could under the circumstances, and what I said in the House was rather calculated to give the assurance to my hon. friend that that matter would be promptly attended to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope so.

Mr. MONK. But the committee must consider that when I came into the department I found a very large scheme proposed which stood to cost not less, I think, than $8,000,000. I do not think it would be feasible to carry it out at that cost. We would be very fortunate if it could be carried out at that figure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The tenders were less than that.

Mr. MONK. The tenders were, I think, $1,700,000 ; but so far as I can judge by the reports of the officers of the department, we must provide proper termini at that important port and must do it promptly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. We must provide for facilities for the Grand Trunk Pacific. That road is not there yet, but it is going there and we must be prepared to give it proper terminals. The same remark applies to the Intercolonial, and the situation at

Courtenay bay is very favourable. But it was impossible, with the amount of money at my disposal, to go further without careful examination, and I do not think I am mistaken when I state to the committee that my hon. friend himself (Mr. Pugsley), was estopped from concluding any contract because the amount required was out of proportion to the amount voted by parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not on that account. The sole ground on which I was estopped, as my hon. friend will see from the memorandum left by the right hon. the leader of the opposition, who was then First Minister—the sole reason was that owing to the magnitude of the work, we thought we should not deal with it after being defeated, but should leave it to be dealt with by our successors.

Mr. MONK. Of course I accept my hon. friend's statement, but the work is very considerable and we must proceed carefully. I am not prepared for very large expenditures of that kind. I think they should have been gone into long before, but we must proceed carefully in order that we may be sure of getting value for our money. In my opinion, these improvements throughout the country must be considered together, and they must be considered in the light of the report of the Transportation Commission. We must consider St. John and the other ports, and it would be far better that we should see the necessity of immediate development on the lines laid down by the Transportation Commission everywhere and simultaneously rather than to act only in some places. The improvement of our ocean and inland ports will entail an expenditure of nearly $100,000,000, if they are to be equipped as similar ports are in other countries, and if we are to put up proper rival facilities of transportation to those possessed by our powerful neighbours. If the plans laid out for the port of St. John commend themselves to the approval of the House, it will not be in my department that objection will be raised. Reference has been made to Montreal. In Montreal a very small amount comparatively speaking has been spent by the government. There was granted a loan to the harbour and we have carried out improvements there. In Quebec, there are great improvements to be made. Very large demands, even in the short time since I have assumed office, have been made to me regarding the increasing necessities of our great Pacific ports. Large demands have been made by inland ports, and I believe we cannot do better than recognize the necessity of carrying out the improvements suggested by the commission. I have often reproached the late government with not having faced that necessity. I assure my hon. friend that very favourable attention will be given by me to the necessities of the port of St. John. There will be as little delay as possible, so far as my department is concerned, in giving prompt satisfaction to the demands of that harbour.

Mr. CURRIE. It is indeed a great pleasure to hear the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), lecturing the House along the lines he has just done, especially when we remember that a few months ago he supported a policy which was intended deliberately to take the trade of this country down to the United States. Now, however, he takes up the cudgels for our national ports and urges that they should be deepened and enlarged to meet the trade of the country, which no doubt is very desirable since the country has decided to keep this trade within its own borders as much as possible. In view of the fact that the port of St. John requires something like $8,000,000, and that the total work done on the St. Lawrence as far as Montreal amounts to date only to some $35,000,000, we ought to look into this matter a little further in order to see if much better work cannot be done for much less money.

Those of us who know the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) know very well that where he expended any money on behalf of his department he did it first with an eye to the main chance of political advantage. However, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) has stated clearly that he intends to follow out the recommendations of the Transportation Commission. To that report the ex-minister never paid the slightest attention. I do not think he ever even knew of its existence until it was called to his attention, as it was, on several occasions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE. That is the state of the case—that hon. gentleman never did any work along transportation lines, but he did it entirely for a political purpose and with a political view. If his friends were there to take dredging contracts there were large expenditures in that section. But if there were no friends of his to take the dredging contracts, the expenditure would be very limited. I hope the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) will not rush into the making of contracts, but will wait until the engineers have given him a proper report. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) ought to know—the reports of his department will show it, and so will those of the Department of Marine and Fisheries—that year after year the business of the country has been going to American ports, that the exports of Canada to too large an extent have been going through the ports of Portland, Boston, New York and Baltimore. These exports have been growing larger

every year until, if I remember the figures correctly, about one-third, or perhaps forty per cent of the whole trade of Canada went through those ports. It is clear we must do something. But, the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), though these matters were called to his attention, did not care two straws which way the trade went so long as a political purpose and the ends of his party were served.

Mr. MONK. The hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) is aware no doubt—I mentioned it the other day—that we have started a considerable work on the west side of the harbour. That necessitates negotiations with the city of St. John. We have put these through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The negotiations with the city of St. John had been carried through and completed under the late government. An agreement was executed with the city, the Canadian Pacific railway and the department.

Mr. MONK. It was completed the other day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was completed before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) became minister.

Mr. MONK. It was not signed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy told me it was signed and completed and put on record.

Mr. MONK. We had to wait for the adhesion of the city of St. Jonn.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems a pity, when we were getting along so nicely that my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) should so unexpectedly burst in. That hon. gentleman does not seem to have an eye to any section of the country except that in which he resides. But a great deal was done by the government, even for Collingwood; some six hundred thousand or seven hundred thousand dollars being spent to make an excellent harbour, which, I am glad to say has enabled a great business to be done through the port which otherwise would not be possible. My hon. friend does not do the late government justice, when he says we have not had regard to the report of the commission on transportation. I do not think he can point to a single harbour mentioned by that commission in which the late government has not been carrying on very important work in harbour improvements.

Mr. MONK. I could mention several.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But what makes me feel badly is this—that, though my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) feels, just as I do, that the work of harbour development should be carried on vigorously, yet he wants to stop the work until he can work out the whole problem of improving the harbours in the way suggested by the Transportation Commission. Think, for a moment, what that means, if it is all to be done at once. It means taking over a debt on the harbour of Montreal amounting, I think, to $18,000,000. It means buying out the Canadian Pacific railway's wharfs at Victoria harbour, and the Canadian Pacific railway wharfs at the harbour of Vancouver, which, I venture to say, would cost many millions of dollars. It means taking over the wharfs in the harbour of St. John, which would not be so very expensive, but which would cost quite a considerable sum. What I want the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) to do is to think out this great problem at his leisure, but in the meantime to go on with the work. Every dollar you spend in dredging a harbour or in building a wharf to be owned or controlled by the government is a work towards the nationalization of that harbour. That is what nationalization of harbours means —the vesting of harbour property in the Crown to be managed by the Crown. But in the last two or three years we have built a fine wharf in the harbour of St. John which is owned by the government. That is a step towards nationalizing that harbour. The wharfs we built at Quebec are steps in the direction of nationalizing that harbour. I am glad that the Minister of Public Works, from the examination and inquiry he has made, agrees that Courtenay bay is admirably adapted to afford terminal facilities for the Grand Trunk Pacific. I will give him the credit, or I will give it to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), whom our people united to return as minister, for the development that we hope will take place. I shall be happy, as a citizen of St. John, to see this great work go forward. I want to see Canadian trade drawn through Canadian channels. I think it is a reflection upon the country that we have so long allowed such a large proportion of the trade of our western country to pass through the ports of Buffalo, New York, and others. But it is only of recent years that even the great railway companies have awakened to the necessity of bringing the trade through Canadian channels. It was at the time I became Minister of Public Works—I do not claim undue credit for it — that the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway came to the government and said they wanted to co-operate with us in building up these two ports on the Georgian bay. They offered to do their part. The Canadian Pacific railway offered to build a through line of railway direct from Victoria harbour to Montreal with a grade of 3-10 of one per cent so that they should be able to carry forty cars of grain where to-day they carry only twenty. The Grand Trunk railway said: If you will help us at Midland—or

Tiffin; it is the same thing—we will be able to build a line with a grade of 4-10 of one per cent. And both companies are working away.

They believe that they will be able to draw the traffic away from Buffalo. We are helping, we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in that great work. The work which we are doing at Port Arthur and Fort William is all along the same line. Don't let my hon. friend imagine that this work which we have been doing is not largely along the line suggested by the Transportation Commission. It is entirely along the lines suggested by that commission, except that we have not gone to the extent of making all these ports free, taking over their indebtedness. But in the meantime, whenever we make an expenditure for dredging and building wharfs, we are doing that much towards the nationalization of our harbours.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows that the works we have done on the great lakes in dredging to assist those great transportation companies, is absolutely contrary to what was recommended by the Transportation Commission. They wanted a free national port, and we have been expending millions to help the dockage of private companies.

Mr. CURRIE. In order to justify the House in supporting the Minister of Public Works in undertaking this enterprise, I am pleased to see that the hon. gentleman who held the portfolio of Public Works under the late government is calling attention to the harbour of Collingwood. That is an example of work in his department which shines very brightly in the annals of Ontario. It is quite true that a very large sum of money was expended by the government upon this harbour. It was to be put down to a depth of twenty feet. The harbour works continued for many years, until I had the honour to be elected for that riding; then it was discovered suddenly that the harbour was already finished and completed and nothing remained to be done. Month after month vessels were grounding in mid-channel where they had this twenty feet, or where they were supposed to have twenty feet of water, until at last absolutely no vessel on the lake would risk making the harbour of Collingwood, which had, according to the Minister of Public Works, a depth of twenty feet, and was completed. Several times I called the attention of the minister to this work, in the House. He caused an examination to be made of the harbour. and what did he discover? He found that what the government contractor who had been working at it for many years, ten or twelve years, had been doing was to dig holes along the bottom of the harbour where there was soft digging, where it was easy to do the work, and whenever he encountered a boulder he left it in the channel. The result was that a large sum of money had to be expended to remove those boulders. I think I am speaking by the book when I say that if the harbour is cleared now it is due to my efforts. There still remains a large amount of work to be done in connection with that harbour. The work already done, or proposed to be done by the late Minister of Public Works, to my mind, requires very close scrutiny from this side of the House and from the minister in charge of the department, and I think he is justified in going slow for a few months in order to see how things will turn out.

Mr. HAZEN. I think my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Pugsley), is certainly in error in stating his belief that the agreement between the city of St. John, the government and the Canadian Pacific had been finally determined upon and settled before the hon. gentleman went out of office. I may say to my hon. friend that within the last ten days, certainly within the last two weeks, difficulties arose between the city of St. John and the Canadian Pacific railway with regard to that agreement, which I am glad to say have now been settled, and the agreement has become a finality. I know that my hon. friend was candid in saying that the matter was finally determined, but he was in error.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The recorder of the city, Mr. Baxter, whom my hon. friend knows very well, sent me three printed copies of the agreement which had been executed by the Canadian Pacific railway and by the city, sent it to me to be executed by my department; and I asked my deputy to execute the work and my deputy told me that he had done so.

Mr. HAZEN. It was actually held up at the request of the city of St. John, my hon. friend was not aware of that fact—of course I am not suggesting that my hon. friend was not absolutely sincere in his statement to the House. It seems to me that this whole question of the development of our ocean ports is one that should be looked upon rather from a national than a local standpoint. I do not think that when a sum of money is put in the estimates for the development of the port of Montreal, for instance, or the port of St. John, or any other port, this House should regard it merely as an expenditure for the benefit of the locality in which that work is to be performed. I had the pleasure the other day of inspecting the great work that is being carried on in the harbour of Montreal by the Harbour Commissioners of that city. The hon. mem

bers will remember that some years ago a sum of $6,000,000 was voted, and from time to time was placed at the disposal of the Harbour Commissioners for the purpose of developing the capacity of that port, and the Harbour Commissioners of that port had plans prepared for the development of the port that would ultimately involve an expenditure of some $18,000,000. I understand that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal have from time to time paid interest on the moneys that have been advanced to the commission by the Dominion of Canada. But while the work carried on in the harbour of Montreal is a very great one, I could not help being impressed by this fact, from the opportunity I had of inspecting the work a short time ago, that for years to come it would be necessary to continue making expenditures in the port of Montreal in order to keep pace with the increasing commerce and trade of this country. Now what is true of the port of Montreal is also true of other great ports in Canada. I do not suppose any one in this House would for a moment think that we should view the work that is done in the harbour of Montreal from a local standpoint. I do not think that any hon. gentleman who considers the work that is being carried on in the harbour of St. John should view it from a local standpoint either, because it is a work which, while incidentally of benefit to St. John, as the money spent in Montreal is incidentally a benefit to the people of Montreal, is far reaching in its effects, because it is an expenditure which will benefit the trade and commerce of Canada as a whole. We have spent in Canada hundreds of millions of dollars for the purpose of constructing railways, railways in some cases running from Atlantic ports to Pacific ports, running through the western portions of Canada, and one of the main reasons for such construction was that these railways might carry the products of the country to the ports on both oceans, there to be shipped out to the markets of the world, whose people are anxious to obtain the products of our farms, our forests and our fisheries. It has always seemed to me that if it is the duty of this country to provide railway facilities, it is also equally its bounden duty to equip the ports to which the railways run, so that the commerce of the country can be quickly and speedily sent forward to the markets of the world. Therefore, I say that I think these expenditures on the ports of the country should not be viewed from a local standpoint, but rather from a national standpoint. I sincerely hope that this House will be generous in voting moneys for the purpose of equipping our ports throughout the country, so that we may be able to compete successfully with our competitors for the trade of the world to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Under our constitutional rule this House cannot be generous or otherwise until the government asks it to be.

Mr. HAZEN. I have every belief that, in the administration of the Public Works Department, my hon. and highly respected friend who sits in front of me, the Minister of Public Works, will not be backward in asking for generous expenditures for the carrying out of necessary public works in the country, including the development of our ports. I am sorry that I was not in the House when my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) first addressed it, but from what I have heard since I came in, I judge that my hon. friend was addressing himself to a little criticism of the expenditure of this sum in the balance of the estimates for 1911-12 for carrying out the work in the port of St. John. I understand from what I have gathered that my hon. friend had the idea that a portion of it ought to be set aside for the work on the Courtenay bay side, and that it should not all be spent on the western side of the harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was that of this amount $500,000 was included in the Supplementary Estimates. I asked from my colleagues of the late government that this amount should be set aside for Courtenay bay and I was expressing the hope that the Minister of Public Works would still keep that $500,000 available so as to let a contract this fall in order to do as much work as possible at Courtenay bay during the coming winter.

Mr. HAZEN. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for telling me what he said, but from information I have received I doubt very much if that can be done and at the same time have the necessary work carried on, on the western side of the harbour. My information is that when the change of government took place a very large sum of money was owing to the Maritime Dredging Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. About a quarter of this sum.

Mr. HAZEN. That is the company in which Mr. McAvity and Mr. Moore were interested. I understood that a quarter of a million dollars was due them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that it is not half that.

Mr. HAZEN. A very large sum of money in addition to that has to be spent there. This contract is under way and a great deal of work will have to be done. The work will have to be continued not only up

to the 31st March next but for a long time after that. Provision will have to be made for docks and wharfs and further dredging will have to be done towards the western shore of the harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This money cannot be used after the 31st March.

Mr. HAZEN. I understand that, but the money is being spent on the western side of the harbour preparatory to the construction of docks and wharfs in order to accommodate the increased business which will be done there, and only a few days ago a contract was entered into for the construction of a wharf here at a cost of about $740,000. There is an immense amount of work to be done at Courtenay bay. The lowest tender received, that from Messrs. Norton, Griffith & Co., was for an amount between $7,000,000 and $8,000,000. When such a very large amount of money is required to prosecute this work I do no think it would be advisable until a contract is entered into for the work to go ahead and spend $500,000 when, as we know, the work will involve an expenditure of $7,000,000 or $8,000,000. I entirely agree as to the necessity for carrying out that work at Courtenay bay, although I do not say according to the plans that have been prepared. These plans may be perfectly right and correct if they are looked into, but I believe the time has come when that work has to be done at Courtenay bay, and it may be possible by some changes in the plans to afford greater accommodation at little, if any, greater cost. A beginning was made by the joint efforts of the Department of Public Works, the provincial government and the city of St. John, and the boring that was undertaken demonstrated that the work is perfectly feasible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was done entirely by the Public Works Department.

Mr. HAZEN. All I can tell my hon. frined is that the government of the province of New Brunswick was asked by the Department of Public Works to join in the work with the result that the Public Works Department agreed to become responsible for one third of the cost, the city of St. John for one third, and the provincial government for another third.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were never called upon to pay their share.

Mr. HAZEN. They stand prepared to do so whenever they are called upon. Perhaps the Dominion government decided that they would not call upon them to pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government and the city never paid.

Mr. HAZEN. This survey demonstrated the fact that it is possible to make a safe harbour there. The work involves not only dredging and the building of wharfs but the building of a dry dock. In view of that would it be wise to proceed with such a small expenditure until the whole matter was clearly considered and a general plan worked out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A thorough and complete plan was arrived at after three years' study. The dry dock will be built under the Dry Dock Subsidy Act of 1910.

Mr. HAZEN. While that is true my hon. friend knows that the building of the dry dock is a part of the Norton Griffith Company's tender. There is a general impression amongst those who are contractors that the aid which is offered to these dry docks will not be sufficient in its present form to build that dry dock standing alone, and therefore, when it is coupled with the dredging and building of wharfs in Ccurtenay bay, the whole thing should be made one work. I think this is a matter which ought to have very careful consideration at the hand of my hon. friend in front of me. At any rate when the Grand Trunk Pacific will come into the city of St. John it could not find a better place than Ccurtenay bay. It will come into St. John over the St. John Valley railway, a work which was made possible by the public spirit, courage and generosity of the local government of New Brunswick. But, I sincerely hope that when the Grand Trunk Pacific is in a postition to do business in the east, when the time has come for freight from western Canada to be carried over the Grand Trunk Pacific, across the St. Lawrence at Quebec, and be carried down to St. John, the Department of Public Works will have taken such steps that the facilities will be ready to handle all the freight that will come over that road to the port of St. John. I will not say that my hon. friend is evincing undue anxiety and hurry on this work, but I will say to my hon. friend that the work has not gone on as quickly in the past as my hon. friend led the citizens of St. John to believe it would. In 1908 my hon. friend came down to take part in the local elections, and he held out the hope in very positive terms to the people that within two years we would find ships of 10,000 tons sailing into Courtenay bay and finding docks there ready to receive them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. My hon. friend is not quite original enough. He is quoting what he saw in the St. John 'Standard.' I saw that some time ago. I looked up carefully what I said in 1908 and there is not a word of truth in that statement.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend is reported during the campaign as saying so not only

in the 'Standard' but in that good staunch Liberal paper, the St. John 'Globe.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was that we must get ready for the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, and I think that my hon. friend with that optimism that has always distinguished him, held out the alluring hope to the people of St. John that within two years we would find ships of 10,000 tons sailing into Courtenay bay and their cargoes being received at the harbour there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; what I did say was that he must go on as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HAZEN. Any way that was the impression that he left in the minds of the people of the community. I am satisfied that when my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), who has only been in office for a few short weeks, has grappled with this and other problems he will do so in a way that will satisfy not only the aspirations of the city of St. John, but will also satisfy the aspirations of the country which wants these great works to go on.

My hon. friend says we brought down the estimates of the hon. gentlemen. I ask what other course was open to us. At the last session parliament voted five-twelfths of the estimates of the year and what could we do except to ask for the other seven-twelfths.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say you have done the right thing.

Mr. HAZEN. We have done the only thing.

Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia, $763,679.85.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) if it was through his efforts that the dredge 'Northumberland' was directed to proceed from the La Have river to Lunenburg some time ago? I think the directions were given when the hon. gentleman had the pleasure of attending a banquet tendered to his leader at Halifax. I understand that my hon. friend there had a very uncomfortable time and that many delegations were sent to meet him from the county of Lunenburg. Was the reason for directing the dredge to go to Lunenburg to render some assistance to his political friends in that county at the time of the local election then on?

Mr. MONK. I could not answer exactly the question of my hon. friend. I am quite prepared to say that there were absolutely no political considerations in the matter. It was urged on me that it was necessary to make a transfer of some dredge, but if my hon. friend will put a question on the order paper I will look up the facts; I have not the advantage of having my officer with me.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is it intended that this dredge should get to work before next May or June?

Mr. MONK. I think so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The minister only thinks so.

Mr. MONK. I am quite sure of it.

Harbours and Rivers, Ont., $1,126,457.72.

Mr. McCOIG. Has the minister received any request to change the location of the harbour to Two Creeks at Wheatley?

Mr. MONK. I do not think there has been any request so far.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, $198,663.82.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For some years a subsidy was given for a steamship service between the cities of St. John and Halifax, and the Windward Islands. The contract expired some months ago while the late government was in office, and the contractors, in consequence, I think, of the British government withdrawing the aid which they had been giving to the service, declined to continue it in the same state of efficiency as before. In consequence of that, and in order to prevent a discontinuance of the service, the late Minister of Trade and Commerce made a temporary agreement, as I understand, with Messrs. Pickford and Black. That agreement has been thought by the merchants of St. John who do business with the West Indies to be very unfair to that city. Under it, if I remember rightly, the city of Halifax gets a service every eleven days while the city of St. John gets a service every twenty-two days. Quite a large trade was being built up between Canada and the West Indies through the port of St. John, and a number of our enterprising merchants were taking a great interest in it. This decreased and comparatively unsatisfactory service was a cause of very great disappointment to the merchants of St. John. They made representations to the late Minister of Trade and Commerce, which were received very sympathetically by him, but the difficulty which confronted him was as to what could be done in the meantime. I would ask my hon. friend whether this temporary service is still going on, and whether any steps will be taken in the near future to improve it. It does seem to me that the present time, when we are seeking to develop trade between Canada and the West Indies, is not a time to make the service less efficient either for passengers or for freight.

Mr. FOSTER (Halifax). No change has been made in the temporary or permanent

services provided for in these estimates. Whatever arrangements have been made have been time arrangements, and no change can be made until that time runs out. I think all these services run out at the end of the present fiscal year. The Jamaica service and the Windward Island service are both in a temporary condition.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend be good enough to keep that in mind?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. With regard to the services to the West India Islands, my view shortly stated is that it is better to have good services and pay more money for them than to have poor services and pay quite a large proportion of what you would pay for good services. I propose to give a broad and sympathetic consideration to the whole question of our trade with the West India Islands, and South America, not excluding other countries, of course. For some of these services we had hopes that the British government might still continue the aid it gave before. That hope has pretty well dwindled; but there are some negotiations on now out of which some good results may perhaps come for the improvement of the services both to Jamaica and the Windward group and to British Guiana.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The service, however, will continue as at present until the end of the present year?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When it was hoped that an arrangement might be made by which the British government would give large assistance in conjunction with Canada and the West India Islands, the idea was to have a service in the summer season between Montreal and the West Indies via St. John, and in the winter season direct to St. John, and to give Halifax a direct service all the year round, so that there would be the two services. I talked the matter over with a good many prominent business men of St. John, and they felt that that would be a fairly satisfactory service for the three ports. It would take the place of the present service to the Windward Islands and would give Halifax and St. John each an independent service. The only disadvantage, so far as the port of St. John is concerned, would be that the point of departure in summer would be Montreal. Would my hon. friend give consideration to that aspect of the case?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes I have gone over the matter with a good deal of interest. I have had some conversations with gentlemen both from Montreal and the maritime provinces who are interested in the service.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Who were the gentlemen from the maritime provinces?

Mr. FOSTER. I think nearly all the steamship men in one way or another had some communication with me.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). There was an item in the estimates last session for a small service between Pelee Island and the mainland in the county of Essex but I do not see it here this year.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no change made in the estimates. If that item is not here I do not know why, but will get the information.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would the proposed steamship service from Montreal to the West Indies mean the elimination of the service now existing between Halifax and the West Indies?

Mr. FOSTER. If the service in the summer time commenced at Montreal, and then went from Halifax and St. John alternately, it would not be an elimination, but an extension of the present service.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would it be an additional service?

Mr. FOSTER. No, not in the way of having the present service plus another one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What the commissioners recommended was that in place of the present service there should be a direct service from Halifax all the year round both winter and summer, not going to St. John; and in addition that there should be another line from Montreal to the West Indies in the summer calling at St. John, and in the winter that line would go exclusively from St. John. So that in the winter there would be two independent services—one from Halifax, and the other from St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not prepared to say that I would accept that proposition, or some other one as I have not given the matter sufficient examination.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have done more this evening than we succeeded in doing in five weeks during last session; and as there are some hon. members absent who would probably have something to say on some of the items, I think the committee should now rise.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We have done very well, but I had hoped we would get through to-night as the matter is very urgent. However, I shall not insist if my hon. friend objects.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). When the motion is made to-morrow to go into Supply some hon. gentlemen on this side propose discussing the matter of the dismissal of officials.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk has laid on the table the first report of the examiner of petitions for Private Bills, and that in pursuance of rule 99 the following Private Bills are read for the first time.

Bill (No. 10), respecting the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 11), respecting the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company, and to change its name to 'the Canadian Mortgage Investment Company.' —Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 12), respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill (No. 13), to incorporate the Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 14), to incorporate the North Arm Bridge and Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill (No. 15), to incorporate the Vancouver Life Insurance Company of Vancouver, B. C.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill (No. 16), respecting certain patents of Thomas Wadge.—Mr. Aikins.

I would like to say with regard to the laying of these Bills on the table that to my mind there is a divergency between the rules which ought to be removed.

Rule 48 says :—

> Every Bill is introduced upon motion for leave specifying the title of the Bill; or upon motion to appoint a committee to prepare and bring it in.

These Bills are not introduced on motion for leave, but under rule 99 which provides that :—

> All private Bills are introduced on petition, and after such petitions have been favourably reported upon by the examiner of petitions or by the Committee on Standing Orders, such Bills shall be laid on the table of the House by the Clerk and shall be deemed to have been read a first time, and to have been ordered for a second reading when so laid upon the table, and recorded in Votes and Proceedings as having been so read.

This, in my judgment, is the reverse of the other rule which provides that they shall be read three separate times. It appears to me that these two rules are rather contradictory and confusing.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. A. C MACDONELL (Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No 17), to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain ?

Mr. MACDONELL. I have always understood that the explanation should be made upon the first reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. Looking up the rules, it seems to me that the explanation may take place either when the Bill is introduced or on the first reading—I think perhaps preferably on the motion for leave to introduce it.

Mr. MACDONELL. This Bill is similar to the one I had the honour of introducing during the last two sessions. The first part provides for the abolition of the provision requiring a deposit of $200, and proposes to substitute therefor a requisition signed by at least 100 electors in the electoral district in which the candidate offers himself for election. It seems to me that the cash deposit should be abolished now that the qualification is removed, but that no one should offer himself as candidate unless there be some demand for his services by the people of the riding. Further, the Bill asks that the hours for polling be lengthened. On two previous occasions when I introduced a Bill to increase the facilities for polling, I desired to have election day proclaimed a holiday, but the House looked upon that proposition as too radical. In order, therefore, to meet the views of the House, I have asked that the polling hours be extended and the polls kept open from eight in the morning until six at night. At present the hours are from nine to five, and those hours are found inadequate, especially in large city districts. I further asked that the House adopt a principle which has been adopted by the Ontario Legislatude. The Bill copies the Ontario law, which provides that during the hours of polling any elector in a city or town shall be given two hours, from 12 until 2 in the day, during which he may poll his vote without suffering any loss of pay or wages. This has been found to work satisfactorily. There is a further provision requiring the returning officer to transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on nomination day the names and addresses of the various candidates so that the work in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery may be facilitated. The Clerk informs me that this is very desirable.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). If I might make a suggestion, it would be this. The half holiday on Saturday is gradually becoming the rule in Ontario. In France the elections are held on Sunday, when the people are free, but I would not ask that that should be done here ; but I think that on Saturdays, when a half holiday is the rule, especially in our cities and towns, it would be a good thing to have the elections. If we had a provision requiring the elections to be held on a Saturday and giving every man an opportunity to absent himself from his work in order to poll his vote, I think that would be an improvement in the law. The fact that men cannot get away from their factories or offices increases the cost of elections, as the candidate has, in some way or other, to supply carriages to take these men to vote.

We should relieve the candidates of great responsibilities if there were a holiday or half-holiday on election day in order that every one could get out and vote. If it is a duty to vote—and I believe it is—every facility ought to be given to a man to record his vote. Under this plan men would vote without loss of time to themselves, and without inconveniencing employers. I am confident that Ontario would be prepared to have her elections on Saturday, and I believe that every province would equally favour that idea.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I was not able, for business reasons, to be in the House when the debate on the address was on, last week. But I am here now, and I intend to take the occasion of this motion to make a few remarks upon some of the questions that were brought up in that debate, and still more to refer to some questions that were not brought up. A good deal of the time of the House was taken up in discussing the question of reciprocity, and the question of Nationalism—I believe it is called—in connection with the province of Quebec. These two questions, to my mind, were settled in the elections, and settled in the right way, and the people are pretty well rid of both now. As to the question of reciprocity in trade, we were discussing in this House and in this country, something that could not be accomplished in this parliament If we wish to get freer trade with the people of the United States, it must come from the people of the United States, they alone have the right to give it, and if they desire closer trade relations with us, and if they wish to take down barriers, let them begin and take them down. But until they do so, it is futile for us to devote attention to the question. We should be much better occupied in discussing questions that we can deal with. There are grievances in this country in connection with trade, and they can be rectified, and rectified in this House; and they should be rectified right away. To some of these I wish to draw public attention. The people of the west who were said to be the moving spirits in regard to closer trade with the United States have grievances which have been brought up in this House, and they may have grievances in regard to trade. The tariff, may be in some respects, objectionable to them. In whatever respect the tariff may be objectionable to the people of the west I hope these objections will be stated in this House and that this House will try to meet the views of the people of the west, and give them relief. They may have grievances against the tariff, and they may be desirous of obtaining the American market. Well, let us try to cure any grievances they may have in regard to the tariff. But, if they wish the markets of the United States, I can only tell them that they must allow the Amercian people and the American Congress to give them entrance to that market—that this cannot be secured by way of this House.

The people of the west have great grievances and to these grievances I wish to call attention. In doing so I do not think I am wasting the time of the House, because these are matters that the House can deal with. What are those grievances? The grievances of the people of the west are in connection with the railway situation. They have great grievances in regard to every feature of the service that the railways give. And these are equally grievances of the people of the east—they are the grievances of the people of all Canada.

There are grievances of the people that we can cure at once. The people of the west, and the people of the east also, are suffering to-day from excessive express charges. The remedy is within the power of the government and of parliament; it is simply the establishment of a parcel post system that will bring the express companies to time. We do not even need legislation from this House. An order in council, or even a direction by the Postmaster General, can put in force in Canada to-day a first class parcel post system that will relieve the people of the excessive charges they are now paying. It is true, the Railway Commission took up this question of express charges. But they were very long in dealing with it and their dealing with it has not been very satisfactory. Now a great new principle

in economics has been developed in my own province of Ontario and in my own city of Toronto, and in this city of Ottawa also; that applies wherever there are great private corporations exercising franchises in the way of public services. The only way to compel those corporations to give the people fair treatment and reasonable rates is by public competition—competition of the state. In the province of Ontario, and in the city of Toronto a monopoly existed in the supply of electrical energy. The rates imposed by the private companies exercising public franchises were exorbitant. The very day the province of Ontario was able to carry out its hydro-electric power policy and the municipalities were thus enabled to supply electrical energy, that very day the rates were cut in two. And where, formerly, you could get no fair treatment from any of these private companies, as soon as competition came in there was a very pleasant change. The same thing will happen in the case of the express companies the moment the government inaugurates a parcel post system. Opponents of this idea say that the parcel post system is in the interests of the large merchants of the cities. There may be something in that. At any rate the express companies always speak through some one who says he speaks for the country storekeeper. But it would be to the benefit of the people of all Canada to have express rates reduced, as could be done by the establishment of the parcel post system. I have said in this House before, but it is no harm to repeat it, that Germany controls the parcel post system the express system, and the railways, and there the people get good service at low rates. In Great Britain they have a splendid parcel post system. And some one representing the government of the United States announced yesterday that an arrangement had been made between Great Britain and the United States for the extension of the parcel post system to parcels between the two countries. But to-day the people of the United States are in the same position as ourselves and have to pay exorbitant express rates. The other day the Railway Commission intimated to the express companies that they proposed to overhaul their charges. That very day 'the coon came down' and the companies submitted to a great reduction in their tolls. And the same thing would happen in Canada, if the Postmaster General should proclaim that the parcel post system was to be extended on lines already worked out by the officials of the department. The people of the west want these reductions, as do the people of the east.

There is another thing where state competition can bring the greatest monopoly in the world to time, and that is in the matter of the telegraph service, and by that I mean both cable messages and land-line messages. In regard to cables, as I said, the greatest monopoly in the world was centred in England. According to statements made in the British House of Commons recently this great monopoly in England has passed under the control of the telegraph companies in the United States, private companies of enormous capitalization and of the greatest influence. In regard to express companies and telegraph companies also the Senate of the United States have overridden the rights of the people of that country, and this same monopoly now proposes to regulate the cable rates of Great Britain and of Canada. This government must have information in regard to the matter, because the previous government had information, and the late Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) stated in this House, in answer to me in the last session of the late parliament, that this government was ready to get a reduction of the cable rates. Well, then, why does not somebody do it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Why did not the right hon. gentleman do it when he had power? I hope this government will do it now and that, in consequence of the mere announcement to the world at large that this government of Canada proposes to follow in the line of government ownership and put the state into active competition with the cable companies, the cable tolls to-morrow will come down one-half. I believe, perhaps, the mere statement of the case here to-day will have the same effect on those companies, those American companies that now control the cable tolls and control more or less the telephone tolls in this country. The Canadian Pacific railway is a very rich corporation, it is making enormous profits out of its franchises in the west and in the east, and it ought to reduce the telegraph tolls that are charged in the west and here in the east. I say that the telegraph tolls in Canada to-day are exorbitant, and especially are they exorbitant in the east, and if they do not reduce them, and if the Railway Commission in this country is not more active in securing a reduction, then I say that this government representing the state ought to declare that it is the duty of the state to embark, not only in the cable business, but in the telegraph business, and to give the people lower telegraph tolls.

Is there anything else into which state competition can be carried in order to secure benefits to the people? I believe the time has come when, if we are not to have complete government ownership of

the railways of this country, we should at least have state-owned railways in competition with private-owned corporations. That alone would be very effective in reducing the freight rates in this country. The freight rates are exorbitant, and the people of the west feel them to be exorbitant, but no substantial effort has yet been made to reduce them. Take the question of passenger rates. I have brought that matter up time and again in this House, but I am talking now about the economic conditions that come home to every man, woman and child in this country, conditions on which the progress and development of the country depend. There is a grievance, a great grievance, in regard to the passenger rates in this country, and I am prepared to show, as I have tried to show in this House before, that a reduction in the passenger rates will not only increase the convenience to the people and the service to the people, but it will in the end increase the revenue to the companies. It is like the reduction in postage; the greater the reduction in postage, the greater has been the convenience to the public and the profits to the post office. So the great Canadian Pacific railway which can afford to pay enormous dividends, and to cut melons and distribute them amongst its shareholders, is in duty bound by its charter, and by the law of fair dealing to the people, to give the people from one end of the country to the other a two-cent a mile passenger rate.

Mr. KNOWLES. What about a reduction in the tariff? Would not that bring the same effect?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I am dealing now with the railways, and if the hon. gentleman will give me a little support in this House in regard to the railway grievances of the people of the west, we will be more likely to get relief. I say that we cannot deal with the tariff now. We will get relief in regard to the tariff when the Democratic party come into power in the United States, because I believe they will then take down their bars, and when they do that we will thank them for it. But we cannot do that ourselves because it is like trying to lift yourself up with your boot straps, you cannot get relief in any other way.

Mr. KNOWLES. I will support the hon. gentleman in every reasonable way to get reduced rates if he will support me in getting a reduction of the tariff in the interest of the western farmers.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I said I was prepared to discuss the grievances of the western farmers, and I am, because they have grievances, and we have always had them. I will help him to get rid of those grievances. But it is not through the Congress of the United States that relief is to come from telegraph tolls, it is through the parliament of Canada. Let the hon. gentleman state his case, and it will be dealt with in this House, and when he makes out a good case he will get support. The people of the west want these reductions, and there is a way of getting them, and you can get them to-morrow. We can get lower express rates by putting a parcel-post system in competition with the express companies. We have a right to ask that great Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with its enormous surpluses, that it should now reduce its tariff both on telegraphs, on express and on passenger rates. Now the very peculiar doctrine has been set up in this country that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by reason of its successive surpluses, were compelled to reduce its tariff, the other railways might suffer. Well, they take that chance in business. We have not guaranteed anybody in this country that they shall be free from competition. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by its charter, by the railway law, and by what has happened in other places, is bound to give the people of this country great reductions in the charges. One way of bringing this about is to show that the Canadian Pacific railway is in this cable monopoly. It is a cable monopoly that is keeping up these excessive rates, and making even the press rates excessive. They are a party to it. Well now, let us in this House, get down to business, to what I call practical business, in dealing with the grievances of the people; let this House undertake now to get lower express rates, to get lower freight rates and to get better railway service of all kinds. A great corporation when it gets a franchise, undertakes the responsibility of giving a service, and this House has a right to define what that service should be. The Railway Commission also has a duty to do in regard to the matter, but it does not do its duty.

And here I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to something with which he agreed with me when I brought it up before in this House, and that is that hitherto we have had no provision in Canada for the enforcement of Federal laws. We pass Federal laws but we do not enforce them, we make no provision for their enforcement. I pointed out before, and I point out now, that in every great Federal law passed in the public interest in the United States, there is a clause that it is the duty of the Attorney General to enforce that law, and money is voted in supply for that purpose. Now, after a great deal of trouble we have had some enforcement of railway law in this country, and I say it is the duty of the government

forthwith to provide for the enforcement of the Railway Act in this country by the Attorney General of the day and by his officers, and that money ought to be given him to enforce our Federal laws. If the bringing of the railways to time was a duty specifically imposed upon the government, as it ought to be, I say that the grievances which the people suffer to-day from the railways would be rectified, even by that means.

But, in some way, whether by this House, or through the government undertaking the enforcement of federal law or by any of its departments entering into practical competition with the railways the thing must be done. The people of this country and the people of the province of Ontario in particular are altogether in favour of what is called progressive government, and progressive government is all in the direction of regulating the corporations that do exercise public franchises in this country. There is only one way to do it, and that is by making laws, and when you have made them, enforce them. If you are not able to bring them to time in that way you have the right to compete with them, and state competition is the new doctrine that I preach here to-day, and have preached here before. It is recognized by the people of Ontario, and especially by the municipalities that public competition is the only way to bring these corporations to time. The rates have been cut in two for electricity all through Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. It has been the same with school books.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). That was not by competition, but the price was reduced, and the state brought the publishers to time.

Mr. COCHRANE. It was by competition.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). My hon. friend here (Mr. Cochrane), who ought to know, says that they forced competition and reduction. Here we are spending the time of this House—I do not say it is being spent wastefully—but taking up too much of the time with the discussion of constitutional questions—lawyers' issues—when it is the grievances of the people, and the rectification of these grievances in every direction, within the limitation of the powers of this parliament, to which we should be directing our attention.

So, I desire to say in connection with this motion to go into Supply, and after having read the debate that occurred in the House last week, that the immediate duty of parliament—and probably the government has a programme in that respect—is to give the people relief in regard to express charges, telegraph and cable tolls, and railway freight and passenger rates, either by active competition, or by an insistence on a reduction of the charges before the Railway Commission. It is necessary at these hearings that the rights of the people shall be stated before that commission not by a single man, but by the state, represented by the legal department, or represented by the best counsel that can be obtained for the purpose. Why should a farmer have to come himself before the Railway Commission or send a lawyer to have his rights respected? If he has a grievance the state ought to see that the cure of that grievance is brought about. In that way, and in that way only we will be doing the people of this country a substantial service. We would be better occupied, I think, in discussing these economic questions rather than these constitutional questions that appear to take up so much of the time of the House, or discussing the respective merits of the parties. It is all very well to discuss the respective merits and records of the parties, but in the meantime it is now known to be the fact that relief with regard to trade, and the widening of markets, especially in connection with the United States, is not within our jurisdiction, and that if we leave that to the Americans they may do something. But there are some things that can be done, and the people are looking for relief with regard to these railway charges and telegraph and cable tolls.

One thing more I wish to say and that is in the progressive platform of the people of Canada—which I am glad to see was mentioned in the opening speeches in the debate on the address—in addition to these things which I have enumerated, is the regulation of the capitalization of companies. The United States have been trying to do it, they are doing it, and they are having great battles over it. The commission which was appointed to deal with this question is about to make its report in the United States, and I have no doubt what the finding of that commission will be. It will be that the capitalization of public companies is a matter of extreme concern to the public, that the tariffs imposed upon these companies must necessarily be based upon the capitalization, and that therefore control of capitalization in the interest of the public is absolutely necessary. We must come to that in this country. I ask the people of the west, I ask the members here from the west, irrespective of party, whether they do not think it was a wrong, a crime against the people of this country that the great Canadian Pacific railway should increase its capitalization as it did increase it by distributing free stock among its shareholders. A great wrong was committed by the Bell Telephone company which did the same thing. How much longer are these abuses to be allowed to continue? The country and parliament are entitled to an early declaration of policy on the part of the government with regard to these questions. I believe in a progressive

programme in that respect, and I hope it will soon be produced. I would like to hear an early statement as to what is to be done with these great questions that come home to everybody in the country. Constitutional grievances are all right, and men may spend their time over them and lawyers may like to argue them, but the people are asking for something progressive on the lines of relief which I have indicated.

They have in United States politics what they call insurgency. There will be a great many insurgents in this country from either of the parties if something is not done with these questions, because all I can make out of the charge of being an insurgent in the United States is that the man who is guilty of insurgency is the man who is seeking progressive legislation in the way of the regulation of companies, the regulation of their capitalization, the regulation of their charges, and compelling them to give good service.

A great many taunts at different times have been thrown at this proposition of public ownership. The sentiment in favour of public ownership is growing steadily all the world over. There is no recession from public ownership in any portion of the world where it has been tried. It is advancing every day, and until we get public ownership I want to see public competition as against the great corporations. There is the key to the position, there is the obligation, and it is up to this House to make a step in that direction. Neither the Conservatives nor any other party in this country can claim any great credit now with regard to reciprocity or things of that kind. That is settled and past, but these questions are here, and must be settled, and they can only be settled in that way, because the demand of the people is for progressive legislation in regard to these great questions which we can settle ourselves. I hope that before long, I hope even before this House rises, if there is to be an adjournment, certainly at a very early date, we will have a declaration along the line of progress. The progress that has been made in Ontario is phenomenal. While the western part had public competition with regard to electrical energy, and the services that went with it, the east had not, but now the Hydro-Electric system is to be extended from one end of the province to the other. The city of Winnipeg has gone into public ownership, and the day that its wires began to conduct the energy that day the old line companies said: We are going to compete for this business now and we are going to cut the rates. They did cut the rates. The people of the United States are almost in rebellion at the condition of things, yet, apparently, they have not the means to get public competition that we have here.

We have the necessary legislation to hand for the purpose, and if the announcement is made in this House to-day that Canada proposes to lead in binding the empire by cheap cable tolls, the monopoly, whether in New York or in London, will surrender in a day. They are willing to surrender now, but if they reduce their tolls, they want to make a term that there shall be no competition from the state. I am opposed to any such arrangement. Some years ago an infamous agreement in a similar respect was made by the province of Ontario with regard to hydro-electric power, and in connection with which the province actually surrendered its sovereignty, but such a surrender by the state to private corporations must never be made in this country again. We should assert that we are imperial by proving it, and not by talking it, and for imperial reasons and for business reasons we should at once declare that we will have cable tolls cut in two even if we have to build a cable of our own. Why, it only requires a few million dollars to build a cable and the Canadian business alone at half the rates now charged would support that cable. I give the late government credit for encouraging the Marconi system which afforded some slight relief, and the money was well spent in that direction, but it would have been ten times better spent in the interest of Canada and the empire if the government had laid an Atlantic cable. I recommend to the governor that they should tell this cable monopoly that they intend to cut the rates in two by building a cable between Canada and the mother country, and if we have our own cable we must have our own land lines and the post office can take them over and do what they did in England namely, double the number of words for the existing price. These are practical questions that come home to every man in this country. If the government wants to show it is progressive it will make an early pronouncement in favour of all these things. I sympathize with the people of the west; they sought to get relief in the reciprocity proposal, but that is not whence their great relief is to come. It is the excessive charges by private corporations that causes most of the trouble, and I give credit to the Winnipeg 'Free Press' for being able to show—notwithstanding the statement of the late Minister of Railways, and no doubt he was sincere in making the statement—that the freight charges in western Canada are to-day heavier than they are in the western states. I do not seek to get into any squabble with hon. gentlemen from the west whether they are Liberals or Conservatives; I shall be glad to join with them on every occasion in their attempt to get relief for their people in the directions I have suggested. I again warn the government that the Canadian Pacific railway may in a few days endeavour to make a further issue of free stock to its

shareholders. That to my mind is an abomination and should not be allowed. The sooner we have a law regulating the issue of securities by these federal companies the better it will be for the people of Canada. We want such a law in the province of Ontario, and I call Sir James Whitney's attention to the fact that such an announcement ought to be in his progressive platform, and that I am sorry to see it absent therefrom. There ought to be a regulation in all the provinces with regard to the securities issued by these corporations. I make these statements to-day absolutely in the public interest, and so as to give the government an early opportunity to say to the people that they intend to effect reforms on the lines now indicated by me.

Mr. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). My hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) semi-occasionally favours this House with his presence, and it is notable that when he so favours the House it is fully advertised next morning in some papers that are published not far from Toronto.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Is that a crime?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am glad the hon. gentleman does come semi-occasionally because he comes in a breezy way, but if he takes his own utterances seriously he is very much like Dundreary's peacocks in that he flocks all by himself alone in that respect.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has evidently been doing the Rip Van Winkle act for some time, because he announces that the remedy for grievances suffered by the people in eastern and western Canada with respect to trade relations with the United States is only to be found in the United States Congress, forgetful that there has been for some time on the statute-books of the United States a provision whereby relief can be afforded to the people of Canada in the west and in the east contingent on the sole condition that the parliament of Canada shall do its part in the undertaking. When he states that this parliament has no power to grant this relief the hon. gentleman is forgetful of the main fact that the people of the United States have enacted a law by which the people of Canada can have free entrance into the markets of the United States provided the parliament of Canada will afford the people of the United States like privileges in Canada.

My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) is to-day much agonized with respect to economic conditions, but since when have these agonies overtaken him. A few weeks ago the hon. member was not seriously affected by anything involving economics, but was entirely governed by sentiment. I do not know that the hon. gentleman would wish to repudiate that idea, but if he speaks true to the fact, as no doubt he always wishes to speak, then he will acknowledge my accusation.

I knew he would acknowledge that sentiment governed him and that he was not particularly interested with economics in the question which was submitted to the people, namely, as to whether their products should have free entry into the markets of the United States. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that in United States politics there is the cult of insurgency. Well, we have always recognized my hon. friend as the prince of insurgents in this country, and I presume that he is now going to lead another insurgent party in this parliament as he did in the last parliament. But I would suggest to him—and I do it most respectfully and in all good feeling—that in his insurgency he should stick closely to the facts and not seek to mislead the people by representing to them that there is no possibility of relief within their reach from the parliament of Canada and that they must turn their eyes to Washington and look to the United States Congress if they would have any favours in the way of tariff regulation on their exports to that country. My hon. friend should not forget, when he states that parliament can do nothing to meet the desires and aspirations of the people of Canada but that they must wait for the American Congress to do something, that the Congress of the United States had passed legislation giving the desired relief provided the parliament of Canada would give its concurrence:

Mr. MACLEAN (York). And the Canadian people refused that concurrence.

Mr. EMMERSON. True our people nominally refused to concur, but my hon. friend did not preach that doctrine of economics to them.

Mr. CURRIE. He did.

Mr. EMMERSON. Some hon. gentleman said that he did.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I think I did. I never made an argument that was not based on facts and the people listened to me and were convinced, and along came some gentleman who talked the contrary but could not convince me.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know what kind of facts my hon. friend is referring to.

Mr. FOWLER. Real facts.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think my hon. friend always indulges in real facts. If he does, my hon. friend from Kings

(Mr. Fowler) who interrupts does not follow him in that respect. I can only suggest that my hon. friend would do well to have some remedy applied to himself with regard to the railwayphobia disease with which he seems to be troubled, and that he should for a moment turn his attention from the Canadian Pacific railway and some of the other railway corporations of Canada and give it to the true economics in which our people are deeply interested. With the energy he possesses, with his breezy manner of expression, I am sure he could do very much in convincing those hon. gentlemen on the other side who sit behind him. I am sure his efforts would have an educative value and that he would accomplish something. For many years he has been beating the air with respect to his express and freight rates, but apparently he never comes down to the practical side of these things. Certainly if he has any ideas that are practicable, he does not put them into effect, but contents himself with coming here ocasionally and giving utterance to them without doing the work that is necessary in order that the government may practically take hold of the grievances which he alleges to exist and relieve the people from them. I am quite in accord with him with respect to many of his ideas in connection with government ownership. I have often thought that he was accidentally right, but I have felt that he should be more serious. I am not saying that he is insincere but I would advise him to direct his efforts towards measures that may accomplish something, and not content himself with coming to this House semi-occasionally and airing himself on these subjects.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Before you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, last evening, I gave notice of the intention of some hon. gentlemen on this side to discuss this afternoon the matter of the dismissal of officials. One or two, however, who wish to take part in the discussion are unable to be present, and, therefore, the discussion will take place on Monday next.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). Before this motion is carried, I would like to say that I trust my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) will realize that we have not been in office more than a few weeks, and that our time has been so much occupied with the work of preparation for parliament that we have not been able to give to the subjects he has brought to our notice the consideration which no doubt they deserve. I would like to say with reference to the observations of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) that he does my hon. friend from South York an injustice when he suggests that my hon. friend's arguments in the recent campaign were not based on economic grounds. I had the pleasure of speaking with him on one occasion, and I know that the speech he made then was almost entirely based on economic grounds. I have personal knowledge also that the newspaper with which he is very closely connected published daily during the campaign, the results of actual investigations into facts which were entirely of an economic character, and dealt solely with the economic phase of the question at issue.

As regards information which my hon. friend alleges to be in possession of the government with respect to the parcel post service, I can only say that up to the present I have not had an opportunity of ascertaining whether such information was in possession of the late government or not; but if any such is available, we shall give it our consideration at the earliest possible moment.

My hon. friend refers to state competition as an effective remedy. Of course there is another school of thought which holds that the true principle is not so much based on state competition as state monopoly. In other words if the state undertakes the operation of any great public utility, it ought to undertake it in the way of a monopoly rather than in the way of competition with private enterprise. I am not offering any opinion at present but merely suggesting that there is a difference on that point. My hon. friend says that the Railway Commission of Canada has not dealt satisfactorily with express rates. I am not prepared either to admit or deny that statement, because I have not given the matter careful study; but I would like to say to him that if he will indicate to me in what respect the Railway Commission of Canada has not dealt satisfactorily or effectively with express rates, I shall make it my duty to communicate his complaint without any delay to the chairman of that commission, and ask him to investigate it or report to me the reasons why he does not think any further investigation necessary.

The parliament of Canada has constituted the Railway Commission as a tribunal for the purpose of keeping the rates charged at a proper standard. As far as I have observed their work it seems to me they have made an excellent attempt at bringing that about. I am not prepared to say that their work is perfect, or that it might not be improved in some respects, but at the same time I am not prepared at the moment to point out in what respect they should have done more. If the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) or any other hon. member of this House will bring to my attention any matter in respect to which he thinks the Railway Com-

mission has not achieved the purpose for which it was formed, I shall undertake that the matter shall be brought to the attention of the commission without delay. My hon. friend also made some observations with regard to passenger rates. I am prepared to submit any complaint of that kind to the Railway Commission. The Department of the Minister of Railways and Canals, I think, is authorized by the terms of the statute to bring any matter of that kind to the attention of the commission and to ask them to investigate it, and it would be a proper thing for any member of this House or any citizen who has any demand of that kind which he wishes to bring to the attention of the government, and in that way to the Railway Commission, to lay it before the Minister of Railways.

My hon. friend also mentioned several other matters, but I do not know that at the moment, I have any observations to offer upon them which would be of service. The regulation of capitalization to which my hon. friend called attention is a very important matter indeed and I can assure him that as soon as the report of the tribunal in the United States, which was constituted for the purpose of investigating that question, is available it will receive the careful attention of the government, because I am inclined to think that there is good reason for the government and parliament of Canada taking up that matter in some reasonable and effective way. Whether or not it will be possible to do so this session I cannot say, nor do I intend to assure my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) that we shall be able to overtake any of the matters to which he has called attention during the present session, because, as I have said, the present government have been in office for only a few weeks, our time has been almost unceasingly employed in preparation for the session and in connection with arrears of public affairs, and the ordinary transaction of public business. In order to convince my hon. friend that I am speaking entirely within the mark I may assure him that it has been my practice for several days past to receive a delegation on the way to lunch, another one at lunch, and a third during my return from lunch, and in that way to be as economical as possible of my time; so I trust he will receive my assurance that every member of the government has been fully occupied with matters of urgent daily concern to the utmost extent of his energy and capacity. At the same time, some of these matters to which my hon. friend has called attention will at the earliest possible moment receive the consideration of the government.

Mr. BORDEN.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Prime Minister has said he will be very glad to have information in respect to excessive express rates. The last decision given out by the chairman of the Railway Commission permits express companies to charge express rates in the west of $1.66 and in British Columbia of $2 for carrying any parcel the same distance as they charge $1 for in the east. It is well known to every member that the cost of building roads in the west is much less than the cost of building railroads down here. The wages for operating may be a little higher, but if you take the upkeep and the interest on the investment in the railways, mile for mile, the total cost of running a mile of railway in the prairie provinces—I am not speaking of British Columbia—is considerably lower than down here.

Mr. CURRIE. How about the revenue?

Mr. TURRIFF. The revenue is twice as large because they charge twice as much.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). And the government subsidy is ten times as much.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman's statement in regard to the cost is very interesting and rather surprising to me. What would he believe to be the average cost per mile of railroad construction in the three prairie provinces under ordinary conditions?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not a railway constructor, but any man who has common judgment, and who goes over the roads in the west——

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, oh.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentlemen think I will make some remarks that will let them criticise the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but they cannot catch me in anything like that. A railroad built as the Canadian Northern railway, or the Canadian Pacific railway, or the Grand Trunk Pacific is built, can be constructed, one hundred miles with another, at a lower cost in the west than the same class of road would cost in the eastern provinces. That being the case I ask why we in the west should pay $1.66 where the man in Ontario pays $1, and the man in British Columbia has to pay the still more unreasonable charge of $2. That is a statement of fact and I think that something should be done. I took this up with the late government a few months before the prorogation and pointed out the difference. There is something radically wrong when the people of the west are bled in this manner, and I am pleased to hear the Prime Minister say that he will take the matter up with the Railway Commission.

I have myself applied to the Railway Commission in connection with this matter, and they claim they are investigating the whole condition and hope to be able to bring about a satisfactory solution. But I want to say that there will be no satisfactory solution of that matter as long as the people of the west are charged two prices as compared with the people of the east.

Mr. CURRIE. What about that car of flaxseed you were telling the House and the country about?

Mr TURRIFF. Does my hon. friend mean to say, as he did in a letter to a newspaper in the west, that I had made a misstatement of fact when I said that flax had been shipped last year from Saskatchewan?

Mr. CURRIE. My hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) was making a statement through the west that several cars of flaxseed were shipped from Saskatchewan, and that the shippers had lost from $300 to $400 a car owing to excessive freight rates in the west compared with those of other provinces. But the question was asked in the House how much flaxseed had been shipped from Saskatchewan to Duluth last year, and the government reported that none had been shipped. That is the kind of stuff the hon. gentleman has been giving to the people in the west.

Mr. TURRIFF. I thought that my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) at some time, with his usual freshness, would bring that matter up, so I thought I would get ready for him. When I made the statement that one of my constituents had lost money on shipping his flaxseed to the United States I made a statement that was absolutely correct. But I did not say the loss was on account of the freight rate, I said that it was on account of the duty of 25 cents a bushel on the flax. Then somebody—I think it was my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) asked the question in the House, and a return was given from the Department of Customs—

Mr. STAPLES. Allow me to correct the hon. member. I did not ask the question. It was the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan).

Mr. TURRIFF. But my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) referred to it.

Mr. STAPLES. Yes.

Mr TURRIFF. And the reply to the question was that no flax had been shipped during the year 1910 from Saskatchewan to the United States. This reply was read in House the day before the closing of parliament. I immediately went to the Customs Department to inquire. I found that the clerk, not being very well posted in his duties, I must acknowledge, thought they were referring to 'flax' as flax straw and not as flaxseed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Come off.

Mr. TURRIFF. That was the report I got from the Customs Department. The next day I got an official statement from them on this subject, which statement is as follows:

STATEMENT showing exports of flaxseed during calendar year ending 1910.

Port.	Country to which Exported.	Bush.
Emmerson.....	United States.. ..	1,260
Gretna.....	United States.. ..	2
North Portal, Sask.	Great Britain.. ..	30,982
" "	United States.. ..	40,246
Bridgeburg, Ont...	Great Britain.. ..	2,588
" " ...	United States.. ..	16,975
" " ...	France	934
Fort William, Ont.	Great Britain.. ..	427,775
" "	United States.. ..	732,996
Niagara Falls, Ont.	United States.. ..	70,038
Port Arthur, Ont..	Great Britain.. ..	558,766
" " ..	United States.. ..	903,484
Sarnia Ont.....	United States.. ..	9,095

North Portal is in my constituency and is the port from which the constituent to whom I have referred shipped his flax. Now, nine-tenths of all the flax grown in the Dominion of Canada is grown in Saskatchewan, and practically all that flax shipped from Fort William and Port Arthur was the product of Saskatchewan. And it will be noted, from the statement, that over a million and a half of bushels were sent into the United States from those ports. So, when my hon. friend rushed into print in a western paper accusing me of trying to mislead this House and the country, he should have been a little more certain of his facts and should have been careful not to make statements himself which had no foundation whatever. I am very glad of this opportunity to refer to the matter and to show that what I said was absolutely true. Every farmer who shipped a bushel of flax from Saskatchewan to the United States last year or this year was compelled to lose 25 cents a bushel through not having free access to the market of that country. You cannot sell the flax in Canada; there is no demand for it, nor can you sell it all to Great Britain. Therefore, some of it simply must be sold in the United States, and the farmer must pay this duty of 25 cents a bushel. Last year the farmers of Saskatchewan paid over $400,000 in duties on flax that was shipped into the United States. And while I am on this subject, I would like to say to the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) that, while I agree with him in a great deal that he has said about the railways—and I intend

to go into that question during this session—yet, for every dollar we lose through the railways, we lose ten through not having the American market as we should have had it under reciprocity. Had we in the west the American market we could stand to be robbed some, but not having the American market we cannot afford it. Access to the American market to-day would make a difference of from 15 cents to 20 cents on every bushel of wheat we have.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is all right for hon. gentlemen to say 'Oh, oh.' But I know what I am talking about. Take No. 3 Canadian wheat to-day at Fort William and compare the price with No. 1 wheat in Minneapolis—and our No. 3 will grade No. 1 in Minneapolis—and the difference will be found to be fifteen cents a bushel, and sometimes more. At the present time, owing to the poor crop you have not a market in Canada for some grades. We have millions, and tens of millions, of bushels of wheat this year that will not grade, and there will be a difference of 25 cents a bushel on that low grade wheat as compared with what you could get for it in the American market. While my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is right in a great deal he has said, let him bear in mind that the one chance of his life to help the people of the west—about whom he is so anxious and whose representatives in this House he criticises as not doing their duty—he neglected, and that in the course he took he went against the wishes of the people of the western provinces where the wheat is produced.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) a question. As I understand it, he says that the difference in the prices of wheat is because of the difference in grade.

Mr. TURRIFF. Partially.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. And I think he said that grade No. 3 in Canada was grade No. 1 on the other side. Now, I would ask him, who made these grades, if it was not the late government?

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) knows who made the grades as well as I do.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has been giving a lot of so-called facts to the House. Now, from what department did he receive these?

Mr. TURRIFF. I got them from the chief clerk of the statistical branch of the Customs Department, and I should be glad to send the statement to my hon. friend (Mr. Currie).

Mr. TURRIFF.

Mr. CURRIE. Now, I would ask, are there any sworn statistics of these exports from Canada to be obtained from the Customs Department. I might ask that question of the Minister of Customs, and I am sure he would answer, 'No.' The flax that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) speaks of went not to the United States, but to Great Britain. A gentleman who was opposing me in my riding, told the farmers that he had bought 40,000 bushels of barley in the riding and shipped it to the United States, and that the farmers had lost something like $15,000 on that transaction. I happened, fortunately, to have the figures from the United States Treasury Department showing the imports of barley for 1911. The 1910 figures were shown in the blue-book published by this government. These figures proved that not a single bushel of barley had been taken into the United States for home consumption during 1911. It will be found when the facts are discovered that these millions have gone to the United States to be shipped abroad, and that takes all the argument out of his story. The flax seed was shipped to the United States for re-export to Great Britain.

Mr. EMMERSON. Was it shipped in bond?

Mr. CURRIE. From Buffalo in bond. The American officials will furnish you the figures to show what amount was reshipped. The Canadian statistics are not definite, because the Canadian government does not require a sworn manifest of the exports.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was going to ask my hon. friend if the Canadian statistics would not show the quantity shipped in bond from this country?

Mr. CURRIE. The Canadian statistics do not take that into consideration at all. I am a shipper, and I ship lots of stuff, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. ETHIER. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He has put a question, and now he is making a speech.

Mr. CURRIE. I have a perfect right to make a speech, and that is what I am doing. I am also putting a few questions, which I find the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) cannot answer very clearly. The statistics as to the exports from Canada are valueless for the reason that no sworn statement is required of the goods shipped out of Canada, whether they go into the United States in bond or for home consumption. We do not pay any attention to that. As a matter of fact, a large amount of exports leave Canada that are not taken into account by our statistical department at all. The only statistics that will show the true figures

are the American statistics, they will show the articles taken into the United States, because they have to be accompanied by sworn manifests and invoices.

Now as to freight rates in the west. A deliberate plot was laid to make the western farmers discontented with the Canadian government. About two years ago, if I remember right, the state of Minnesota undertook to legislate in the matter of railways and railway freights. They established a board similar to our Railway Board, and this board made rates of a highly socialistic character. They decreed that freight rates in the state of Minnesota should virtually be cut in two. Now the railways had to bow to this ruling, but they immediately appealed to the courts, and the courts have sustained the railways in their contention that the state of Minnesota has no right to force these rates on the railways, for the reason that under the constitution of the United States certain principles are laid down, which were violated, because these freight rates were confiscatory. But what do our hon. friends do? Although they knew otherwise, thousands of copies of these fake freight schedules were spread broadcast by hon. gentlemen opposite all through the west, to stir up dissatisfaction among the farmers, to show the farmers in the west what terrible freight rates they had to pay in Canada, whereas if they lived in the states they could get their stuff shipped for one-half the money. I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they established a Railway Commission which has absolute control over all the freight rates in the west, and if any farmer has a grievance, or if any shipper has a grievance, if the hon. gentleman has a grievance about freight rates in the west, or if his neighbour has any grievance, he can go to that Commission and demand a hearing. That is a fact they cannot deny. Now if they have any confidence in that commission established by themselves, if they have any confidence in the officials appointed by themselves, why do they not appeal to them? Apparently, from the agitation they have been carrying on over these freight rates, one would think they had not the slightest confidence in any official appointed by them on that Railway Board. Those are the facts, and if the hon. member who has just sat down is anxious to help his friends in the west, he ought to go to work and get a schedule of these overcharges, as a practical business man, and lay them before the Railway Commission in the west. He should have done that two or three years ago, when his party was in power. But the people did not believe him. The only place where the people believed him was in the west, where they had managed this campaign of misrepresentation. But in the east where the people were seized of the situation, they came to the conclusion that so far as the Liberal party was concerned, they had lost the confidence of Canada, and the result is the remnant we see in this House to-day.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to answer a question the hon. member asked me. He made the statement——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. member that he has already spoken two or three times. If he merely desires to ask a question or to answer one without debate, there is no objection. But to enter into a debate would be irregular.

Mr. TURRIFF. I just wish to answer a question. The question was, if I knew that no flax had been shipped into the United States from Canada in the year 1910 for consumption in the United States, and coupled with the question was a statement that the flax shipped into the United States from Canada during 1910 was shipped in bond and sent through to Great Britain. Well, I find that during 1910 there was $1,256,436 worth shipped into the United States, on which the Americans paid a duty of $353,158. If it was being shipped through to Great Britain it would have gone through in bond, and would not have paid any duty.

Mr. COCHRANE. I may say that I have received petitions from Boards of Trade in Winnipeg and other cities in reference to freight rates, and I immediately forwarded them to the Railway Commission, and I have an answer from the chairman that he will investigate them at once. If there are any other complaints, I am willing to take them up in the same way.

Mr. FOWLER. This discussion which started about freight rates and express charges has wandered somewhat far afield. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) treated us to a lengthy dissertation, in his usual florid style, on reciprocity. The hon. member for Westmoreland seems to feel very sorely the position in which he sits at the present time on the left of the Speaker, and consequently he sometimes says things that are a little nasty—if that be not unparliamentary, as I have been out of parliament for some time; he is a little nasty in his rejoinders. I happened to interject a remark that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) was dealing in real facts, and the hon. member for Westmoreland found it necessary to remark that I was not following the example of the hon. member for South York. I do not quite understand, Mr. Speaker, why the hon. gentle-

man should say that. He has had one experience with me with regard to certain facts, and he seemed in that experience to have run up against real facts, so real that the hon. gentleman exchanged the office which he then held for a seat as private member.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps it might be as well to come back to the real question which was brought before the House by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). I do not altogether agree with the observations of my hon. friend from South York. We all understand that he is most persistent in pursuing the question he has brought up. Whenever he comes into the House, he is not long here before he brings up the subject of freight rates, passenger rates, and railway questions in general. My hon. friend in this matter is a radical, he is not only a radical but he is revolutionary, according to my humble judgment. My hon. friend is persistent in pursuing his object of securing the nationalization of railways. He could not persuade the late government to go so far as he wanted them to go, and to nationalize the railways; and I doubt if he will persuade my hon. friends opposite to do so. The policy of my hon. friend is too radical, I believe, for Canada at the present time. We have a good system of railways, as everybody will agree. It is not giving universal satisfaction, because every man who has to pay railway freights always thinks that he is paying too much.

We have been gradually reducing rates. In the west rates have been reduced a good deal. They were reduced once, and then they were reduced again. I believe that everybody will agree that we went very far, as far perhaps as public opinion would justify, or the needs of the country demanded, when we established the Railway Commission eight years ago. The Railway Commission has done remarkably well. Everybody is pleased with it. I believe that my hon. friend who has just addressed the House on this side, will agree with me that it is giving satisfaction. It may be that with regard to a certain decision it has not done so. I would like to know the court which has always given satisfaction to every suitor. It may be that upon the occasion to which my hon. friend referred the decision rendered by the commission was not altogether satisfactory to the people of the west. As I understand the statement made by my hon. friend, the commission made three classes of rates, one for the east, one for the west, and one for British Columbia. If they have adopted that basis that was the true basis to adopt. We acknowledge that there should be a different basis for freight charges and passenger rates in the east and in the west. It may be possible that the commission went too far in the use, and in the application of that doctrine. But, if the commission went too far the remedy is with the commission itself. The Prime Minister can do nothing with the commission. The commission is a perfectly independent body, independent of the government, independent of the opposition, and amenable only to parliament.

Mr. BORDEN. We can merely bring matters to their attention.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is all, and if a decision has been improperly rendered I am sure that the commission will be the first to give a new hearing, and to reconsider its determination. So, I think the remedy of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) is more with the commission than with this House. But, I have an observation to make to my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I do not understand the statement he made a moment ago that our customs service do not take account of shipments going out in bond. My hon. friend is in error about that.

Mr. CURRIE. I say that the customs service do not take into consideration anything shipped out in bond. The right hon. gentleman who has been Prime Minister and leader of the government of this country apparently does not know that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then my hon. friend was altogether in error in saying that goods shipped in bond are not taken into account. We have been accustomed in our statistics to keep track of the goods that have been shipped in bond, and those which are shipped to the United States for consumption. I think that my hon. friend is altogether in error.

Mr. CURRIE. I have no desire to show up the right hon. gentleman's knowledge of this question——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CURRIE. —because anybody knows—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) has already spoken.

Mr. CURRIE. I do not desire to speak, but I stand by the statement I made.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House to the question of the express charges, particularly in the province of Ontario, which have been mentioned by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean). We have operating in Ontario two very strong companies—the Dominion Express company and the Canadian Express company. One of the chief complaints I find in Ontario is that where a parcel is sent, say, a distance of 100 miles, to be carried part of the distance by one company, and part by the other company there is a double charge. In my opinion these should be an arrangement

between the two express companies to divide the rates and the person receiving the express parcel should not be compelled to pay more than one charge, although the charge may have have to be divided between the two companies. That is a very universal complaint, and I think it is one that should receive the attention of those who have authority over it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). That was one of the substantial grievances of the fruit growers, was it not?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, the fruit growers have some substantial grievances in respect to express charges but I do not wish to go into that question just now. I simply wish to direct the attention of the House to a complaint which has been heard for many years, and I think it is one which should receive the immediate attention of the Railway Commission. If they are not powerful enough to remedy this matter I think the government should step in and see that something is done in the interest of the people with reference to the carriage of express parcels.

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Chairman, before you take up item 135, I wish to say a word or two with regard to a couple of other items. First I desire to say something with regard to the appropriation for the harbour of St. John. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) and, I think also my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) were both under the impression that there is a very much smaller amount available for St. John harbour than is actually the case, and I would like to give my hon. friends the figures in the hope that they would be good enough to look into them, and if they do, I think they will see that I am right. In the Supplementary Estimates passed last session there was an item of $500,000, of which five-twelfths was voted. That would make $208,334. When the late government went out of office, that amount, as I understand, remained intact. I might have used it to pay for the dredging upon the western side, but as I had said to my colleagues that that amount was intended for the improvements at Courtenay bay, it remained intact until the late government went out of office, and I presume it is intact to-day. Then, in the estimates which we voted last night, there is also for St. John harbour a sum of $554,166.66. That makes a total amount now available for St. John of $762,500.66. I am satisfied that, after paying the amount due for dredging when the late government retired from office, and making all provisions for dredging upon the west side, assuming it is carried on with ordinary speed up to the end of the present fiscal year, the 31st March next, there will still be available probably some $300,000 with which the work at Courtenay bay can be started, and which would pay for all that could possibly be done before the 31st March.

If the work at Courtenay bay is not started I believe that about $300,000 of the vote will lapse on the 31st March. In connection with the vote for the parliament buildings I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that the allotment of accommodation to the Liberal members is very unfair indeed. While our numbers are greater than the numbers of the opposition in the last parliament, two of the rooms formerly occupied by Conservatives have been taken away from us. The result is that six New Brunswick members are huddled together in a small dark room in the basement which is not fit to be occupied by gentlemen. When I was minister, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) was given a good room by himself because of having been an ex-minister, but three of us are now obliged to occupy the same room, and the six New Brunswick Liberals are accommodated as I have described. I remember that I gave to two Conservative members from New Brunswick a room in the basement, but which looked out on the terrace, and that has been taken away from us. The accommodation for the opposition members in that respect is very unsatisfactory, and I wish the Minister of Public Works to look into the question, and see that the same measure of justice is extended to us that we extended to the Conservatives when in opposition.

Mr. EDWARDS. There were eight or ten of us in the garret last parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. I regret that the Minister of Public Works is not in his seat at the moment, but I understand that Mr. Speaker in connection with the Chief Whip of each party has undertaken to apportion the accommodation. I thank my hon. friend for the accommodation given me last parliament, but I was not alone in that room as he says; I occupied it together with another good friend who was in exile with me. I have no doubt that Mr. Speaker and the Whips will endeavour to make satisfactory arrangements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend come down to room 103 in the basement and see the accommodation we have?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will give me a formal invitation I may expect something.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, if not Ottawa water we might have some ginger ale.

Intercolonial railway, $1,429,924.97.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am particularly interested in the items providing

a subsidy for the construction of a railway from Dartmouth to Musquodoboit harbour, and thence through the valley of the Musquodoboit to Deans Settlement, and also the proposed railway in the county of Guysborough. I beg to point out to the Minister of Railways that it was the settled policy of the late government to construct these two railways as branches of the Intercolonial railway, and further, that the present Prime Minister expressed his concurrence in that policy. During the summer months tenders were asked for the construction of these two branches and some time after the 21st of September, contracts were formally awarded as I understand it, to the lowest tenderers. I quite appreciate the fact that the Minister of Railways and the other ministers have been exceedingly busy of late, and I should not in the least be surprised if they say they have not yet had an opportunity of looking into this matter as fully as they would desire. But, that I may urge the Minister of Railways to immediate action in prosecuting the work I would point out that the people living in the section of the country to be traversed by these proposed railways have been long and anxiously waiting for railway service. I would also point out that it is possibly a serious injury to the contractors who are the successful tenderers to have construction delayed unreasonably. I trust the Minister of Railways will at once enter into formal contracts so that the construction may be commenced immediately. The minister will on consideration have no difficulty in reaching the conclusion that my suggestions should be adopted. I think the minister will also agree that the policy of the late government in reference to the construction of these two branches was sound, and not open to any substantial criticism.

Mr. SINCLAIR. This question is of special interest to the county I have the honour to represent, and I am pleased that my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has referred to it. The question of the Intercolonial railway branch lines has been before this House and the country for years, and it was after considerable difficulty that the members from the provinces through which the Intercolonial railway passes were able to convince the late government of the necessity of embarking in the construction of branch lines to the Intercolonial railway.

There was a good deal of hesitation, I understand, on the ground that a great deal of money would be required to build all the branch lines necessary along the line of the Intercolonial railway. At first the government adopted the idea that roads already built might be leased on the report of the chief engineer that they were earning sufficient revenue to warrant the government taking them over, and it was only last year that the government finally arrived at a decision to embark on the construction of branch lines as well as the leasing of them. The argument urged was that it was impossible for a company to profitably operate short branch lines which had to deliver all its traffic over the Intercolonial Railway. In sections such as the one to which my hon. friend has referred, with one branch going through the eastern part of the county of Halifax and another branch going through the county I have the honour to represent, the traffic would be all delivered to the main line of the Intercolonial and they would get a long haul, and branch lines of that character might be profitable to the Intercolonial, when they would not be profitable at all if built by an independent company and weighted down by the expenses necessary to run an independent company. The Intercolonial has now a staff of managers and engineers and shops at Moncton and other places and a complete equipment, so that it can equip and run branch lines at much less cost than would be possible to an independent company. Impressed by this argument and the great importance of opening up undeveloped sections of the country by railway accommodation, the late government undertook to adopt the policy of building branch lines in Nova Scotia. Three branches were projected—one on the island of Cape Breton, one reaching into the county of Guysborough from Sunnybrae to the town of Guysborough, with a branch to Country Harbour, and a third from Dartmouth and east through the county of Halifax. My hon. friend has pointed out that tenders were asked for during last season, and in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) information about these tenders was given to the House. The question of my hon. friend from Pictou was as follows:

1. Who were the tenderers for the construction of the portion of the new branch of the Intercolonial railway from Sunnybrae to Guysborough, between Guysborough and Country Harbour and Melrose?
2. What was the amount of each tender?
3. When was the contract awarded?
4. To whom was it awarded?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Nova Scotia Construction Co., Ltd., Sydney, N.S.; M. J. O'Brien, Renfrew; James H. Corbett, Moncton, N.B.; Kennedy & Macdonald, Antigonish, N.S.; S. Pearson & Son, New York, N.Y.; M. P. & J. T. Davis, Ottawa; McArthur Bros. Co., Halifax, N.S.; John W. McManus, Co., Ltd, Memramcook, N.B.

2. Nova Scotia Construction Co., $1,057,122.19; M. J. O'Brien, $1,165,189.17; James H. Corbett, $1,145,326.10; Kennedy & Macdonald, $1,085,470.86; S. Pearson & Son, $1,446,020.98; M. P. & J. T. Davis, $1,066,695.40; McArthur Bros. Co., $1,272,614.76; John W. McManus Co., Ltd., $1,300,947.61.

These accounts are based on schedule prices.
3. Contract was awarded by order in council dated 2nd October, 1911.
4. Nova Scotia Construction Co.

It would appear then that the late government had gone so far as to award the contract to the Nova Scotia Construction Company, and I am informed that that company was ready, at the time the contract was awarded to commence the work. But it would appear that they were stopped by the new administration and no work has been commenced; and in answer to a question asked by myself yesterday, the Minister of Railways replied that the government had the matter under consideration. With my hon. friend from Halifax, I have no complaint that the government should give the matter due consideration, but I trust that it will not be very long until they can see their way clear to begin the construction of these lines. No doubt the districts along the line need railway accommodation very much, and the people there are very much interested as to whether the new government really intend to construct those lines and thus carry on the work begun by the late government. I hope that the Minister of Railways is in a position now to say what the policy of the government is, and to assure us that although he has not yet been ready to do any actual work, it is the policy of the government to go forward and build those lines of railway.

Mr. McKENZIE. I fully concur in what has been said by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) as regards the necessity for building railways into those counties which they represent, but their arguments apply with greater force to the county of Victoria which is part of the riding I have the honour to represent. A discussion on this question of extending railways into Cape Breton was had in this House a little less than a year ago. On the 12th of December last the policy of extending branch lines through the different sections of the province of Nova Scotia came up on a resolution moved by myself. That resolution practically stated that in view of the railway development in the Dominion generally, the time had arrived when the Intercolonial should extend branch lines into the counties of Nova Scotia hitherto unprovided with railways. There was a very full discussion of that resolution. I would commend to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) the speech on that resolution made by the present First Minister, then leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden). That gentleman spoke at length on the subject. He declared emphatically that the government should not hesitate a moment in going on with this work and that it had already vacillated too long. In view of that declaration of policy and in view of the fact that the former leader of the opposition is now in a position to carry out the policy he then advocated, we are entitled to ask for a declaration to that effect from the Minister of Railways.

The item now before the Chair is divided into three parts. One covers the railway from Halifax, the other the railway to Guysborough, and the third the railway from Alva, in Inverness, to Baddeck, in the county of Victoria. Surveys have been made under these items of which five-twelfths of the amount was voted, and a very practicable route has been found by the surveyors. Everything was in readiness for construction, tenders had been called for, the last day for receiving them being October 12, last. I find from the answers to questions I put on the order paper that two tenders were received from contractors, but I am sorry to find from the answer to one of my questions that it is not the intention of the minister to proceed with the work at present. I am sure that will be a very great disappointment to the people of Victoria county who are very much in need of this development, and who have no railway at all. Yesterday we were told it was a matter of great hardship to some parts of the west that farmers have to haul grain 70 or 80 miles. That is bad enough in a new country, but here in Victoria county, one of the oldest in Canada, there are places that are over 100 miles distant from a railway and people have to haul their produce that distance if they would ship it by rail. It will be understood with what delight they received information last year that railway connection was to be given to them, and they will be equally depressed when they find it is not the intention of the present government to proceed with that work. I would strongly urge the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), to read the discussion when this matter came up in parliament, and particularly the speech made by the Prime Minister on December 12, last. I am sure he will conclude that if the Premier will carry out the views he then expressed there will be no delay in proceeding with the construction of this road.

Mr. COCHRANE. As the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has said, I have had little time to go into this question. There have been verbal reports about the routes, in fact one gentleman told me down there that the road should proceed from Windsor Junction and cross over, that being the shorter route to the outlet of the good valley of which the hon. member spoke. Others said that the classifications were all wrong, that where there had been reports of a large amount of earth

and very little rock the reverse is the case. So many representations were made and there was so little data on which I could lay my hands, that I concluded it was best to hold the matter up for a short time.

While the policy of the government on the general matters of railway construction has not been laid down, I realize as the head of the department, that it is the duty of this or any other government to develop the country and to provide facilities for the taking out of the natural resources of the country in the cheapest and most economical way. I feel though that when any proposition is laid before the government to build or subsidize a railway there ought to be a clear statement of the conditions in the section of country affected and the future prospects for such a railway in order that we may be satisfied that the railway will be able to stand on its own feet. The government will not lose sight of the three roads mentioned and I hope that before long, if the evidence will justify the construction of the roads, we will be able to proceed on the regular lines. I cannot say yet just in what way it will be done, whether we will accept the tenders that are in or ask for new tenders. That will take time to find out and I am not letting the grass grow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals with regard to the construction of a spur line from Hampton station to Hampton village for which there is an amount in the estimates. I asked a question a day or two ago, and it was answered yesterday. The question and answer were as follows:

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Is it intended to proceed with the work of constructing the spur line of railway from Hampton station to Hampton village, for which an appropriation was made by parliament last session?

2. Who submitted the lowest tender for the work, and has the contract yet been let?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No, not at present.

2. Only one tender was received which was not dealt with and contract not awarded.

Would the minister now state who the tenderer was, and the amount of the tender?

Mr. COCHRANE. I could not offhand, but I will be very glad to produce the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has it been decided not to proceed with this spur line?

Mr. COCHRANE. I would want a good deal more information than I have of the necessity for this line, before I could undertake to build the road. At present I have not information sufficiently strong to warrant the construction, but I shall go into the whole matter and see what can be done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be glad if my my hon. friend would do so. I should perhaps call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the condition of affairs at Hampton. Hampton village is a thriving village, quite populous and there is one very important industry there employing a good many hands in the manufacture of lumber which it would be a very great advantage to ship by rail. The village to which it is proposed to build this spur is situated upon the Kennebecasis river, whereas Hampton station is a mile or a little further by the route the spur would take from the village.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is the extension for the purpose of helping to get the lumber out to the market?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is one object, there would be a very considerable traffic in lumber. The question of building this spur has been more or less under consideration for the past quarter of a century. The necessity of building this spur has been pressed on the different ministers from time to time so the matter is not a new one at all. In addition to lumber there would be a very considerable passenger traffic. A great many people who are in business in St. John have their residence in Hampton in the summer season.

There is a suburban train which runs from St. John to Hampton station, where the train remains over night. If the spur line were built, the train would run on to Hampton village. There would be no increase of cost for the trainmen, and very little extra expense in running the train to the village. I believe the cost of construction was estimated by the engineers of the department at something like $50,000. I am satisfied that if my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane), would look into the matter, giving it his personal attention, he will reach the conclusion that it would be in the public interest to follow the decision come to by his predecessor.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I am sorry I was not here a few moments ago when the attention of the Minister was being called to the desirability and necessity of proceeding with the railway provided for in the vote now under discussion in the eastern part of Nova Scotia. I wish to refer particularly to the item :—

For the construction of a railway from a point on the Intercolonial railway at or near New Glasgow, in the county of Pictou, or from Sunnybrae in the said county, (in the event of the branch line of that railway to that place being acquired as it may be under this application), to the town of Guysborough and from the said line of railway at Cross Roads

County Harbour to the deep water of said harbour.

As, no doubt, my hon. friend pointed out who dealt with the matter before, the question as to the wisdom of the construction of these railways was thoroughly threshed out in the last session of the last parliament. And the present Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), joined his support to the resolution moved by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), with special reference to the construction of this line and for the branch line from Dartmouth to Dean Settlement. The policy had the approbation of all the members in the last parliament, so far as could be learned as a result of the debate. As, no doubt, the hon. Minister is well aware, the work under this vote has already been proceeded with and the railway from Sunnybrae to the station at Ferrona on the Intercolonial railway has been purchased by the government, and is now being operated by the government. Therefore, the policy of the construction of the road from Sunnybrae to the town of Guysboro, is ont to which, I take it, the country as a whole is irrevocably committed. As to the policy, we have the assurance of my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane), as I understand, that all he desires is that matters of detail shall come under his attention so that he may have no doubt as to the course he is to adopt. As to the general policy with regard to this particular enterprise, I am sure the judgment of his leader as expressed last year and repeatedly affirmed in Nova Scotia during the campaign, is one which he will be willing to accept. As I understand it, the contract has been made, and valuable time will be lost, if there is unnecessary delay in permitting the contractors to proceed. The right of way could be cut out more advantageously in the winter than in the summer. If the hon. Minister can, as I trust he will, see his way clear to permit the contractors to proceed immediately, he will take a step that will entitle him to the fullest consideration of the people of that portion of the province and of hon. members of this House who come from that part of Canada.

Hudson Bay railway—Construction, $1,166,666.66.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Some hon. member asked that this should stand. I am quite willing that it should pass, providing that the hon. member who asked that it should stand is given an opportunity to discuss the matter in some other form.

Mr. COCHRANE. On notice of motion. Quite agreeable.

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions—Steam service for not less than fifty-two full round weekly trips between St. Johns and Halifax via Yarmouth and other way ports during the season of 1911, $5,833.34.

Mr. LAW. Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), please state if the steamship company receiving this subsidy is obliged to make fifty-two round trips per year now ?

Mr. FOSTER. The item says : 'not less than 52 full round weekly trips.' That is a term of the contract.

Mr. LAW. I think that has been changed to a smaller number of trips. That is what I wish to inquire about.

Mr. FOSTER. I take it that it could not be changed if it were a contract founded upon that item. I am sure I could not pay for any smaller number of trips.

Mr. LAW. They could be paid for, I suppose, pro rata.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I think there would to be fifty-two full round trips.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Trade and Commerce stated yesterday that it was intended that these items should be exactly the same as they were passed at the last session of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am inclined to think there are two items omitted—perhaps a mistake of the printer. My hon. friend from Essex referred to the communication with Pelee island. And my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), has just called my attention to the fact that the item for the service between St. John and Cuba seems to have been omitted.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I would call the attention of the proper member of the government to the fact that the statutes of last session have not yet found their way into the Library.

Additional for Canada, China and Japan service, $28,388.88.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) as to whether there is anything in the main estimates this year for a service between North Sydney and Newfoundland. In that connection I may be permitted to say, that I understood some representations were made to the late government about providing an increased subsidy to maintain a better service between North Sydney and Port au Basque, in Newfoundland, involving the running of a daily train from Port au Basque to St. John's, Newfoundland. I trust the minister will consider some means of giving Canada better steam communication with the sister colony of Newfoundland. Our trade with that colony has increased materially during the last

ten years. Our neighbours to the south of us are competitors for the trade of that colony, and there is a service between St. John's and New York and Philadelphia. Such a service as is now in operation, if increased, will provide additional traffic for the Intercolonial. If a new service was provided, furnishing daily communication between Canada and the sister colony, undoubtedly our trade would greatly increase. I hope that the minister will look closely into this matter, and will give it favourable consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE. This service advocated by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is one directly interesting my county, and I endorse what he has said. The traffic between Canada and Newfoundland has grown 400 per cent within the last ten years, and has been of he greatest advantage to the Intercolonial. Steamers running between North Sydney and Port au Basque are the best avenues for trade that that railway has got. The tri-weekly service now in operation is insufficient to meet the trade in passengers and freight that is offering I hope, therefore, that when application is made for an increased subsidy, and to put two steamers on the route instead of one, the minister will remember what has been said in the House. I brought the question before the former Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he intimated that as soon as a company was ready to put on additional steamers a larger subsidy would be given.

Mr. SINCLAIR In connection with all these steamboat services I would like to suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce the importance of obtaining information from these companies, who are getting these large subsidies from the government, respecting their profits. No doubt it often happens that we are paying subsidies unnecessarily. We pay subsidies from year to year, and it is impossible for the members of this House or for the government to get exact information as to the profits these companies are making. I see no reason why they should not be required to show their balance-sheet to the Minister of Trade and Commerce at the end of the year, so that we may know what profits are made by the company that we are subsidizing. That would enable us to decide whether we ought to continue the subsidies. I have not the slightest doubt that in the past we have been paying subsidies where they were not required, because we have not had that information. I know there is an objection on the part of these companies to disclosing their affairs, and it is a natural objection. But where the government is contributing such large amounts towards the profits of these companies I submit that it would be no great hardship if they were required to give a statement at the end of each year showing what profits they have made from the trade they are carrying on. There are statements required at the present time, I understand, showing the amount of freight and the number of passengers that are carried. But that does not give us any information as to how much money they earn, or whether it is necessary that we should continue paying them these large amounts in order to help them carry on their business. In England joint stock companies are required to publish a statement at the close of the year in the official papers, showing what profits they have made. I think that is a good plan, and might properly be introduced here.

Mr FOSTER. I may say that when we come to vote the subsidies for 1912-13, and come to this branch of the subsidy granting, I will be able to discuss some of the points that have been raised by my hon. friends. I think there are some things to be guarded against in voting sums of money for steamship subsidies. Some may be entirely unnecessary. The country does not want to give money unnecessarily to any of those lines. Some may not make much profit, and yet it may be absolutely necessary for the convenience of the people that the government should come to the aid of such companies. Others may be getting too much, and therefore making too great profits. All these things will have to be taken into account, and so far as possible be supervised, so that the country, while doing its duty in all cases, may not do more than its duty in any case. With reference to the returns, of late years the quantities of freight carried are returned, but the values of the freight carried have not been returned.

I have given instructions already that for all companies to whom we grant subsidies there shall be the further condition that they shall give us not only a return of the quantities of the freight but of the values of the freight carried, so that we may get an idea of the service that the company is doing. With reference to the Newfoundland service, my position towards Newfoundland is entirely sympathetic—of course it will be sympathetic towards Canada—and whatever can be reasonably done to assist in that service I should be glad to recommend to the House. There are new propositions already before me with reference to the service, and these will be thoroughly considered before the main estimates are brought down.

Fisheries, $510,708.32.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). A few evenings ago my hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) while discussing the

address, made the statement that it was one of the many planks of the Conservative party in the recent election that free medical aid and free medicine should be extended to the shore fishermen. It did appear that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) had never heard of this policy before, and it seemed to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House a very strange thing. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has yet learned whether this was a part of the programme of the Conservative party prior to the recent elections. I would like to inquire of him if he has had an opportunity of seeing the statement made by his leader on this question and, if not, if he would be gracious enough to accept from me a copy of the manifesto of his leader containing this declaration promising inshore fishermen free medical attendance and free medicine. I can assure the hon. gentleman that if this policy is put into force his department will be a very busy one and he will probably be the busiest physician and chemist in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They will all take their medicine.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am afraid we will have to call the hon. gentleman the Lydia Pinkham of Canadian politics. I have had numerous inquiries from inshore fishermen of my own constituency who consider themselves more or less ill and who are already looking for assistance by reason of the statement made by the Prime Minister. I hope the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will acquaint himself with the various gospels of his political leader so that he will be in a position on the floor of the House to answer any questions relating thereto. I hope that by the time the House reconvenes after the Christmas holidays he will have had sufficient time to have made himself acquainted with this matter and will be in a position to enlighten us upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before passing away from fisheries I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to what I think is a grievance of which some people have a right to complain. It has been the custom for some time past in the Department of Marine and Fisheries to make a contract with the stewards of the steamers engaged in the fishery protection service under which they are paid so much a head for boarding the crews. The stewards are alone responsible to the merchants who supply groceries and other articles required for the steamers. In the case of the steamer 'Stanley' the gentleman who was lately steward of that steamer incurred bills to a considerable amount in the city of St. John. Some time ago he, having become heavily involved, left the city and as a consequence quite a number of people who furnished supplies to the steward of the steamer are unable to collect the amounts which are due to them. I understand that my hon. friend has been advised by the Minister of Justice that the government is not responsible. I remember bringing the matter to the attention of his predecessor, or at all events, to the attention of the deputy minister, before the late government went out of office, and the same view was taken, but I urged very strongly that the matter was one to which the department ought to give equitable consideration. To begin with, I think it is very questionable whether it is the proper way in which to deal with the crews of these steamers, but whether it is or not, certainly, if public notice were given that the government would not be responsible for supplies furnished to a vessel, that it was a matter entirely for the steward, everybody would be on his guard. I think that the claimants have a strong case for consideration. In the case of the 'Stanley', as I understand it, the steward ordered the goods in the ordinary way, they were furnished to him as the steward of the steamer, and people, while they rendered their bills to the steward, still rendered them to him as an officer of the government and they were very much surprised I believe when they found that the government did not hold itself responsible for these bills. It is a very great hardship that the people who furnished supplies to the steward of the steamer in good faith should not be able to collect their accounts. I do not find any fault with my hon. friend because he has acted in accordance with the law and acted on the advice of the Minister of Justice, but I would hope that my hon. friend may see his way clear to take the matter into his equitable consideration, approach it from an equitable standpoint, and I think that if, under the circumstances, my hon. friend would feel justified in asking parliament for authority to pay these bills, parliament would be glad to accede to his request. In future, if it is intended to continue this practice, I think that in every port where any of these steamers are there should be public notice given that the government is in no way responsible, that the steward has a contract with the government and that people who furnish him with supplies do so at their own risk. We know how it is with people who furnish supplies to government officers. They naturally look to the government. They would naturally expect that he had the authority of the

government to incur these obligations. I noticed that in a copy of a letter which my hon. friend had sent to one of the claimants he dwelt upon the fact that the people had rendered their bills to the steward of the steamer. I would remind my hon. friend that that is exactly the way in which they would render their bills. They furnish these supplies to the steamers and they would render their bills to the stewards of the steamers, or perhaps the steward may have asked them to make out their bills in that way; but that would not show that they did not rely upon the fact that, he being an officer of the government, in furnishing these supplies, the government would be responsible.

Mr. HAZEN. I may say that the facts are correctly stated by my hon. friend and the matter is now under my consideration. When I first heard of the practice prevailing in the department under which the steward contracted to supply meals for the officers and men at a certain amount per meal or per diem, I thought like my hon. friend that it was not a wise system, but since talking the matter over with the officers of my department my views have undergone some change. Under the old system by which the department paid this expenditure directly, there seemed to be no way of curbing it, and one year when the food consumed on these vessels was averaged up it was so enormous that it could not have been possibly used by the officers and men. Under the present system a great saving has been effected, but the weakness of the system appears to be that the steward who takes the contract for supplying the food was not asked to give a bond for the faithful performance of his duties, and indemnity to those who might lose by his transactions. This morning I instructed the purchasing agent to ascertain what the cost of such a bond from each steward would be, as it seemed to me that it might be better for the government to pay the cost of these bonds, rather than have these questions arising in the future. I also instructed the officer to prepare a detailed statement of the persons to whom these sums were owing and the particulars in each case, as some cases may differ from others. The contention is that these stewards wearing the uniform of Canadian ships had purchased the supplies and that those who sold to them naturally thought they were selling to the government of Canada. The purchasing branch of the department is inclined to dispute that because some of these bills were contracted over a year ago, and up to the time this steward left St. John no bill was rendered and no claim made to the department. The purchasing agent feels that at least some of these people knew they were dealing with the steward personally, and that the government was not responsible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Might they not suppose that the stewards had not been placed in funds?

Mr. HAZEN. The matter is receiving my careful consideration, and when I get the details of the accounts I will be able to form a conclusion on that. For instance, one of the banks in St. John discounted $800 worth of paper for this steward, and it is very doubtful if the government is liable morally in that case. I do not understand how the manager of that bank could have thought that the government was in any way responsible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may have been in a different position from the others.

Mr. HAZEN. I am having inquiries made into the matter. My disposition is to view it from a generous standpoint, and if I can justify doing so, to ask the House to make a refund, and afterwards take steps to secure bonds so that such a thing will not occur in the future. That might be better than advertising that the government is not responsible for these Bills, although that suggestion is worthy of consideration.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The fish scrap produced at the government refining works Canso is a valuable fertilizer which for years has been used by the farmers in eastern Nova Scotia, and I am advised that recently the price of it to the farmers has been raised from $20 to $28 per ton. I believe that the latter price can be received for it in Boston, and different parts of the United States, but the lower price was in a way assistance given to the agricultural interest of eastern Nova Scotia, and considerable hardship has arisen from increasing the price. No doubt $20 a ton is a low price for this fish scrap, but the farmers have had it at that price for years, and it is after all good policy to encourage our farmers to use it on the land rather than to have it sent to the United States where it is mixed in the factories and shipped back to Canada and sold at a high price.

Mr. HAZEN. I will have inquiry made, but I have some reason for doubting the correctness of my hon. friend's statements, as I have not issued any order to increase the price since I have been in the department. Possibly it may have been done by some official without advising me. If the price of this fish scrap has been increased, I will ascertain what the reason is and inform my hon. friend.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair), asked about the price being charged for fish scrap from the reduction works. I have consulted the deputy Minister who informs me that the rule of the department is to sell this scrap to the people in the neighbourhood at the market price, which is at present $28. Really the market price is a little over $28, but the department are charging that amount.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That was not the rule of the department previously ; it was sold at a fixed price of $20 a ton for a number of years, and farmers were invited to send in requests for the number of tons they would require, some months before the opening of the season, and they received it at that price of $20. I wish to know why the old system was changed to the market price of $28.

Mr. HAZEN. I have no knowledge of the matter myself ; I can only give the information I have from the deputy minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This seems to me to be a particularly inappropriate time to raise the price of this fertilizer to farmers, in view of the paragraph in the speech from the Throne, saying it is proposed to devote considerable money to the encouragement of the farmer.

Mr. HAZEN. I am informed that the change to $28 was made some months ago, before the present government took office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps that is what defeated us.

Mr. McCURDY. If I may revert to the votes for subsidies for steamships, large sums are provided in the estimates for various steamship services, particularly West Indian services. The speech from the Throne foreshadows increased trade between Canada and the West Indies, and I would suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce the advisability of the establishment by the Dominion government of a steamship service to the West Indies to act in conjunction with and to implement the business of the Intercolonial railway. It is common knowledge that many large railway enterprises find this a profitable and proper adjunct to their business, and I would suggest that, the government should carefully consider the establishment in conjunction with the Intercolonial railway of a line of steamships to the West Indies and British Guiana, from which we naturally expect to draw a larger trade in the near future.

Mr. FOSTER. The suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. McCurdy), is a new one to me and involves quite a change from the system which has been in vogue for a number of years. That does not argue that it is not a defensible system or might not be an improvement. I shall talk the matter over with the Minister of Railways and Canals, who would have to have a finger in the pie. The first thing involved would be an addition to the capital account for steamships to run the service, or else we would have to hire steamers. The line of action outlined by my hon. friend is in accord with the practice of the large railway systems. Perhaps a company could do that better than a government, but it is a matter well worthy of consideration, and I shall discuss the matter with the Minister of Railways and Canals, who is kindly disposed to projects of that kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair), has suggested to me to ask whether or not the Minister of Trade and Commerce would consider the establishment of steamship communication between the maritime provinces and Porto Rico. It appears that Porto Rico affords the very best possible market to the fishermen of the maritime provinces, and it might be possible by giving a reasonable subsidy to so reduce freight rates as to overcome the duty which would have been done away with if the reciprocity arrangement had gone through.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid my hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) has been putting mischief into the head of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). Probably, the number of propositions already before the department is sufficient for a year or so. As we have gone back to the question of steamship subsidies, I desire to make a change in items 141 and 142. They are both votes for the same object and read as follows:

141. Steam service between Quebec and the Isle of Orleans during the time between the closing of regular navigation in the autumn and the taking of the ice-bridge between the island and the mainland, also after the breaking up of the ice-bridge until resumption of regular navigation in the spring, $291.67.

142. Steam service between Quebec and ports on the north shore of the Isle of Orleans, $1,458.33.

I would like, in item 142 to drop out the words ' ports on the north shore of ', making it read simply, ' steam service between Quebec and the Isle of Orleans '.

Amendment agreed to.

Trade and Commerce—Bounties on manufactures of steel; lead contained in lead ore; crude petroleum and manilla fibre. To cover expenditure in connection with the administration of the Acts, $4,083.34.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). What bounties are payable under the Acts?

Mr. FOSTER. Bounties on lead, on petroleum and on manilla fibre.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to cover the administration only?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I wished to know what bounties were still alive, and to which this administration would apply.

Mr. FOSTER. Bounties are paid on lead ore, on crude petroleum, and on manilla fibre which goes into the manufacture of cordage and, being exported from the Philippine Islands is subject to export duty which does not apply in similar fibre going to the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Does the hon. minister contemplate a bounty on iron and steel?

Mr. FOSTER. Not contemplating anything.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). The hon. minister is not able to give us a statement about that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is it the policy of the government to renew the bounties on steel that are now expiring?

Mr. FOSTER. That is too large a question to give an answer to just now. It is under consideration.

Mr. OLIVER. Have the bounties on steel entirely expired?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. This wording of the estimates was drawn when bounties on steel were still paid.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I understand that representations were made to the minister with regard to bounties on steel and pig iron?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Do I understand the hon. minister to say that these are under consideration?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Will the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) say whether he is in favour of them or not?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). As the Third Party is so curious, I will tell him when the government's action is made known.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman now that I am in favour of them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). It would be much more interesting if he could tell us whether the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) is in favour of them or not.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The hon. gentleman has brought the matter up, and might explain his own position.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I will tell you.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). When?

Mr. FOSTER. We know very well where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) was.

To provide for the expenses of administering the Act respecting annuities for old age, $26,250.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Has the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) recommended the dismissal of any of the officers in the annuities branch of his department?

Mr. FOSTER. I can say with reference to the Annuities Branch, that the administration of annuities will be transferred from the Department of Trade and Commerce to the Department of the Postmaster General on the 1st of January.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I was not curious about that. I asked the minister if he had recommended the dismissal of any officials from the Annuities Branch of his department.

Mr. FOSTER. All the outside officials that have been employed heretofore in lecturing and canvassing will have their services dispensed with on the 31st of December.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). On what grounds?

Mr. FOSTER. On the ground that the policy of the government is opposed to the administration of the Annuities Act on that basis, and proposes to hand it over where it can be, we think, better and more economically administered.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Did the minister recommend that himself?

Mr. FOSTER. I did.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think the minister might have waited until the transfer was made to the Post Office Department, so that the Postmaster General might have an opportunity of ascertaining whether that was a wise thing to do.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend ask whether there have been any dismissals, or whether there will be dismissals?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I asked whether any had been dismissed.

Mr. FOSTER. One has been dismissed.

Mr MACLEAN (Halifax). What is his name?

Mr. FOSTER. McArthur.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What was the offence?

Mr. FOSTER. He did not attend to his work. He attended a little more to political work than to the work of the annuities.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Where did he come from?

Mr. FOSTER. He came from Ottawa.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Did the minister give this official an opportunity to answer the charge, or was he summarily dismissed on the recommendation of the member for Ottawa?

Mr. FOSTER. The member for Ottawa never had any communication, good, bad or indifferent, with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, neither had any politician outside of my office. It was entirely a departmental act. If my hon. friend wants the papers, all he has to do is to call for them, and I will be glad to lay them on the table of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it might be well if my hon. friend could tell us what principle will guide the government with regard to the removal of employees of the government. The late government, I understand, after the election of 1896, adopted the policy that they would not remove any officials against whom charges of a political nature were made. except after investigation. That policy was substantially adhered to. I know that applications were made, made since I became a member of this House, for the dismissal of employees of the government. I have in mind a number of postmasters who had taken quite an active part in politics, and the Postmaster General declined to make removals except in cases where there was an investigation, or where the member for the constituency pledged his word that he had personal knowledge of an employee having been guilty of offensive partisanship. There was a statement made, so it was reported in the newspapers, by the hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) a few days ago, which I am sure, if my hon. friend read it, must have come as a great shock to him, in view of the many speeches he has made in this House in favour of permanency of the tenure of officials as far as possible. That hon. gentleman is reported to have said that he believed in the principle that to the victors belonged the spoils, and he assured his friends that in the county of Albert, so he is reported in the Conservative organ in St. John, that was the principle upon which he was going to act. I do no think that such a course can possibly commend itself to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). I speak thus because of remarks which I have frequently heard my hon. friend make upon that matter in this House. I think it might be well if we could have some assurance as to what will be the course of the government in that respect, whether they will remove officials simply upon the allegation of partisanship, or whether they will give to the officials against whom allegations of that character are made an opportunity of defending themselves by a reasonable and fair investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Pugsley) could have followed the course of events during the last few days. Yesterday we had a notice given that on motion to go into Supply the junior member for Halifax would raise that point. On going into Supply this afternoon my hon. friend was not ready for it, or rather thought it would be better to postpone it until Monday, when several of the members who wished to take part in the discussion would be here, and could do so. Under these circumstances, probably it would be better if my hon. friend would allow the matter to go in that way, with the understanding of course that the government and members on this side of the House are quite ready to discuss it at any time.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am sorry to hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) say that he proposes to transfer the administration of the annuities branch to the Post Office Department. I think that would be a very grave mistake, and I think we would hear the last of government annuities if such a transfer was made. I trust the minister will not decree that this be done until next year, so that we may have an opportunity of discussing this matter after recess, which no doubt will soon take place. I would say that the Post Office Department is not equipped for the carrying on of this work, and there must be officials now in the Trade and Commerce Department who have acquired some experience, and which experience cannot be found in the Post Office Department. I wish to submit, without having given the matter very much consideration of course, that it would be very much against the interest of this important service to make the proposed transfer. I hope the minister will at least postpone the matter for a short time, so that we may have an opportunity of discussing it later.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be disposed to allow the hon. gentleman an opportunity of discussing it if it could reasonably be done. However, action has already been taken, and it will not be possible I think to postpone that action. I would be very glad to have the House discuss the whole matter thoroughly, which no doubt it will do. But

I would like the House to do it with all the papers before it. I would be glad to bring down the papers which will give the course of the administration for the last two and a half years, and give the grounds of the government for making the transfer. I am inclined to think when the whole matter is brought down and discussed that my hon. friend will agree with me that it was the best thing that could be done.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I suppose the transfer will not take place until after March 31, in any event?

Mr. FOSTER. The transfer will take place on the 1st day of January.

Mr. PELLETIER. I should regret if my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was under the impression that this very important branch of public business is transferred to my department for the purpose of carrying it to the burying ground. That is not the intention at all. When the question was discussed between the Minister of Trade and Commerce and myself it was with the fullest intention of carrying on that branch with greater care. After discussing this matter also with Dr. Coulter, my Deputy Minister, we have come to the conclusion that it could be handled in our department very successfully. This is all I can say for the moment. I think the hon. member for Halifax will find by the results that the Post Office Department can handle this business in a very effective manner.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have an open mind on the matter, I am open to conviction. I would not like to see the annuities go to the burying ground, and I hope my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) will not allow the service to go to the Dead Letter Office, either. I am sorry the transfer is being made so quickly.

Mr. McKENZIE. Do I understand that this transfer is being made to the Post Office Department in order that the services of postmasters throughout the country may be enlisted to handle that matter?

Mr. PELLETIER. Of course the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman is a matter which will receive consideration. Certainly the postmasters will be invited to help us, and I think they will be glad to do so. The transfer will enable us to dispense with a large number of employees who hitherto have not handled this thing as satisfactorily as it might have been. I hope that the results will be such next year that the House will be unanimously of the opinion that the idea of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is a good one.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does the minister propose to carry on a campaign and put lecturers in the field, or does he propose to do away with that system?

Mr. PELLETIER. I am really not in a position to go into details now. Of course, it is expected that when it becomes a branch of the business of the Post Office Department the deputy minister and I will go into it fully and try to devise something which will be workable and which will give satisfaction.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That is all very well, but I think it would be better for the minister and his deputy to work it out fully first and then make the transfer afterwards, if they think it desirable to do so. I am rather suspicious that this is the modus operandi adopted in order to get rid of some officials in the service.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will take the first opportunity available to assure my hon. friend that there is nothing at all in that.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I will take time to consider the assurance.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend will date back awhile to the discussion which took place in this House when the annuities Bill was passed, that discussion will show him varying views on each side of the House. I subscribed very strongly to this policy at that time, and I am inclined to think that Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself agreed with the idea, but rather concluded that as the Act was the creation of the then Minister of Trade and Commerce it should go to his department for inauguration.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) if these annuities are in any way in competition with the insurance companies?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Well, it is a form of investment and, therefore, you might say they are. I think the idea is an excellent one and I think the Act is a good one to carry out the idea, but I think the House will agree, when we come to the particulars, that the expense in connection with it in the Department of Trade and Commerce, or which would be connected with it in the Department of Finance, overburdened the thing to such a degree that it could not fairly be carried out by that system.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask if any legislative enactment is necessary for this transfer. I see that for other transfers from one department to another legislative enactments are necessary. If there is any legislative enactment necessary for this transfer, we will have an

opportunity of discussing the change when the Act is brought down.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It depends entirely on the legislation. In connection with the Annuities Act there is no legislation required. The Act provides that it can be administered by any department to which it is assigned.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). How many officials are there in the outside services whose services will be dispensed with?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). All the lecturers and canvassers.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I understand that there is one gentleman who is a lecturer for the whole Dominion—Dr. Samson. He will be dispensed with?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). He will be dispensed with; all the lecturers and canvassers will be dispensed with.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). How many are there?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There were fifteen. Some have resigned, others have gone out and I think twelve remain.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The Annuities Act will certainly be a dead letter unless the services of these lecturers are continued and even added to. In my judgment it is utterly impossible to expect the successful operation of the Annuities Act if it is left entirely to the administration of the Post Office Department. I do not think that the Minister of Trade and Commerce should dismiss these lecturers from the service. If there is to be a transfer of administration from one department to another these officials should certainly be transferred to the Post Office Department. In my judgment the dismissal of these lecturers is absolutely indefensible, because it is utterly impossible to expect the public to become interested in this Annuities Act unless there is a campaign of publicity being carried on from day to day. One of the difficulties in the administration of this Act was that there was not a sufficient number of lecturers in the field throughout the provinces. It does look to me that this contemplated transfer is a move to get rid of some of the officials in the service of the government.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend may have that opinion and he may revise that opinion. My hon. friend may think that and it may not be the opinion of the majority of the House. Probably we will get at a better and more reasonable conclusion when we have all the facts before us, and I would be very glad if any hon. gentleman would move for the papers, or, if no hon. gentleman does move for the papers, I shall be very glad to lay them on the table of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am not objecting so much to the transfer to the Post Office department. I concede that there may be some things to be said in favour of it, but I do not see why the officials in the service should be dismissed.

Mr. LAW. I would like to ask the Minister if the postmasters will be paid any extra salaries in connection with the duties which are put upon them ?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Now, there is a thrifty member of parliament. Postmasters at the present time are agents for the sale of annuities and are paid a certain percentage for the work they do.

Mr. LAW. Yes, and their work will be increased very largely if these duties are taken out of the hands of the lecturers and put into the hands of the postmasters.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If their duties are greater and the crop they reap is larger, their percentage will also rise in the same proportion.

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be impossible for postmasters to give any attention to work of that character, and I would like to know whether it is the intention to have this publicity work carried on by means of lecturers or canvassers ?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The transfer was based upon the principle that lecturers and canvassers should be dispensed with. They have been dispensed with and on that principle the government's policy has been carried out.

Mr. EMMERSON. No new ones are to be appointed ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not quite see why the Minister of Trade and Commerce will not give the committee the promise that this transfer will not take place until the end of the fiscal year, so that in the meantime hon. members may have an opportunity of studying the matter. Every member of the government has, on frequent occasions since the opening of parliament, given as an excuse for not doing a certain thing, the fact that he has been very busy and has not been able to give very much consideration to anything. That is quite natural and something that every hon. gentleman can quite understand.

It is quite obvious that neither the Postmaster General nor the Minister of Trade and Commerce nor any of the members of the government have been able to give this matter the consideration it deserves. Many people throughout the country take a deep interest in the principle of government annuities, and surely no public interst will suffer by postponing this trans-

fer until the end of the fiscal year. Of course it is not at all a party question.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is a waste of public money to carry the system on as at present—and that is my firm conviction after careful consideration—then it would be wrong for the government to continue it for three months longer. I have considered the matter and have come to a reasoned conviction upon it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What was the objection to the system; was it too expensive?

Mr. FOSTER. There were several objections, but I would prefer to discuss them with the papers before the House.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Well if the hon. gentleman has all the facts in his head now he might dispense a little of the information amongst us.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should have all the papers before the House, and intelligently discuss the matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The Minister of Trade and Commerce should take us into his confidence now, and tell us why he is making this transfer. For instance. I would like to know for my own guidance how much the minister expects to save by the change.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose I might give a general outline by saying that in the first place it never has seemed to me that there was anything germane between an annuity system and the Department of Trade and Commerce. It has seemed to me that either the Finance Department or the Post Office Department was the proper department to administer the system; the Finance Department having a system of savings gradually diminishing, and the Post Office a system of savings continually increasing. The Department of Finance has no extended agencies reaching over this country, and it would have to carry on the system by a propaganda which would involve expense, whereas the Post Office Department reaches every section of the country, gets in contact with almost all the people, has 13,000 or 14,000 offices distributed throughout the length and breadth of the land, has a large number of money order offices, and has facilities already existing for advertising and canvassing in every part of the country. It would seem reasonable that the Post Office Department can, with a minimum of expense. and a maximum of efficiency administer an act of that kind. That is the view I took when the Bill was discussed in the House, and I think Sir Wilfrid Laurier concurred in it. It was placed in the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the moment it was placed there the staff commenced to grow, and it has grown larger and larger until I found in the department some fifteen lecturers and canvassers and a large staff besides, the cost of which amounted last year to about $40,000. If the principle be good that public lecturers and canvassers shall be put in the field in order to make a propaganda, that principle could not be denied extension to every part of the country, and if you have a canvasser and lecturer in one county or group of counties, by what right should you deny every other county or group of counties lecturers and canvassers.

These lecturers, moving about from one part of the country to the other, are, to a certain extent, irresponsible. They have to arrange and to advertise their meetings and conduct their meetings, and in doing all of this, a great deal of expense is incurred. It has been found practically impossible to supervise fairly well and keep those expenses within bounds. When the papers are laid before the House, they will amply prove what I have said. The abuses incident to a system of that kind, the irresponsibility to a certain extent, and the almost impossibility of constant and close supervision, render it impracticable. In some instances we paid for lectures which were never delivered, although the papers were made out as though the meeting place had been arranged and the chairman had presided, and although the number of those present was set forth and the quality of the audience, namely, whether it consisted of traders, bankers, farmers or fishermen. All these were set forth in detail, but in the end we found that no meeting had taken place and that consequently no lecture had been delivered. The difficulty of supervising a system of that kind is at once evident to anyone that looks into it. It is perfectly right to encourage thrift in the people, but there are different ways in which that encouragement and education can be given ; and to my mind it seems quite sufficient for the purpose if the department should place in the hands of the people, as well as it can, a safe and sound form of investment for their savings. That was done under the Annuities Act, the government did its part by having these annuities put on a basis of four per cent, which was a generous one for the government, considering that the government undertook the expenses of management. In Great Britain, where the savings of the people are looked after in various ways by the government itself, the Post Office is the favourite channel for distributing information to those who wish to have a safe method of investing their earnings. Lately in Great Britain the authorities have called the attention of the smaller investing public to the value of consols at their present rate as a method of investment. But they did not enter into any propaganda for that purpose ; they

simply put the matter in the hands of the post office officials and let the public make up their minds as to whether they would take advantage of this means of investment or not. The difficulties I have spoken of resulted in an expenditure of some forty thousand dollars, with the prospect of a very large increase, thus bringing the cost to the government of the sale of these annuities anywhere from nine to twenty-five per cent. I saw no possibility of diminishing that cost under an independent management by a department which had not the facilities for carrying out the scheme. Those were the chief reasons which led me to believe, in the first place, that the expense was too great, and in the second place that there was no prospect of avoiding an increase in that expense every year. It was very difficult for the Department of Trade and Commerce to supervise, in fact, it was impossible for that department to supervise the expenditure closely and thoroughly. But in the Post Office Department we have all the facilities. It is useless to say that the money-order post office people are not sufficiently intelligent and wide awake to explain these annuity investments to the public. It is also useless to say that with our numerous post offices and officials, this system cannot be more economically carried out by the Post Office Department than by an independent agency. These are the chief reasons which led me to the conclusion that it was not wise or proper to keep it under the administration of an independent department which had few facilities for carrying it out, and which had to acquire new and expensive machinery in order to carry it out. I consulted with my hon. colleague the Postmaster General and his efficient Deputy, and we came to that conclusion.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am quite prepared to concede that the Post Office Department is perhaps the better department to administer the Annuities Act. At any rate, there is a great deal to say in its favour ; but I am sure the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), has convinced every hon. member here that the administration by the Post Office Department in the manner he contemplates, will result in the Act becoming a failure, and I am convinced that the hon. gentleman and the Postmaster General have not given the matter sufficient consideration. True, he has consulted the Deputy Postmaster General—and a very efficient Deputy he is ; and I readily understand that there are many reasons why this matter should be placed in the Post Office Department ; but when the hon. gentleman justifies the transfer upon the ground that there will be more publicity by putting the administration of the Act in the Post Office, I disagree with him. It is absurd to think that the intricacies of an insurance scheme can be explained by ninety-five per cent of the postmasters with any degree of satisfaction. I submit that there is no other way of making the annuity scheme popular than by a campaign of publicity to be carried on by lectures. The hon. Minister says there have been employed only fifteen lecturers in Canada. That number was too small and should have been increased. I know that in Nova Scotia, a great mistake was made by the late administration by sending lecturers around in the summer season, but even then they did a great deal of good. I remember in the early part of June of this year, after the close of a meeting in a certain section of Lunenburg, in which I happened to be, I was told by one of those attending at the meeting, that he had decided to take out an annuity the following day.

The following afternoon I happened to be in another place where the same lecturer was explaining the annuities scheme, and after the meeting I met two other persons who told me they were very grateful for having heard the annuities scheme explained, and had made up their minds to take out an annuity. The Annuities Act might as well be repealed, as be transferred to the Post Office Department without a publicity campaign through the system of lecturers. It is in the interest of the state that thrift should be encouraged, and it is impossible to convince the citizens of the advantages of thrift except by a system of lecturing. The Minister of Trade and Commerce can hardly be serious when he says this Act can be administered by the agencies of the Post Office Department. If it has cost $40,000 a year in the past that is not a large sum for promulgating the principles involved in the annuities scheme. Even if it should cost double the amount it would be money well expended. I submit that neither minister has had an opportunity of studying this matter as it should be studied before making such an important departure, and that no public interest would suffer from postponing the transfer say until the end of the fiscal year. The ministers have given no reason for the proposed dismissal of these lecturers. The minister says that meetings have been advertised and have not taken place. That might happen any where in Canada for reasons easily explained. I happen to know of one case where a meeting was advertised during the summer in a community where it would be impossible to get an audience together at that time.

Mr. NESBITT. The decision in this matter depends largely on the object the government has in view. If they do not care to increase the annuities they are taking a very good means of stopping the increase. If the services of lecturers who are really

competent are discontinued, that will further tend to reduce the number of annuities taken out. A great many postmasters or postmistresses through the country are perfectly capable of explaining the annuity system, but on the other hand some of them are not. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is well aware of that. Personally I have no money to invest in annuities, but if I had I would go to the post office to invest it. Many, however, would not do that. Competition in insurance is very keen, and the insurance agent would thoroughly explain how much better and cheaper it would be for a man to take out an annuity with the insurance companies. The services of the lecturers have done a great deal of good, and I know of people who have invested in annuities on account of the lectures they have heard. I believe the Minister of Trade and Commerce is absolutely capable of administering this system and that he really has the matter at heart, and I think it would be wise of him to reconsider his decision to do away entirely with the lecturers, if he wishes to increase the number of people who invest in annuities. These government annuities must be good and if the government pay the expense of management no company can compete with them. It is a new thing, any new business requires a certain amount of expense in introducing it, especially in a wide country like Canada, but in time there is a probability that without advertising the system could be successfully administered through the postmasters and postmistresses. If it is placed in their hands now I fear we would immediately see a great falling off in results. I have nothing but good wishes towards the annuity system, I have no interest to serve, and I only wish for its good under whatever department it may be.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am willing to accept the offer of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to bring down the papers on Monday, and you will let the item stand over until then. If he would lay the papers on the table of the House early on Monday we would have an opportunity of seeing them before three o'clock.

Mr. McKENZIE. We may not have another opportunity to discuss this matter, there is one point I would like to have dealt with. I confess I know little about the workings of the Annuities Act. But, as the proposal seems to be that the working of the annuity system shall come in part into the hands of the postmasters throughout the country, it would be well if we could form some idea of how it will work. If the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) has matured the scheme sufficiently, I would like him to explain in a general way this new proposal. Suppose the case of a person buying an annuity through the agency of a country postmaster, what would the procedure be, and what regulations does the Postmaster General intend to provide? The purchaser of an annuity has to pay money, and that money must find its way through some channel to the hands of the Receiver General. The Postmaster General must provide safeguards against the loss of the money. The ordinary country postmaster gives very slim security for the proper discharge of his duties and for accounting for the little moneys that come into his hands. If I understand this matter, it means the hand ling, possibly of large sums of money by these country postmasters, and an increase in the moneys to be transmitted by mail. What safeguards will be thrown around the handling of these moneys?

Mr. PELLETIER. As to the safety of the moneys to be handled, I think the House may rest assured that, with the very good organization that exists in the Post Office Department, there will be no great danger for the comparatively small additions that will be made to the very large sums already handled by postmasters and taken care of by the department. When this matter was first mentioned to me by my hon. colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) it struck me at once that there was a good deal in what he said. And I think the House, at least the majority of hon. members, must have been convinced by what he said that there are several first class reasons for the change he has proposed. I can only speak of the subject on general lines, for I have not gone into the details. So far, my deputy minister knows more about the details than I do. And I must state here that that gentleman has my full confidence, and from what I have known of him since I came to office, he is a worthy officer and fully efficient. As I say, he has gone into the question more fully than I have, and he reported to me that the reasons given by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) are good reasons. And he tells me that he is satisfied that the Post Office Department will be well able to take care of this part of the public business, and that many good public purposes will be served by the change, amongst others that, instead of having fifteen agents for the whole of Canada, we are going to have 13,384, which seems to me a good increase, especially as it will cost the country nothing, or practically nothing. In the first place, our present postmasters all over the country are not very well paid. Their salaries are not what they might be, and I perhaps may go so far as to say, are not what they ought to be. I think this will be admitted on both sides of the

House. If we can save the country the money now spent for lecturers, and can also have an increase of business through the post office, by giving the postmasters a percentage on the business which they assist in bringing in, in an indirect way, their present salaries, and the country and the people interested also will benefit. I need not go into what my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said—he has said it too well, to make any repetition necessary. But the facts I have given, I think, will support what he has said. I have not gone into the matter very deeply; I have not had time. But I have gone into it deeply enough to be able to state to the House that I feel sure that we shall make a success of this work as it will be organized. With the general ideas we now have, and which we will develop more fully, I think that when we come back to the House next year, both sides of the House will agree that we have attained good results, and that the hon. members who have spoken to-night will feel satisfied that the move has been a good one.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I would suggest to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that as this is the last item it would perhaps be as well that it should pass. The principal objection that I have heard from him, is with regard to dispensing with the services of the lecturers and canvassers. I think it would be only right to give the proposals of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Postmaster General a fair trial. It seems to me that there is a great deal of reason in what they urge. The Post Office Department touches the community at 15,000 different points; and one would think that advantage might be taken of that organization to carry on the administration of this Act in a less expensive way and perhaps with even more efficiency than at present. However, should the hon. member prove to be right—and, no one can foresee absolutely—the matter can be taken up in the future along the lines which he suggests, and canvassers and lecturers can be employed if that course is found necessary in the public interest.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am content that the item pass, but I do not quite understand what incentive I should have to go through this large number of papers that are going to be brought down, when a number of officials have already been dismissed, and the transfer has been made.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). We have 13,000 postmasters who would make efficient agents, no doubt. There was a meeting of the Postmasters' Association in Toronto the other day, and they passed a resolution in favour of having increased duties imposed upon them so that they might implement their salaries. which are at the present moment rather meagre. They suggested as one additional duty the expansion of the parcel-post system, about which we have heard to-day in this chamber. It might be a good idea to increase the duties of postmasters, not only in this but in other directions. The post office in every community ought to be used in some way to render better service to the public. The post office ought to be the centre of the telegraph system, of the savings bank, of money orders, and of this annuity business. It is a splendidly organized institution, it costs very little, and can be used in many ways to render further service to the community.

Some resolutions reported.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. WHITE moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee).

Mr. WHITE moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1912, the sum of $48,680,561.37 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to, resolution reported, read the first and second time. and agreed to.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to inquire whether the government will afford the House an opportunity for discussing the matter of the dismissal of officials. We have already discussed it on going into Supply, but will the government afford us every opportunity desirable?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

ADJOURNMENT OVER CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask my hon. friend who is leading the House (Mr. Foster), whether he can give us any information as to what the government propose to do in regard to adjournment over the Christmas holidays. Some gentlemen on this side of the House, at all events, would like to make some arrangements based upon the time when the House will adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. On Monday when the Prime Minister is here he can answer that question. The leader of the opposition is not here to-night?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the matter had better go until Monday. I am informed by the Chief Whip, however. that an arrangement has been made to adjourn on Thursday evening until January 9.

Mr. McKENZIE. May I call the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that Tuesday is not a good day for maritime province members to be back here because that would necessitate them leaving home on Saturday or Sunday. If we adjourned until the 10th, which would be Wednesday, that would enable them to leave on Monday morning and be here on time.

Mr. BORDEN. We desire in every way to meet the convenience of members and I will give the hon. gentleman's suggestion very careful consideration.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18), for granting to his Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1912.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is private members day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But, after the business of private members is disposed of, because there will be very little of that?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There are some government Bills on the Order Paper and it may be possible to take one or more of these.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 4, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) presented the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House. The report is as follows:

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Aikins,
Barker,
Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blondin,
Borden,
Bristol,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Chisholm (Antigonish)
Coderre,
Crothers,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Fowler,
Fripp,
German,
Kay,
Lafortune,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Maclean (Halifax),
Marcile (Bagot),
Munson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Porter,
Rainville,
Robidoux,
Ross,
Sevigny,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tremain and
Wilson (Laval).—41.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Achim,
Aikins,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Barker,
Barnard,
Bellemare,
Barrette,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Boivin,
Boyer,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Carroll,
Cash,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clare,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Coderre,
Crocket,
Cruise,
Currie,
Delisle,
Devlin
Donnelly,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliott,
Emmerson,
Lanctot,
Lapointe (Kamouraska,)
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Law,
Lennox,
Lesperance,
Low,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
McLean (Sunbury),
Marshall,
Martin (Regina),
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Monk,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Pelletier,
Pugsley,
Rhodes,
Schaffner,
Sevigny,

Ethier,
Forget,
Fortier,
Foster (King's N.S.),
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Gauvreau,
German,
Goodeve,
Gordon,
Guillbault,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Jameson,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lalor,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stevens,
Taylor,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Tremain,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Wallace,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson Laval),
Wilson (Wentworth) and
Wright.—119.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-five members.

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Ames,
Armstrong (York, O.),
Ball,
Boulay,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Bristol,
Broder,
Bureau,
Burnham,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Clare,
Clarke (Essex),
Clarke (Wellington),
Crocket,
Davidson,
Devlin,
Ethier,
Forget,
Foster (King's, N.S.),
Fripp,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
Gordon,
Guthrie,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Victoria, Hal.),
Jameson,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lamarche,
Lavallée,
Macdonell,
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Mondou,
Nantel,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Paul,
Porter,
Proulx,
Reid (Grenville),
Robb,
Ross,
Sharpe (Ontario),
Shepherd,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Thoburn,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Walker and
White (Renfrew).—58.

And that the quoroum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Barrette,
Best,
Boulay,
Brown,
Burrell,
Chabot,
Clare,
Cromwell,
Doherty,
Elson,
Fortier,
Hazen,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Low,
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
Marcile (Bagot),
Michaud,
Paquet,
Paul,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Seguin,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Stanfield,
Turgeon,
Verville and
White (Leeds).—35.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of seven members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Beattie,
Bickerdike,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Brouillard,
Cardin,
Cash,
Chabot,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Currie,
Douglas,
Elliott,
Lavallée,
Lesperance,
Low,
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Middlebro,
Murphy,
Nantel,
Nicholson,
Roche,
Stevens,
Verville,
White (Victoria, Alta.) and
Wilson (Wentworth).—26.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Aikins,
Baker,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blain,
Boyce,
Carvell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke (Essex),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements
Coderre,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Edwards,
Fisher,
Fowler,
Fripp,
German,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Kyte,
Lalor,
Lennox,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McKenzie,
Marshall,
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Regina),
Meighen,
Merner,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Mondou,
Monk,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Neely,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Pardee,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rhodes,
Robidoux,
Sevigny,
Sinclair,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Tobin,
Tremain,
White (Leeds) and
Wilcox.—61.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Aikins,
Ames,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Baker,
Ball,
Barker,
Barnard,
Beattie,
Bellemare,
Best,
Bickerdike
Blondin,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Currie,
Demers,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Emmerson
Fisher,
Forget,
Fortier,
Foster (King's N.S.),
Foster (Toronto, N.),
Fowler,
Gauthier (St Hyacinthe),
Goodeve,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lancaster,
Law,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Lesperance,
Loggie,
Low,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York, O.),
McCraney,
McCurdy,
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Martin (Regina),
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Osler,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Perley,
Porter,
Power,
Pugsley,
Rainville,
Rhodes,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross,
Seguin,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sinclair,
Staples,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Thornton,
Tobin,
Verville,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel and
White (Leeds).—98.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 8.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Béland,
Best,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Bradbury,
McCrea,
McKay,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
McMillan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Munson,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Paquet,
Paul,
Proulx,
Reid (Grenville),
Richards.
Robb,
Rogers,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Seguin,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sinclair,
Smith,
Staples,
Steele,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thomson, (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Turriff,
Walker,
Wallace,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel.
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Laval)
Wilson (Wenthworth) and
Wright.—98.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twelve members.

Mr. BORDEN.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs

Alguire,
Barnard,
Cardin,
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clarke (Essex),
Clements,
Emmerson,
Fowler,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Hazen,
Hughes (King's P.E.I.),
Jameson,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Lavallee,
Loggie,
McCurdy,
McKenzie,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Nicholson,
Pardee,
Pelletier,
Power,
Robidoux,
Shepherd,
Sinclair,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg)
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Turgeon,
Wallac and
Wilcox.—35.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs

Arthurs,
Boyce,
Loggie,
Lovell,

Carrick, Macdonald,
Carroll, McMillan,
Chisholm (Antigonish), Marcil (Bonaventure).
Cochrane, Merner,
Cockshutt, Mondou,
Devlin, Nesbitt,
Douglas, Osler,
Goodeve, Richards,
Guilbault, Sexsmith,
Hartt, Shepherd,
Hepburn, Smith,
Kidd, Smyth,
Lalor, Turgeon,
Law, Turriff and
Lewis, Walker.—34.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs

Ames, Kidd,
Barrette, McKay,
Blain, Michaud,
Béland, Munson,
Bourassa, Osler,
Bowman, Perley,
Brabazon, Rainville,
Bradbury, Richards,
Champagne, Rogers,
Charlton, Thoburn,
Cochrane, Warnock,
Cromwell, Webster,
Cruise, White (Victoria, Alta.),
Davidson, Wilson (Laval) and
Ethier, Wright.—32.
Goodeve,
Henderson,

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs

Bellemare, Lovell,
Beattie, Marcil (Bonaventure),
Boulay, Monk,
Brouillard, Perley,
Burnham, Reid (Restigouche),
Cockshutt, Schaffner, and
Foster (Toronto N.) Taylor.—15.
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of five members.

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs

Béland, Foster (Toronto N.),
Blondin, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Borden, Lemieux,
Boyer, Lewis,
Broder, Meighen,
Clark (Bruce), Pardee,
Crothers, Pelletier, and
Doherty, Pugsley.—17.
Emmerson,

Mr. BORDEN moved that the said report be now concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would suggest that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) allow this motion to stand until to-morrow, so that members may have an opportunity of looking at the lists prepared.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Mr. BORDEN. There are also the list of the House of Commons members of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament and the list of the Committee on Debates. I suppose it would be better to let these also stand until to-morrow.

RESTAURANT COMMITTEE.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That Messrs. Boyce, Clarke (Essex), Chisholm (Inverness) and Sharpe (Lisgar) be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the restaurant so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act as members of the committee of both Houses on the restaurant; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 19) to amend the Inquiries Act. He said: The Bill contains only one clause, and perhaps the reading of that clause will be the best explanation of the measure. This is to amend the Inquiries Act, Chap. 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. Under Part I, authority is given to appoint commissioners to inquire into any matters that affect the general public interest; and in Part II, provision is made for the issue of commissions for departmental inquiries. This Bill provides, with regard to both classes of commissions, that, where the commission so specifies, the commissioners appointed shall have power to engage the services of such accountants, engineers, technical officers, or other experts, clerks, reporters and assistants, as they deem necessary, and also to engage the services of counsel to aid the commissioners in the inquiry. As to these powers it might be said that they were implied in the deputing of authority to inquire. But this measure goes on the principle that what would go without saying would go more clearly if said. But the more substantial part of the Bill is in what follows. It empowers the commissioners—

To authorize and depute to such accountants, engineers, technical advisers or other experts, or any qualified persons, the power to take evidence, inquire into and report to the commissioners upon any matter within the scope of the commission as may be directed by the commissioners and such persons shall,

in the execution of the powers so deputed or authorized, have the same powers as the commissioners to issue subpœnas, enforce the attendance of witnesses, compel them to give evidence, and otherwise conduct the inquiry.

The power intended to be conferred is, to put it briefly, the power of delegation of the right of the commissioners to inquire. That power is to be exercised only when the commission specially confer it. It has been deemed advisable to give this power in view of the fact that in certain cases, either by reason of the wide range of the matter to be inquired into, the number of details that might be required to be considered, or for other reasons, it might be found both more expeditious and more advantageous that the commissioners should be placed in such a position that they could place the authority to inquire into some particular portion or portions of the matters committed to them in the hands of a sub-commission which would report to them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time .

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like, with the consent of the House, to ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, 'An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.'

Mr. SPEAKER. I am told there is no notice of the Bill, therefore it would be irregular.

Mr. MACDONALD. I was instructed that it could be introduced with the consent of the House. However, I will move to suspend the rule in order to permit me to introduce the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman might explain the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. The Bill is one which I have been asked to introduce to provide for the renewal of the charter of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which has expired. It is necessary in order to permit construction to go on, and in order to avoid a technical difficulty which would otherwise arise unless the matter was dealt with immediately. I therefore move the suspension of the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think before the rule could be suspended a recommendation is required from the committee of the House, which has not yet been given.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would suggest that, with the unanimous consent of the House, the rule can be suspended. I may call your attention to a case which happened many years ago where the charter of a certain bank in Prince Edward Island was renewed. In that case the Bill was introduced, read the first, second and third time in one day, with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. BORDEN. I think any rule, assuming necessity, might be suspended, but only with the unanimous consent of the House. The circumstances of this case are, as I understand them, that the time limit provided in the charter of the Grand Trunk Pacific for the continuance of its construction work, expired on the 1st of Dec. The same limit is to be found in the contract of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway: it is the same in both cases. These are two entirely distinct matters. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway charter might be extended so far as the time for completing construction is concerned to a particular period, and yet the government might not see fit to extend for a similar period the term fixed in the contract. The urgency of this case was presented to the government, and it was proposed that a Bill for both purposes should be introduced; the matter came before the government only recently. It was pointed out to the company that two different questions were to be considered. Now the urgency of the situation as regards the Grand Trunk Pacific railway is this, that the time fixed for the completion of their work under the terms of their charter having expired, the company has now no legal status to continue its work on the uncompleted section until parliament shall have extended the time. As I have already mentioned, that period expired on the 1st of Dec. It seems to me, therefore, a proper case in which the rule of the House should be suspended in order that the work upon construction may not be suspended. It is a choice between one thing or the other. Strictly speaking, the company has no authority to proceed with the uncompleted portion of its line after the 1st day of December, unless parliament sees fit to extend the time for completion. The method which has been adopted in the Bill which has been mentioned by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), is to provide, in an amendment to the charter of the company, that the time should be extended for such a period as may be fixed by the government under the terms of an order in council, dependent upon authority for that purpose being given by this House. It is apparent, therefore, that the Bill which has been introduced by the hon. member for Pictou, is one of two Bills which will have to be passed by unanimous consent, if the purpose is to be achieved; in the first place a Bill extending the time fixed by the charter of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway for such a period as may be determined, and another Bill which will be presented by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, if the House sees fit to suspend the rule in both cases.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule I have in mind was Rule 40 :

Two days' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a Bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, or for the putting of a question.

Thus applying to the present case. Then Rule 41 says :

A motion may be made by unanimous consent of the House, without previous notice.

Mr. MACDONALD moved that Rule 40 be suspended in relation to Bill (No. 20), respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill introduced and read the first time.

Mr. COCHRANE moved that Rule No. 40 be suspended in relation to Bill (No. 21), respecting the National Transcontinental railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill introduced and read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CASE OF F. D. McRAE.

Mr. McMILLAN:

1. Has the government or any of its members, received any petition or request for a commutation of the sentence of life imprisonment imposed on F. D. McRae at the last Cornwall assizes?
2. If so, what action has been taken with regard to such petition or request?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.
2. Answered by preceding answer.

FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Was any promise made by the present Minister of Labour, or other government supporters, in the province of Ontario during the recent election campaign, to the effect that if the Conservative party were returned to power all those who lost money through the failure of the Farmers' Bank, would be reimbursed by the government?
2. Did the Toronto 'Globe' of August 26, 1911, state as follows:—

'That in or about the month of June 1908, the manager of the Toronto 'World,' of which paper W. F. Maclean, Conservative member for South York, is chief owner, made an arrangement with W. R. Travers, manager of the Farmers' Bank, to solicit deposits for the Farmers' Bank, which, it is now claimed by the 'News' and other Conservative organs, was rotten from its inception.

'That in return Travers agreed to loan funds of the bank to the Toronto 'World.'

'That in pursuance of this understanding the manager of the Toronto 'World' procured by the exercise of influence over Col. Matheson, the Provincial Treasurer, an increase in the deposit of the province of Ontario in the Farmers' Bank from $10,000 to $35,000.

'That contemporaneously with the increase of the deposit of the province of Ontario to $35,000, Travers, for the bank, loaned Dr. Beattie Nesbitt $25,000 and the Toronto 'World' $10,000, and wrote a letter to Col. Matheson, informing him that these loans had been made, a copy of which letter is now, or was recently, on file among the papers of the Farmers' Bank.

'That Col. Matheson denies the receipt of this letter.

'That with the $25,000 thus obtained Dr. Beattie Nesbitt was enabled to pay the first instalment of the purchase price of the Keeley mine, the speculation which finally wrecked the bank and drove Nesbitt out of the country—a fugitive from justice."

3. Will the government re-imburse the losses mentioned and described in the above quotation from the Toronto 'Globe'?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No such promise was made by the Minister of Labour. The government has no information as to promises made by other government supporters.
2. The government has no information on the subject.
3. The government has no knowledge or information as to the alleged transactions.

THE CANADIAN NAVY.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Did one of the present members of the government, viz., the Minister of Inland Revenue, during the last electoral campaign, at Ste. Scholastique, on the 24th June last, and at Ste. Therese de Blainville, on the 18th September last, denounce the attitude of the chief of the opposition, Mr. R. L. Borden, on the question of the Canadian navy, and repudiate him as his leader?
2. Was the said minister then a Nationalist candidate in Terrebonne?
3. If so, did the said candidate pledge himself that if elected in Terrebonne he would demand the repeal of the Navy Law?
4. Is it the intention of the government to repeal the Navy Law? If so, when will said law be repealed?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.
2. No.
3. Answered by the answer to No. 2.
4. The policy of the government will be announced in due course.

RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

1. Does the government intend to continue the drainage works already commenced in the Rivière des Prairies?
2. What amount of money has been placed in the estimates for that purpose for the current year 1911-12?

3. How much of this amount was voted by the last parliament?
4. How much has been expended up to this date in the execution of these works?
5. What is the depth at low water of the channel of the Rivière des Prairies for that part of its course which extends from the channel of the St. Lawrence at Bout de l'Ile, Montreal, to the Rapid la Passe?

Mr. MONK:

1. It is intended to continue the dredging operations in the Rivière des Prairies.
2. $30,000.
3. $12,500.
4. 1910-11.. .. ..$3,190 02
1911-12 .. .. 3,190 02

$9,621 29

5. The present depth, at low water, is seven feet, with the excention of two spots where there is only a depth of six feet.

DURATION OF PRESENT PARLIAMENT.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Did the Prime Minister inform Mr. George Taylor, ex-M.P., that there would be only two sessions of the present parliament?
2. Did Mr. George Taylor, ex-M.P., state at a public meeeting in the County of Leeds that the Prime Minister had informed him that there would be only two sessions of the present parliament?
3. Is it the intention of the government to limit the life of this parliament to two sessions?
4. If so, will a re-distribution Bill be passed before dissolution?
5. If not, when will a re-distribution Bill be introduced?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.
2. The government has no information on the subject.
3. The question has not been considered.
4. A redistribution bill will be passed before dissolution.
5. Answered by answer to No. 4.

BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Has the Prime Minister or any other member of the government, had a conference with representatives of the Manitoba government respecting the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba?
2. If so, was the question of separate schools discussed?
3. What is the attitude or intention of the government with respect to separate schools within the territory to be added to Manitoba, or within the province as enlarged by such additional territory?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. The matter has not received the consideration of the government.

Mr. WILSON (Laval).

* Mr. MACDONALD:

Have the terms of the arrangement with the government of Manitoba as to the extension of the boundaries of that province been arrived at and agreed upon by the Dominion government?

Mr. BORDEN:

The extension of the boundaries of Manitoba has been under consideration, and a basis of settlement has been reached respecting the financial terms which have hitherto been in dispute. The basis adopts the principle of equality of treatment as between Manitoba and the other prairie provinces. The application of this principle to the details is being worked out.

MAPLE SUGAR STANDARD.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

1. For what reasons has the order in council of March 20, 1911, establishing the standard of quality of maple sugar and syrup, under the provisions of section 26 of the Act of Adulteration been annulled by order in council of October 27, 1911?
2. Has the Department of Inland Revenue made any experiments since March 20, 1911, to determine the proportion of ingredients which pure maple sugar and syrup contain?
3. If so, who are the expert analysts employed to make these experiments?
4. In what parts of Canada, or in what foreign countries or parts of these foreign countries, were collected the samples on which these experiments were made?
5. Before adopting the two methods of analysis, the Canadian method and the Winton method by the order in council of October 27, 1911, did the Department of Inland Revenue test them on samples of Canadian sugar or syrup?
6. If so, in what parts of the country were the samples collected?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. The order in council of 20th March, 1911, was cancelled by that of 27th October, last, because further examination of maple sugar showed that under its requirements samples of genuine maple syrup might be condemned.
2. Yes. 456 samples analysed.
3. Assistant Analysts Valin, Forward, Kitto and Lemoine.
4. Ontario and Quebec provinces.
5. Yes.
6. Ontario and Quebec provinces

CANAL AT CHESTER, N.S.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has work on the canal at Chester, N.S., been discontinued?
nat reason and on whose recommendation was such work discontinued?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. That inquiries may be made as to the necessity for the work.

MR. A. J. O'BRIEN.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Was A. J. O'Brien, caterer in the Immigration buildings at Halifax, dismissed or removed?

2. If so, on what grounds was the dismissal or removal made, and has any person been appointed in his place?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. On the ground that the service would be thereby improved. Yes

NE TEMERE DECREE.

*Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. In view of the statement made by Mr. Burnham, the member for West Peterborough, from his seat in this House on the 24th instant, as reported in Hansard, pages 327 and 328, to the effect that in the province of Ontario the Ne Temere decree was used against the late government and that it played an important part in the recent general elections, will the government inform the House in what respect, if any, the late government was, in the opinion of the Ministry, censurable by reason of or in connection with said decree?

2. Having reference to the various questions asked of the late government at the last session of parliament, and answered by Sir Allen Aylesworth, late Minister of Justice, which questions and answers were as follows:

Questions by Mr. Sexsmith (see Hansard, page 6,269).

'1. Under the laws of Canada, or of the several provinces, are marriages valid when contracted between persons of different religious beliefs? If so, in what cases?'

'2. Has any one the right to urge persons who have contracted such valid marriages to disregard them on the ground that they are invalid?

'3. If such right does not exist what is the remedy?'

Answer by Sir Allen Aylesworth:—

'1. There is no Dominion legislation on the subject. The solemnization of marriage in the provinces is, under the British North America Act, matter entirely of provincial jurisdiction.

'Section 92 of that statute enacts that in each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say:

'2. The solemnization of marriage in the provinces.'

Question by Mr. Hughes, the present Minister of Militia and Defence (see Hansard, pages 7207-8).

'1. Is the government, or any member thereof, aware that the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic church and the courts of Quebec province are said to decline to recognize as valid a marriage between a Roman Catholic man and a Roman Catholic woman if solemnized by other than an ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic church?

'2. Is the government, or any member thereof, aware that, as alleged, ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic church declare invalid, marriages solemnized between a Roman Catholic and one of another faith throughout the Dominion of Canada unless the ceremony be performed by an ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic church?

'3. Under the British North America Act, section , does not marriage come under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada?

'4. Is it the intention of the government to enact legislation which throughout Canada will make a marriage legal in any and every province if performed between persons of the same creed or faith or of different creeds or faiths, in any province by any official or officials recognized for such purpose in any other province; in short, to enact a Dominion of Canada marriage law which will accept for every part of Canada and make lawful in every province a marriage consummated under the law or form of any province?

'5. Is it the intention of the government to make it a criminal offence, and to prescribe punishment for any person, ecclesiastic or other, who intrudes or promulgates or publishes or declares any rule or dogma of any ecclesiastical organization casting a doubt upon or declaring invalid, or in any sense reflecting on the legality of a marriage performed by any official recognized as entitled to perform a marriage ceremony, or setting up any such ecclesiastical dogma or rule as overriding the law of Canada?

'6. Is it the intention of the government to declare valid a marriage solemnized in Quebec or in any other province of Canada between two persons of the Roman Catholic faith, providing the officiating clergyman be a Protestant, and for the removal of doubt to make the law retroactive?

'7. Is it the intention of the government to permit any ecclesiastical dogma or rule to override the laws of the people of Canada?

'8. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to restore to legitimacy every woman who supposed her marriage legally consummated, and also the children born of such marriage?

'9. Will the government enact legislation compelling alimony to the woman where the man has left her under the ecclesiastical dogma of any church?'

Answer by Sir Allen Aylesworth:—

'1 and 2. Neither the government, nor any department of the government, has any knowledge in relation to the matters referred to in these questions other than such as may be gathered from newspaper articles or references to the subject.

'3. Under the British North America Act the subject of marriage and divorce is one in regard to which parliament may legislate, but everything relating to the solemnization of marriage in the provinces is within the exclusive powers of the provincial legislature.

'As to the remaining questions, other than question 7, legislation of the character indicated in the questions would appear to refer wholly to the persons by whom, or the form of the ceremony by which, marriages in any province could be validly solemnized, and in that view such legislation would seem not competent for the parliament of Canada to enact. Legislation such as is indicated in questions 8 and 9 would seem also to relate to property and civil rights in the province,

and on that ground as well to be matter for the exclusive consideration of the provincial authorities.

'7. The government is not acquainted with any law of the people of Canada which has been overridden by any ecclesiastical dogma.'

Question by Mr. Taylor (Leeds) (see Hansard, page 8585).

'1. Has the Dominion government power to legalize or validate any or every marriage solemnized anywhere in Canada?

'2. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain the power of this parliament in this regard?

'3. If not, does the government propose to take any steps for that purpose?

'4. Has the opinion of the law officers of the Crown been asked or obtained upon this question?

'5. Does the government propose to obtain the opinion of the law officers of the Crown thereon?'

Answer by Sir Allen Aylesworth:—

'1. The government does not consider that it possesses any such power.

'2, 3, 4 and 5. The government has not considered the advisability of taking any of the courses suggested.'

Question by Mr. Taylor (Leeds), (see Hansard, pages 10195-6).

'1. Has the parliament of Canada the power to legalize or validate any or every marriage solemnized in Canada?

'2. Does the government consider it desirable that steps should be taken to prevent cruelty and injustice by reason of marriages contracted in good faith before a duly ordained clergyman, but afterwards declared invalid?

'3. Does the government propose to take any steps for this purpose or in this connection?'

Answer by Sir Allen Aylesworth:—

'1. The question calls for an opinion upon a matter of law in regard to which the government would desire to be advised if necessity arose.

'2 and 3. The government is of the opinion that it has no power or jurisdiction in the premises.'

Does the government concur in the views and opinions thus expressed by Sir Allen Aylesworth in reply to said questions respectively?

3. If it does not concur therein, in what respects does it differ therefrom?

4. Is the government of the opinion that either it or the parliament of Canada has power to deal with such decree?

5. Does the government intend to take, or to ask parliament to take, any action? If so, what, regarding such decree, or the solemnization of marriages, or the law relating to marriage?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The government does not feel called upon to express any opinion upon the statement alluded to.

2 and 3. The government would regard with the utmost respect and consideration the opinion of the late Minister of Justice upon any question of law whether relating to the interpretation of the British North America Act or otherwise and it entirely agrees that the question raised as to the respective powers of parliament and of provincial legislatures is one of legal interpretation upon which eminent lawyers may differ.

4. The government has no legislative power. As to the powers of parliament this question is answered by the answer to the previous question.

5. The matter has not been under consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) has answered question No. 4. The hon. gentleman states that opinions may differ. My question is as to what is the opinion of the government with regard to the powers of parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) is out of order. There can be no debate at this stage. An hon. member is entitled simply to ask a question and it remains for a minister of the Crown to answer it as he sees fit.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand that the member who has asked a question has no right to draw your attention to the fact that the question has not been answered?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has been done over and over again since I have been a member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, but not at this stage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand you to rule, Mr. Speaker, that I have no right to call attention to the fact that the question has not been answered?

Mr. SPEAKER. When the minister has given his answer that precludes any debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even though the question is not answered?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

DISMISSAL OF Mr. EMILE DUMELONG.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has Emile Dumelong, Post Office caretaker at L'Assomption, been removed?

2. If so, at whose request and what are the reasons for his removal?

3. Who has been appointed to replace him and on whose recommendation?

Mr. MONK:

In answer to the first question: Yes. To the 2nd question; At the request of reliable parties who assert that this gentleman has meddled very actively in politics during the last elections.

To the third question: Anthime Martel, on the recommendation of Mr. Morin, lawyer, and many other persons.

WEIGHING GOODS IN CUSTOMS.

Mr. WEICHEL:

1. Is the government aware of the alleged recent issue by the French government of a ministerial decree, re weighing all goods in customs, to take effect on January 1 next?
2. Is the government cognizant of the fact that the enforcement of this decree will require all goods shipped to France to be removed, on arrival, from the cases or boxes in which they are contained and the goods weighed separately from the packing which may surround them?
3. Can the government inform the House whether this new decree will apply to Canadian exports to France equally as to the United Kingdom and foreign countries?
4. If so, will the government take steps to join with the boards of trade of Great Britain in such representations to the French government to secure modification in the decree as will minimize the inconvenience which it is feared the order will involve?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. No.
4. The department applied to the French Consul General in Montreal for information upon the subject, who replied that he had not received any instructions from France. The government, however, has taken steps to obtain information upon the subject.

RAILWAY FROM O'LEARY STATION TO WEST POINT, P.E.I.

Mr. RICHARDS:

1. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of a line of railway known as the branch line from O'Leary station to West Point, in Prince Edward Island, for which an appropriation was made by parliament at last session? If so, when?
2. What are the names of the firms or persons who tendered for the construction of said branch line?
3. What is the amount of each tender and the cash deposit on each tender?
4. Was any tender accepted by the Railway Department? If so, which tender?
5. Was notice of acceptance sent to the successful tenderer?
6. Was the successful tenderer instructed not to proceed with the work of construction? If so, for what reason?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. It is not the intention of the government at the present time to proceed with the construction of the branch line railway from O'Leary station to West Point in Prince Edward Island.
2. (a) Daniel R. Morrison, Summerside, Prince Edward Island; Henry J. Phillip, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island; Archibald McLean, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. (b) R. E. Mutch, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island; W. A. Mutch, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. (c) Willard Kitchen, Grand Falls, New Brunswick. (d) Thomas Campbell, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.
3. (a) Daniel R. Morrison, tender, $101,588; accepted bank cheque for $20,000. (b) Henry J. Phillip and others, tender, $74,405; accepted bank cheque for $20,000. (c) Willard Kitchen, tender, $85,196; accepted bank cheque for $15,000. (d) Thomas Campbell, tender, $72,706; accepted bank cheque for $20,000.
4. Yes. The tender of Thomas Campbell.
5. Yes.
6. Yes. On October 11, 1911, this work was held up in order to enable the minister to look into the matter.

LOBSTER FISHING SEASON IN ST. JOHN AND CHARLOTTE COUNTY.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has the date of opening of the lobster fishing season in St. John and Charlotte counties been recently changed?
2. If so, what is now the opening date, and upon what ground was the change made?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes, for the present year.
2. 20th November. As no canneries are allowed in this district, and there is a size limit of 4¾ inches carapace measurement, it was considered, pending further investigation, that fishing might this year be allowed to commence on that date without danger to the permanence of the fishery. Last year fishing was allowed to begin on December 1. Under the regulations of September 30, 1910, the season opens on January 6.

POSTMASTER AT MAHONE BAY, N.S.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has the Postmaster General received any request for the removal or dismissal of David Mader, postmaster at Mahone Bay, N.S.?
2. If so, by whom, and upon what grounds was his dismissal made?
3. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to give the said David Mader an opportunity of answering any charges made against him before taking action?

Mr. PELLETIER. 1, 2 and 3. No such request has so far been received at the department.

POSTMASTER AT EAST ROMAN VALLEY, N.S.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the Postmaster General received any communications asking for the dismissal of John M. Rogers, the postmaster at East Roman Valley in the county of Guysboro, N.S.?

2. If so, what name or names are signed to such communication or communications?

3. What reason or reasons are given for the requested dismissal of the said postmaster?

4. What action has been taken in this matter?

Mr. PELLETIER. 1, 2, 3 and 4. Patrick Walsh, formerly postmaster at East Roman Valley, who was dismissed in September, 1905, for political partisanship, having made application to be restored to his former position on the ground that he was unjustly dismissed, it has been decided, after full consideration of the circumstances of the case, that Mr. Walsh be re-instated.

61ST REGIMENT.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Is it true, as certain newspapers report, that the government has appointed, or intends to appoint, Captain Armand Lavergne, the commandant of the 61st regiment of Montmagny?

2. Is it true, as stated, that Major J. E. Rosignol, of St. Denis, Kamouraska, is the oldest officer of that regiment and possesses all certificates and qualifications required for the post of commandant?

3. Did Major Rosignol act as commandant at the last annual drills of the 61st regiment?

4. What special qualifications does Captain Lavergne possess to be preferred to other officers?

Mr. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to put his question in proper form I shall be very pleased to bring down the answer. I am sure that if he looks at it he will see that it is not in proper form.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. How is it wrong ?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not feel that I am bound to hunt all over the country to find out what certain papers have said.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All right.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands for correction.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. When will that portion of the Transcontinental railway between Quebec and Moncton be finished?

2. Does the government intend to operate this section of the said railway itself from now until the Quebec bridge is built?

3. If so, will its management be entrusted to the officials of the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. COCHRANE :

1. The following information is received from the chairman of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission : 'The engineers of the Commission advise that the portion of the line in the province of New Brunswick will be completed by September, 1912, and the portion in the province of Quebec from the New Brunswick boundary to the St. Lawrence river will be completed by the 30th September, 1913.'

2 and 3. The matter has not, so far, been considered by the government.

DYNAMITE AND OTHER EXPLOSIVES.

Mr. ROBB:

Does the government intend to introduce this session legislation regulating the manufacture, sale and use of dynamite, and other explosives?

Mr. BORDEN:

No; the government has no such intention.

MAIL CONTRACT BETWEEN NICOLET AND STE. MONIQUE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the mail contract between Nicolet and Ste. Monique, county of Nicolet, Quebec, been cancelled?

2. Have any complaints been made against the contractor? If so, what is their nature and the name of the complaint?

3. Have any public tenders been called for a new service?

Mr. PELLETIER:

There is no mail service or contract for mail service between Nicolet and Ste. Monique de Nicolet.

WORK AT ST. ANDRE, KAMOURASKA.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamourasks):

1. Was the work on the wharf at St. André, Kamouraska, stopped after the 21st of September last?

2. If so, who gave the order to stop the work and at whose request was it done?

3. On what date were the said works afterwards resumed, and who gave the order to this effect?

4. Were the overseer and the other men employed on these works before the 21st of September dismissed and replaced by others?

5. If so, was it in order to effect this change that the works were suspended?

Mr. MONK:

1 and 2. Work on the addition was discontinued for lack of funds on 19th, October.

3 and 4. Work of repair, under another appropriation, was started, under another inspector, on 20th October.

5. No.

St. PATRICK DE BRANDON.

Mr. LAFORTUNE:

1. What is the population of St. Patrick de Brandon in the county of Montcalm?

2. What is the revenue of the post office at Brandon?

3. Does the government intend to build a post office at Brandon?

Mr. ROCHE:

There is no place of the name 'St. Patrick de Brandon' in the County of Montcalm.

POST OFFICE AT EGANVILLE.

Mr. LOW:

1. Has the Department of Public Works taken any steps towards purchasing a site for the proposed new post office building to be erected at Eganville?

2. If so, what sites have they under consideration?

3. Does the department contemplate changing the location from the south side of the river, where the office has been located for nearly half a century, to the north side?

4. If so, at whose request or representations is the change of location being made?

5. Has the council of Eganville made any suggestions as to the most desirable location?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.

2. Bonfield site, west end of bridge, corner John street; Mills site, east Bonnechère street, lot No. A; Childerhouse site, east Bonnechére street, lot No. 2; Reinke & Boland site, reserve southeast of bridge, part of No. 3; Gourley site, part Island lot in Bonnechère river, northwest side of bridge.

3 and 4. The merits of sites on both sides are being carefully considered and investigated.

5. No.

OFFICE OF SOLICITOR GENERAL.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Is the office of Solicitor General filled? If so, by whom?

2. Who receives the salary attached to that office?

3. Is it true that the Hon. Minister of Justice holds the two offices of Minister of Justice and Solicitor General and collects the salaries?

4. Is it true that outside of the collection of these two salaries the Hon. Minister of Justice also receives a pension from the state as a retired judge If so, what is the amount he receives yearly in this capacity?

5. Does the government intend to continue the payment of superannuation allowance concurrently with his salary to the Hon. Minister of Justice?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.

2. No one.

3. No.

4. The Minister of Justice receives no salary or pension except such as are payable to him under the statutes of Canada.

5. Answered by the answer to No. 4.

LAND GRANT TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How many acres of Western lands were given to railway companies by the Dominion of Canada under contracts made prior to June 23, 1896?

Mr. ROGERS. 30, 388, 220, 25 acres.

MR. MEDARD FOREST.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has Mr. Medard Forest, excise officer at L'Epiphanie, been dismissed? If not, is he on the point of being so, and what grounds are alleged to justify this dismissal?

2. Who asked for his dismissal, and has there been or will there be held an inquiry to prove to the department the existence of the grievances alleged against him?

3. By whom is he replaced or what person is suggested to the department to replace him?

4. Does the Department of Inland Revenue intend to make other dismissals in the county of L'Assomption?

5. If so, will it make them after inquiries?

6. At the present time, are there any requests for dismissal of excise officers in the county of L'Assomption and by whom?

7. Does the department intend to consider these matters?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. A demand for Mr. Forest's dismissal has been made; the charge being that he had been, during the last federal election, an active political partisan. This demand is under consideration.

2. The demand has been made by reliable persons and Mr. Forest has been given an opportunity to refute the charge, but has ignored the request.

3. As his retirement has not yet taken place his successor has not been appointed.

4. As to other cases, each one will be dealt with on its merits.

5. If deemed necessary inquiries will be made.

6 and 7. No other requests have been received for the dismissal of excise officers in the county of L'Assomption.

RIDEAU HALL.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Did the Hon. A. E. Kemp, a member of the government when addressing a meeting in Toronto recently make the following statement, as reported in the 'Mail and Empire' on November 3, 1911:

'Although $100,000 was appropriated last year to remodel and re-decorate Rideau Hall, prior to the arrival of their Royal Highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, it was doubtful, according to one man, if more than $20,000 had been spent; where the balance had gone had not been discovered'?

2. If such statement was made by Mr. Kemp, upon what information was it based?

3. Before making such statement did Mr. Kemp make any inquiry of the Minister of Public Works respecting the matters referred to in such statement?

4. In view of the information given to the House on the 22nd instant by the Minister of Public Works, and appearing in Hansard, pages 562 and 563, showing that the appropriation referred to was $50,000 and not $100,000

as stated by Mr. Kemp, and that of this amount $46,441.87 was expended for the purposes mentioned by the Minister of Public Works, leaving an unexpended balance of $3,558.13 on November 1, 1911, does Mr. Kemp intend to retract the serious and unjust accusation made in such published statement against the Department of Public Works and the responsible officials thereof?

Mr. MONK:

1. The general statement was made that Government House, upon the arrival of their Royal Highnesses, was in a state of unpreparedness and that such a condition was inexplicable.
2. This statement was based upon the known condition of the place.
3. No, but the condition of the House was a matter of common knowledge and comment.
4. In view of all the circumstances no retraction is considered necessary.

THE ANNUITIES BRANCH.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it true that the Annuities Branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce has been or will be transferred to the Post Office Department?
2. If so, what is the cause of the transfer?
3. Is it true that the various annuities agents have been dismissed
4. What are the names of the agents so dismissed and the localities where they were employed?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. The Annuities branch will be transferred to the Post Office Department on January 1, 1912.
2. In order to utilize the post offices and the post office system for the better and more economical administration of the Act.
3 and 4. Mr. McArthur, agent for eastern Ontario, ceased to be an employee of the Department of Trade and Commerce in November, 1911. The names of the employees whose services will be dispensed with on December 31st are: Georges Belleau, province of Quebec; R. D. Cameron, western Ontario; Henry Cartwright, city of Toronto; Mrs. Emily Cummings, general; Edwin Dickie, cities and towns in Ontario; Pierre Gravel, city of Montreal; Theo. J. B. Leger, northern New Brunswick; Dr. James Samson, general; L. N. Santerre, province of Quebec.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation during this session with a view to bring the outside service under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BORDEN. The government intends to extend Civil Service reform as announced during the recent election. It has not yet been advised as to the necessity of further legislation for that purpose.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it the intention of the government to increase the number of the Civil Service Commissioners?
2. If so, how many new commissioners will be appointed?

Mr. BORDEN. The question has not yet been considered.

CEDAR RAPIDS POWER COMPANY.

Mr. ROBB:

1. Has the government granted any water-power concessions in the St. Lawrence river between Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis to the Cedar Rapids Power Company or other power companies or individuals?
2. If so, what terms, conditions and rental govern the lease?
3. What provision is made for regulating the price of light, heat and power from such water-powers?
4. How many applications are now before the government for the leasing of water-powers in the St. Lawrence river between Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis?

Mr. MONK:

1. No. The lease of the power and bed of the river was made to the Cedar Rapids Power Company by the provincial government of Quebec, the Public Works Department merely examined and passed upon the plans for development works to be constructed by the company.
2 and 3. The Department of Public Works did not grant this power concession, but it is understood that an agreement was entered into by the Cedar Rapids Power Company with the Quebec government regulating prices, rental, &c.
4. No applications for leases. Two applications are now before the Public Works Department for approval of plans of works of development.

LETHBRIDGE POST OFFICE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Are the plans completed for the post office at Lethbridge, Alberta?
2. If so, when will the tenders for its construction be asked for?

Mr. MONK:

1. Sketch plans have been prepared, but have not been finally approved.
2. When plans are completed, the department will be in position to call for tenders.

LETHBRIDGE ARMOURY.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Are the plans completed for the armoury at Lethbridge, Alberta?
2. If so, when will the tenders for its construction be asked for?
3. Is provision being made for an infantry corps as well as a field battery?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. No, but appropriate plans are now under consideration of this department.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Accommodation suitable for the needs of present and prospective corps will be provided.

IMPORTED CRUDE PETROLEUM.

Mr. BEATTIE :

1. What was the quantity of crude petroleum oil imported into Canada, each year, since 1902?
2. What was the quantity of refined petroleum oils and other petroleum products imported into Canada, each year, since 1902?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. The quantity of crude petroleum oil imported into Canada during the fiscal years from 1902 to 1911, inclusive, was as follows :—

	Crude petroleum, fuel and gas oils (other than naphtha, benzine or gasolene) when imported by manufacturers for fuel purposes or for the manufacturing of gas.	Crude petroleum lighter than ·8235 but not less than ·775 specific gravity.	Crude petroleum ·8235 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature.
	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.
1902	591,328	.....	
1903	2,143,888	.....	
1904	4,318,569	.....	
1905	.....	72,533	22,440,856
1906	.....	21,283	19,805,656
*1907	.....	10,146	13,252,968
1908	.....	53,037	24.866,963
1909	.....	3,515	31,594,212
1910	.....	3,281	36,947,670
1911	.....	10,246	54,310,597

2. The quantity of refined petroleum oils and other petroleum products imported into Canada during the fiscal years from 1902 to 1911, inclusive, was as follows : —

	Oil, coal and kerosene, distilled, purified or refined.	Products of petroleum, n.e.s.	Illuminating oils composed wholly or in part of products of petroleum, costing more than 30 cts. gal.	Vaseline, &c.	Gasolene under ·725 specific gravity.
	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	$	Gallons.
1902	11,811,083	493,807	8,512	8,434	
1903	13,810,752	554,658	4,126	11,666	
1904	17,111,294	848,642	10,151	12,537	
1905	9,238,505	918,124	10,649	13,078	
1906	9,225,561	1,730,898	3,769	14,308	
*1907	6,446,965	1,604,296	4,996	11,647	
1908	6,951,844	1,835,116	4,132	14,028	3,340,081
1909	11,613,625	1,474,216	4,237	15,274	5,204,125
1910	9,234,098	2,188,958	10,756	18,112	8,650,711
1911	9,142,078	2,604,481	51,703	24.948	16,629,758

Gasolene not enumerated previous to 1908. * 9 months.

NE TEMERE DECREE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Did the honourable member for West Peterborough state in the House of Commons that the Ne Temere decree was an issue in the last general election in the province of Ontario?

2. If so, does the government intend to take any action to meet the views of the people of Ontario in regard to that matter?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) is referred to the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) for an answer to this question.

2. Answered by the answer to question No. 1.

POPULATION.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. What is the population of Canada?

2. What is the population of Quebec?

3. What is the population of the city of Montreal?

4. What is the population of the city of Quebec?

5. What is the population of the following cities and towns: Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe, Sorel, Hull, Fraserville, Montmagny, Rimouski, Nicolet, Joliette, St. Jerome, Sherbrooke, Lévis, Maisonneuve, Chicoutimi, St. Jean, Victoriaville, Outremont, Roberval, Valleyfield, Terrebonne, Marieville, Ville Marie, Drummondville, Grand Mère, Verdun and Laprairie?

Mr BURRELL:

1. The population of Canada is 7,184,410.

2. The population of the province of Quebec is 2,003,023.

3. The population of the city of Montreal is 470,805.

4. The population of the city of Quebec is 78,203.

5. The population of the cities and towns asked for is as follows:

Three Rivers, 14,441; St. Hyacinthe, 9,797; Sorel, 8,419; Hull, 18,217; Fraserville, 6,733; Montmagny, 2,616; Rimouski, 3,097; Nicolet, 2,593; Joliette, 6,346; St. Jerome, 3,479; Sherbrooke, 16,405; Levis, 7,448; Maisonneuve, 18,674; Chicoutimi, 5,880; St. Jean, 5,903; Victoriaville, 3,028; Outremont, 4,745; Roberval, 1,737; Valleyfield, 9,449; Terrebonne, 1990; Marieville. 1,587; Ville Marie, 850; Drummondville, 1,725; Grand Mere, 4,783; Verdun, 11,627; Laprairie, 2,388.

Note:—The foregoing figures of population are all subject to revision.

CARRIER AND LANE.

Mr. LESPERANCE:

1. Has the old establishment of Messrs. Carrier and Lane, situated at Lévis been rented, transferred or sold? If so, to whom?

2. At what price has the said establishment been so rented transferred or sold?

3. What amount of money has the government received for the rent, transfer or sale of the said establishment up to this date, and on what dates have the respective payments been made?

4. What is the amount of each payment?

Mr. MONK:

1 and 2. Part of the property has been leased to the Canadian Shoe Machinery Company, for 30 years at $4,000 a year for the first 10 years and $6,000 a year for the last 20 years; a store to S. Paradis at $240 a year, and the Barras wharf to the Quebec & Levis Ferry Company, at $500 a year; the two latter leases were subject to cancellation at any time, and the last lease has been cancelled.

3 and 4. In rent from S. Paradis $700, payable monthly on the 10th of each month; from the Quebec & Levis Ferry Company, $694.52: on 20th April, 1910, $500; and on 17th June, 1911, $194.52.

The lease with the Canadian Shoe Machinery Company provides for lessors' repairs to be made by the lessees, and deducted from the rent; settlement of these is now under consideration, and pending same, no rent has as vet been paid.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. D B. NEELY (Humboldt) moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence and orders in council in connection with the awarding of the contract for the building of the Hudson Bay railway, and of all orders suspending work on the same.

He said: In moving for the papers and correspondence in connection with the letting of the contract for a section of the Hudson Bay railway and all orders suspending work on same, I am bringing to the attention of this House a matter which is of very vital interest and importance to the people of western Canada. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it created no small surprise throughout western Canada when the newspapers announced that one of the first acts of the new Minister of Railways was to suspend all work under the contract which was given by the late government for the construction of a certain number of miles of the Hudson Bay railway. For the last four or five years the construction of a railway to Hudson Bay has been a matter of very great interest to the people of the west, and whatever views as to the utility of the work the people in other parts of the country may have had there has been no doubt as to the view held by the great majority of the people west of Lake Superior. There can be no doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman in this House that no government of Canada had ever taken up this question seriously until Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the election campaign of 1908 made the defin-

ite announcement that he proposed to build the Hudson Bay railway, an announcement which gave the greatest satisfaction to the people of the west. The fact that that announcement was made in eastern Canada gave us an assurance of the sincerity of purpose of the right hon. gentleman, and, therefore, to him is due the credit for Canada undertaking this great work. We are happy to know in western Canada that so far as the two political parties of this country are concerned, at the present moment there is no division of opinion as to the necessity and the advisability of building this railroad. The present Prime Minister, during his tour of the west last summer—I think at every place he addressed an audience—made reference to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway and stated that he was quite in accord with the policy of the government building the road to Hudson bay. He went further and he told the people of the west that he purposed operating that railroad by the government itself as demanded by the organized farmers of the west. Of course we cannot give the hon. gentleman all the credit he might have had if he had taken his stand on this question when Sir Wilfrid Laurier first announced it at a time when there was undoubtedly a great deal of prejudice in the minds of eastern Canada, especially in Toronto and Montreal, against the prosecution of this work.

This prejudice was not confined to one political party, because even such a staunch Liberal newspaper as the Toronto 'Globe', on one occasion, if not on more than one, undertook to throw cold water on the proposition.

Mr. MACDONELL. I beg to state that there is no prejudice in Toronto against the construction of that road.

Mr. NEELY. While my hon. friend represents a division of the city of Toronto, he claims a great deal when he claims to know the sentiments of all the citizens of Toronto.

Mr. MACDONELL. I know them better than the hon. gentleman does.

Mr. CURRIE. What authority has the hon. gentleman for making that statement?

Mr. NEELY. I may say that again and again such a prominent Conservative newspaper as the Montreal 'Daily Star' also attempted to throw cold water on this proposition. So that, so far as eastern Canada is concerned, it had been brought to our attention in the west that there was more or less prejudice against the construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. CURRIE. By whom?

Mr. NEELY. By leaders of thought such as I have indicated.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman has no authority to make the statement unless he produces some proof.

Mr. NEELY. I have quoted authorities that are supposed to represent to some extent public opinion in eastern Canada, namely, the Toronto 'Globe' and the Montreal 'Daily Star'. Notwithstanding the knowledge of these prejudices, the late government, realizing that western Canada had come to that point of development and progress as to require this new outlet for the products of the western farmer, and having made the promise, having put their hand to the plough, immediately after the election, and after they were returned to power, made preparations for the carrying out of their promise. As we know, there was a good deal of work in the engineering line to be done before any active construction could take place, because the country through which the road must pass is an undeveloped region as to which there was very little information; and so the government made provision in the first session of the last parliament for engineers to be sent over the territory to lay out the route of the road. Later on an estimate was submitted to the House and passed for the construction of a bridge across the Saskatchewan river at the Pas Mission, and, as we know in the estimates of last spring there was an item of $2,000,000 for the active construction of the road itself. After the dissolution of parliament, and while the verdict of the electors was still in abeyance, the late government called for tenders for a certain number of miles of construction, something less, I believe, than 200; and, according to statements made by the late Minister of Railways to the public press, a contract for that work was given to the lowest tenderer. The contract was signed and executed, and we all understood that the work was to be immediately under way. But, Sir, the elections came along on the 21st of September, and the late government were not given the responsibility of seeing this work, which they had so honestly and sincerely begun, brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House how nearly the bridge to which he has referred is completed, and how many miles of the railway for which the government gave the contract have been completed, or even graded.

Mr. NEELY. I am surprised that a member representing a constituency in the west should ask those questions. I understand that the bridge is rapidly nearing completion. So far as the road itself is concerned, it was only during the late summer that the contract was let, so that my hon. friend can hardly expect very many miles to be built.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It was just before the election.

Mr. NEELY. About a month afterwards orders were given for the suspension of the work on this contract. It was with great consternation that the people of the west heard through the public press that one of the first official acts of the new Minister of Railways was to issue orders for the suspension of the work. It would appear that that hon. gentleman had not been reading the papers at the time that his leader made his tour through western Canada last summer, when he found very much fault with the late government because of the tardy way in which they were fulfilling their promise to build a railway to Hudson bay. I think the Prime Minister at one point went even so far as to state the exact length of time in which he could build the Hudson Bay railway if the people of Canada gave him the opportunity. I know that my opponent in the late election made the statement on platform after platform that if the Hon. Mr. Borden were returned to power at this election, we would have a railroad in operation to Hudson bay inside the term of four years; he stated that Mr. Borden had given him authority to make, or himself had made that statement. Now, that pledge undoubtedly helped to counteract to a very large extent in the minds of the western people the other announcement which the Prime Minister was so fond of making, that if made premier of Canada, he would not support reciprocity.

Therefore, I would ask the Prime Minister if he thinks the action of his colleague, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) will enhance his reputation in western Canada as a fair dealer with the people, as a man who will keep his pledge and his word? Does he think the Minister of Railways in holding up this contract and practically holding back the work on the Hudson Bay railway, this great national undertaking, for a year, will receive the approval of the people of western Canada? Evidently my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) places considerable value on the spectacular and sensational in his entry into public life in the Dominion government. Something big had to be done to bring him before the public mind. He had not been a member of this House. There were members who for a number of years in their parliamentary life had devoted great attention to the study of the railway problems of this country, for instance the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). When the new government was being formed many people were surprised that the Prime Minister had to go beyond the ranks of his parliamentary followers to find a man suitable to fill the position of Minister of Railways in the new cabinet. Where did he go? He went to the cabinet of Sir James Whitney, Premier of Ontario. Sir James has a reputation throughout Canada as being something of a dictator, and perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Railways learned his lesson while he was a member of that government and came to the conclusion that he could make the greatest success of the administration of the Railway Department by adopting that policy of dictation, and so we have this order suspending work on the Hudson Bay railway as his first official act—I think the order was promulgated before the hon. gentleman even had a seat in this House. That order came as a very great shock to us in the west because it is daily becoming more evident to us that if there is one work urgently needed in western Canada it is the construction of this railway undertaken by the late government. It is known to everyone that the west to-day is suffering from the worst car shortage in its history. There is a large crop, a somewhat damaged crop, needing to be transported as soon as possible to the head of the lakes; it must be kept moving in order to prevent it from deteriorating. But we are confronted with this unprecedented car shortage. This car shortage in western Canada is surely the strongest argument in favour of this new outlet to the markets of the world. Yet although we have in this evidence that the existing railways are utterly unable to cope with the situation and that the new government are equally unable to cope with the situation, for I have not heard of their doing anything to relieve the car shortage, the first official act of the new Minister of Railways is to set back that great undertaking that must furnish a new outlet to the products of every farmer west of the Great Lakes.

Is there no such thing as sanctity of contract between governments and those with whom they contract to do business? Does the Minister of Railways not appreciate the fact that governments ought to have the same code of honour as exists between individuals? Yet here we have an instance where a contract is let on a great public work, a new government comes into office and immediately work under that contract is suspended. My information is that a considerable amount of material was being shipped in to the line of this railway, that a number of subcontracts had been let, that these subcontractors had men and material on the ground. Some of these men were there possibly a day or two or three days when the order came from Ottawa that all work under this contract must be suspended. You know that in that portion of the country through which the route of the proposed railway runs, the winter season is the especial season for the shipping in

of supplies and for the cutting out of the right of way. There is a good deal of work that can be done very easily and conveniently in winter that cannot be done in summer. I contend that by the suspension of work under this contract the Minister of Railways has practically held up that work for one solid year, and I think the people of western Canada are also quite convinced of that.

That may seem a light matter to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, but if he were able to place himself in the position of the western farmer and, as in this year, find it impossible to get a car to his station for his damaged wheat and at the same time know that the government are holding up work on an undertaking that would afford another outlet for his wheat to the markets of the world, my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) would not sit with such complacency and make such orders.

There is another important feature of the question. There is no doubt that the contractors will have a very serious claim against the government of Canada as the result of the order of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) holding up the work. I do not think there can be any question about that. Of course the Minister of Railways does not have to pay it; the country has to pay it

But that, Sir, is the least important feature of this order holding up the work on this contract. Why was it done? That is the question that we have been waiting to hear answered. I think this parliament and this country ought to have been given some information on the point when such an order was given. Is there anything to show that the chief engineer employed by the late government made a mistake in laying out the route? I notice that in the speech from the Throne reference is made to the fact that the government propose to investigate the matter and ascertain the best route to Hudson Bay. Did the chief engineer charged with the work under the late government make a mistake in laying out the route? Why does not the Minister of Railways let the country know that this was the reason—if that was the reason why the work was held up on this contract? And if the chief engineer under the late government made a mistake in laying out the route has the chief engineer been discharged from the employ of the new government? As I understand it, there can be no question—there is no question—that the route of the first two hundred miles would be the same (that is, if the starting point were the same, Le Pas Mission, on the Saskatchewan river) no matter whether the terminus was Port Nelson or Fort Churchill. So, I cannot see that there is anything wrong with the location of the route, for this contract covered something less than the first two hundred miles. Was the lowest tender not accepted in the letting of this contract? If the lowest tender was not accepted, then it is the duty of this House to ask for a commission of inquiry, to inquire into the matter. And I do not think the Minister of Railways ought to take the responsibility upon his own shoulders of punishing the late government for not having accepted the lowest tender. But my information is that the lowest tender was accepted and that the contract was awarded to a firm or a company that had done a great deal of this work before, and from that standpoint were absolutely reliable. In this connection, I might say that since the recent elections, we have been reading a great deal in the press throughout the country that one of the chief responsibilities of the new government will be to make a thorough investigation into all the departments of the late administration, in order to find out what abuses existed in these departments, and to correct them. Well, I think I have the right and the authority—I will assume it—to say for the benefit of these newspapers who have been making these statements and of hon. gentlemen on the government side who may have been making them, that, so far as the alloting of public works by the different departments of the late government is concerned, if there is one thing the members of the late administration will heartily welcome it is a thorough investigation by their successors in office into every department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER. Not very loud.

Mr. NEELY. I understand an hon. member to say I am speaking too loud, I am speaking sincerely, and I wish to make myself heard. I resent these insinuations of the Tory newspapers, and of hon. gentlemen opposite, of finding wrongdoing before hand; and I say we take up the challenge they offer us and ask them to go ahead with all the investigations they please. And I feel safe in saying that no department of the government can stand a more thorough investigation than that of Railways and Canals as administered by the late minister, the Hon. Geo. P. Graham.

So far, I have not found anything that would look like a reason why this work was suspended. Of course, the present holder of the office of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), is new to his position. We can quite understand that he had to learn what his new duties would be. But surely, Sir, it was not necessary to hold up a great national undertaking while he was learning his lesson. Perhaps the Minister of Railways, when he came to his new office was possessed of the good Tory conviction that because these contracts were let by a

Grit government they must be wrong. If that be the case, I hope that his experience in mixing with members, not only on his own side, but with gentlemen on this side of the House, may convince him that there may be some little good even in a Grit government.

Now, Sir, we in the west feel very strongly and very keenly over the question of the early construction of the Hudson Bay railway. And some of us have a little fear as to what this new move actually means. I hope our fears are unfounded. I see the statement made in the public press within the last few weeks that the government of the province of Manitoba propose to build a railway to Hudson bay. If they do it, and do it honestly and expeditiously, I think the people of Manitoba will give them a great deal of credit. But that is no reason why the people in the provinces further west should not see the completion of the work which will connect them more directly with the ports on Hudson bay than any road that can be built through the province of Manitoba. I see my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay), in his place. I am sure that he can add his testimony to mine when I say that any movement that might be commenced in the province of Manitoba or elsewhere to change the starting point adopted by the late government for the building of this line to Hudson bay would certainly not be a welcome movement to the people of Saskatchewan or the people of Alberta.

In presenting this motion to-day, I am not so strongly condemnatory of the action of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, I am only seeking to impress upon his mind, if I can, the paramount importance of this work in the minds of the people west of the Great Lakes. If I have any fault to find with him it is this: I assume that the proper course, in case he had suspected there was anything wrong with the route of this railway, or that there was anything wrong in letting the contract, would have been to investigate and to act afterwards. But evidently he has followed that rule the other way, he has acted first and is investigating now. Well, we ought very shortly to have the result of these investigations. I say that the people of the west, the people whom I represent in this House, are very anxiously waiting the result of my hon. friend's cogitations. Therefore, I trust that the country, and especially the people of my own part of the country will very shortly be in possession of the information, not only that which is called for by the motion I am presenting, but all other information that is pertinent to the question, and which will show why my hon. friend has undertaken, on his responsibility as Minister of Railways, to hold up for practically a period of a year, work on this great national outlet from western Canada to the markets of the world.

Mr. JAMES McKAY (Prince Albert). As the hon. member (Mr. Neely), who has just taken his seat, referred to the member for Prince Albert, I feel it my duty to make a few remarks on this question. I am prepared to endorse some of the remarks the hon. gentleman has made as to the importance the people of the west attach to the immediate construction of this road; but I am not prepared to agree with him in his criticism of the present administration with regard to their position towards the construction of the road. I submit that if the hon. gentleman had been as zealous in protecting the interests of his constituents during the last few years as he appears to be now, the construction of this road would already be considerably advanced. It is not my intention to go fully into this question. Hon. gentlemen will no doubt remember the language of the right hon. the leader of the opposition used when he was introducing the Bills for the construction of the Transcontinental railway, when he declared that there 'was no time to waste,' 'it was necessary that this road should be constructed now.' This Hudson Bay railway has been in Dominion politics a great deal longer time than the Transcontinental railway. As early as 1897 it was a principal plank in the platform of the Liberal candidate in the city of Winnipeg, and during the subsequent elections it was a very important plank in the platforms of Liberal candidates. Then we find that in 1908 the right hon. leader of the opposition, then Prime Minister, announced at Niagara, just on the eve of the election, that the time to build the Hudson Bay railway 'was now,' language very similar to that used by him when introducing his Bills for the construction of the National Transcontinental railway. Now, Sir, what was the action of the late administration with regard to those two roads? We find that construction was started almost immediately on the National Transcontinental, but we had to wait year after year while this road was being built, for anything to be done on the Hudson Bay railway. Yet the government knew as much about the country through which the Hudson Bay railway was to run as they did about the country through which the National Transcontinental was to be constructed. Then we find that the language used by the right hon. gentleman in 1908 was echoed by the Liberal leaders during the general election of that year: they all took the key-note of their speeches from the language used by the right hon. gentleman at Niagara, that the

road should be constructed now. We find that the then Minister of Railways was quoted as using words to a similar effect in a speech he made at Galt, that the time to build the road 'was immediately,' 'right away,' or words to that effect. Then we find that the Hon. Clifford Sifton, when accepting nomination at Brandon, for the election in 1908, used these words as reported in the papers:

So, therefore, if the people of the Northwest give Sir Wilfrid Laurier their endorsement at this election, then in three or four years we may expect to see trains running to Hudson bay.

This quotation is a fair sample, and contains the kernel, of the speeches of the Liberal leaders during the campaign of 1908, namely, that the road was to be built 'now,' that it was to be built 'immediately,' that 'within three or four years we would see trains running to Hudson Bay,' language much stronger than that used by any of the Conservative leaders in regard to that matter. Now what are the facts? We did not see any haste adopted by the then administration in the construction of this road. We find that all they have actually done, outside of the contract, was to expend money on surveys, and to start building a bridge over the Saskatchewan river at the Pas. The question was asked the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) how much of that bridge was constructed. I am not prepared to say now how much of it has been constructed, but I am prepared to say that during the elections just held I made particular inquiry to ascertain how much of that bridge was constructed, and I was informed on reliable authority that only two abutments and three piers had been constructed, after work had been proceeding for something like two seasons. Now, Sir, is it any wonder that the people in the west have lost confidence in the late administration for their want of expedition in the construction of this road?

Mr. NEELY. In Saskatchewan?

Mr. McKAY. I am speaking more particularly for my constituency, which is nearest to this bridge, and I submit that the people there have lost confidence in the serious intention of the late administration to proceed with the speedy construction of this road. What has been done elsewhere? We find that a bridge was constructed at Saskatoon in one season, another bridge was constructed at Warman in one season, another bridge was constructed just south of Prince Albert, over the south branch, in one season, another bridge with as many piers, and if I remember rightly with one more pier than on the bridge required at the Pas, was constructed in one season; and it took the late government, with all the money at its disposal it wanted, all this time to do what little construction has been done on the bridge at the Pas.

I submit, therefore, that the people in my constituency were justified in coming to the conclusion that the late administration were not serious in endeavouring to construct this road as speedily as possible.

In regard to the actual construction of the road, what do we find? We find that they did, just on the eve of the last election, send a contractor up there to start the construction of the road. When the contract was signed, I am not prepared to say, but this I know that the contractor did not get his men on the scene of operations until within two weeks of polling day. I submit that the latter portion of the remarks of the hon. member for Humboldt is a reply to the earlier part of his speech. He goes on to say that winter is the best time to clear the right of way. I submit that in that portion of the west the winter is not the proper time for the purpose of the construction of the road; that is the grading and so on. It may be and, I believe, it is the right time for the cutting out of the right of way, but there is still ample time without losing a whole year, for the construction of the road, to do whatever work can be done on this road during the months of winter. I hope the government will look into this question immediately and, as the speech from the Throne states, make an announcement in regard to the road as soon as possible. I hope that the cutting out of the right of way will proceed during this winter, and that no time will be lost. I am satisfied that the present administration is in earnest about this undertaking. I am prepared to give this undertaking to the hon. member for Humboldt, that whenever he rises in his place to fight the cause of the western people, I will stand by him. The government will, so soon as they investigate this matter, go on with the construction of the road more expeditiously than did the late administration. If the present government decide to go on with the construction of this road, say within a month, they would still have plenty of time to cut out the right of way for the 185 miles for which the contract has been let, and there would still be ample time for the contractors to get the material on the other side of the river. Then, if they do not get their material and contracting plant on the other side of the river before the ice breaks I submit that the bridge will be completed this winter, but the present administration are taking hold of this matter vigorously and they intend to push it to a speedy conclusion.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). My hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Mc-

Kay) seems to place a great deal of blame on the late administration for not hurrying forward the work of this Hudson Bay railway, and he gives as one of the main reasons why there was a change of sentiment in that part of the country the fact that the late administration were not hurrying forward this work. If that is the case, if the people of the district of Prince Albert voted against the late administration because the work had not been carried out quickly enough I want to know how my hon. friend will reconcile his claim that this administration are in favour of this work with the fact that instead of hurrying on the work they immediately stop it, as my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) has stated. It is all very well for the hon. member for Prince Albert to say that the right of way can be cleared out and supplies got in at any time a month later from this. If any private corporation, company or individual had any considerable amount of work to do in that part of the country they would take mighty good care to get their men and supplies in there just as soon as the frost made it possible to allow them to be taken in over the muskegs. For the first couple of hundred miles there is a very considerable amount of that road that will have to be built across swampy land and muskegs. It is absolutely necessary to get the supplies in there this winter if the right of way is going to be cleared out, and if the contractors are going to be able to go on with the work next summer.

Mr. CURRIE. What percentage of arable land is there along that road?

Mr. TURRIFF. If my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) will take a trip over the road he will be able to form a very fair idea of the amount of arable land. I have not been over the route. The hon. member for Prince Albert seemed to think that the late government were very slow in what they were doing in connection with that road. But, my hon. friend should remember that it is only about three years ago, or a little over three years ago, that the present leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made the announcement as leader of the government that the road would be built, and that from the time he made that announcement, or from the time that parliament met and it was possible to vote money, money has been expended in no stinted way in surveying the whole route from the Saskatchewan river to Port Nelson and Fort Churchill, a distance of 500 or 600 miles. When you consider that every part of that road is beyond the farthest settlement you can realize something of what the difficulties are. I have never been opposed to taking plenty of time in having proper surveys made. There is no use in going on and spending millions and millions and then finding out after the money has been spent that it has been largely wasted simply because a few hundred thousand dollars had not been spent in the first place in finding out where the road should be built. We have an example of that in the case of the Canadian Pacific railway. I am not saying it in any spirit of criticism of the Canadian Pacific railway, but when that railway was built the people of Canada knew very little about that part of the country through which it was to run. If that road were to be built now it would not go over the same route at all. You see the Canadian Pacific railway every year spending tens of millions of dollars in changing the road both east and west of Winnipeg. Anybody who travels over that road will see that in some places they run for miles away from the old road that had been in operation for twenty years. Therefore, it takes time to have a proper survey made of a national undertaking such as the Hudson Bay railway. It was not only in connection with the road that information had to be obtained, but it was in connection with the harbour facilities as well. Nobody could tell whether Fort Churchill or Port Nelson was the better place to adopt as the terminal of the Hudson Bay railway until outfits had been sent up there and proper surveys and soundings had been made to find out which would be the better and the cheaper harbour and which would be adopted in the general interest of the country. As my hon. friend from Humboldt has pointed out, this part of the road, covering some 185 miles, for which the contract was let, will not be affected by the question as to which port should be selected. Two years have been devoted to the work of finding out the best line of railway. This work has been done under a very capable and a very able chief engineer. I do not think there is any reason to suspect that his work has not been satisfactory. He located that road and the late government let the contract.

Had the work been permitted to go on good progress could have been made during the coming summer, but that is now questionable, and the statement of the hon. member for Humboldt seems reasonable, that in all probability through the suspension of the work a whole year will be lost. The construction of the Hudson Bay railway is the most important question in the west next to the question of securing the American market, and when the present Prime Minister told the people out there that when he came to power they would not get the American market, but that they would get the Hudson Bay railway operated by the government, it was looked upon as something of a set-off. But, now that we are not going to get the American market and now that the work on the Hudson Bay railway has been stopped, what are the people of the west to

think of this new government. I trust that the Minister of Railways will at once take action to remove the suspension, and allow the contractors to proceed with their work immediately. I received word last Saturday that from one station in my constituency from which we ordinarily ship a million bushels of wheat, there was such a blockade for want of cars that they have only been able to obtain 53 cars so far. Is it any wonder that the people of the west are looking for an outlet for their product by the Hudson Bay railway. Two years have already been spent in obtaining the necessary information which is now in the department and I trust that the minister will at once remove the injunction and allow the work to proceed.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals). In order to relieve the mind of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), which seems to be considerably worked up about this matter, I want to tell him now that this government will carry out the promises they made when in opposition. There has been no change of policy in reference to the building of the Hudson Bay railway. Considerable representations have been made to the department that the road did not start in the right place, that the surveys were not correct, that the first hundred miles went through a deep swamp, and so on. In consequence, the contract has been held up until we have had time to investigate the matter. As to my seeking advertisement in coming in as Minister of Railways I will leave the people to answer that statement of the hon. gentleman. Indeed, the speech of the hon. member appeared to have been made for his constituents and not for the purpose of giving information to the House. There will be no further delay than is absolutely necessary for the checking up of these surveys. The hon. member (Mr. Turriff) has stated that there was a good deal of time spent on these surveys, but what information have I got, or has the government, or has the country got, that they are any better than the surveys made for the Grand Trunk Pacific railway which took several years to complete. If the hon. gentleman will look into the history of the construction of that road he will find that in every instance almost, the estimates of the cost made by those who located that road have been more than doubled. It is the duty of the present government to examine into every detail of an important work like this, and though my constituency is a long way from Hudson bay, I believe that the undertaking is in the interests of the whole country. Before we proceed we should be well satisfied that the road is located in the right place, that it starts from the right place and goes to the right place. I can assure the hon. gentleman and the House that there will be no more delay in the building of that road than is absolutely necessary in the public interest.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). We have had a very important announcement from the Minister of Railways; because if I correctly gather his meaning, the situation is ten times more serious than my hon. friend from Humboldt had supposed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) assumed that there would be a delay of possibly a month as the hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) had suggested. But, if I understand correctly what the minister has said, the delay may not be for a month only, but for at least a year, or perhaps two years, or perhaps a considerable number of years, if he is going to do what he says he is going to do, namely, to make a re-survey of the various routes.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say that.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what he said.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. OLIVER. The minister is to make a survey of the various routes between the wheat fields and Hudson bay. If he means what he says that is what he is going to do.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not make the statement that there would be a re-survey; I said I was going to investigate.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman stated that representations were made to him that the first 100 miles were not properly located and did not start from the right place, and if that does not mean that he must make absolutely new surveys, to start from whatever the right place is, then I do not understand the English language. But, Mr. Speaker, I would not criticise the minister for in any way secreting his intention because we have similar information contained in the speech from the Throne as to what was likely to be the policy of the government. I must admit that in the paragraph of the speech from the Throne alluding to the Hudson Bay railway the government tells the country exactly what the minister has told us now. That is the construction I placed on that paragraph, and I think it is a reasonable construction to place on it. It reads:

> The selection of the best route for the Hudson Bay Railway is engaging the attention of my advisers and an announcement will be made to you of the result of their inquiry.

Now, how can a selection of routes be made with due regard to the respective advantages of these routes, unless these several routes are surveyed, and unless the necessary time is taken to make these surveys?

If it is complained against the late government, as it was complained, that they took up too much time in making surveys, what is to be said of the new government that is to make not one but several surveys, according to their own statement, or according to the inference that must be drawn from that statement, before they begin actual construction? Mr. Speaker, the situation for the people of western Canada is more serious than was anticipated, and it is most desirable that we should know exactly where this government stands on this question. If we are to take the words of the speech from the Throne and the statement that has been made by the hon. Minister of Railways in the House to-day, and are to understand that this great enterprise is to be held up for an indefinite period, then certainly we are face to face with a very serious situation. I must say that the very definite promises made repeatedly and emphatically by the present Premier on this matter are not in process of being implemented, as they were understood.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce). Mr. Speaker I am afraid that the ex-Minister of the Interior is not a good interpreter. What kind of a fist he would make of the business if he had the printed statement in each case before him, and devoted a little time coolly and reasonably to study it out, I am not prepared to say; I think he would come to a pretty good conclusion, but evidently, with the statements just fresh from the lips of the Minister of Railways or other members, he either makes a very improper interpretation or else he has very poorly understood what the minister has said.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think so.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just an opinion which is modestly presented for the consideration of the House; I am not dogmatic about it at all. But the haste of my hon. friend to know where the government stands on this matter is refreshing in the light of the past. In 1908 one of the most important supporters of the late government had no doubts as to where the government stood, and he based his canvass in the city of Brandon on the statement, as explicit and definite as any words could make it, that within three or four years at the most the railway would be runnin, to a port on Hudson Bay. On that plank stood my hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior. On that plank stood all my hon. friends who are facing me who were in the House and supporting the government at that time. Four years have nearly gone, three have altogether gone, and on the 21st of September, that fatal day when they bade good-bye for a certain time to the administration of affairs in this country, what had they done to implement the promise of the late Prime Minister and the promise of the late member for Brandon and the position taken by the whole Liberal party? They had done almost nothing but surveys. Now, within two months after the new ministry and the new Minister of Railways come into power, my hon. friend is up on both legs demanding where the government stand on this business, and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways says: When I came into the department I considered it my duty, as the minister responsible for every bit of work that should be done on that undertaking, to test and examine the matter. I knew, of course, that the late government had made surveys; I knew that they had gone into an examination as to what port was the best, and it became my duty as Minister of Railways, before I took one step or allowed one step to be taken, to check up that information and check up those surveys, and form my own opinion; and if I came to the conclusion that the surveys and the information were sufficient for me, I would unloose the machinery and let it work; if I came to the conclusion that the surveys were faulty or that the ports selected were wrong, then it would be my duty in the interest of Canada, not to allow a single pick to be put into the ground until I knew the best routes and the best ports.' That is simply what my hon. friend said, in much fewer words than I have taken to set the ex-Minister of the Interior right.

Mr. OLIVER. That was not my understanding at all.

Mr. FOSTER. That is one of my hon. friend's misunderstandings. I have been long enough facing him in this House not to wish to take the responsibility for all the understandings of my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER. Will my hon. friend permit me to explain my understanding?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has just spoken as to the possible selection of the route as relating to the ports, the termini of the road. The Minister of Railways spoke of the point of commencement of the first hundred miles, and it is in regard to that I take the strong stand I do. I say that if the Minister of Railways is going to make a selection of route, choosing from amongst several starting points, then he must make new surveys.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend needs a little labouring with on that point. Certainly it is almost as important for a man to know where he is going to start from as to know to what point he is going. He may get to the right point for which he aims a good deal easier and quicker by starting from the right point than he could by

starting from the wrong point and going a long way round. Precisely the same reasoning applies to the point of starting as to the terminal. The information was gathered, it was in the office, and the minister did perfectly right in saying: Representations have been made to me that the road was not either started right or going right, and I will use my judgment to see that it is both started right and goes right. My hon. friend would have done the same thing if he had done the wise thing. So that, making all allowance for the greater vehemence and earnestness which my hon. friend must put into his work when in opposition than he displayed when on this side of the House, when you boil it down there is not much difference between the ex-Minister of the Interior and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways as to the question of procedure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has shown conclusively that my hon. friend from Edmonton properly interpreted the words of the Minister of Railways. Those words were merely that the whole scheme of the Hudson Bay railway, as commenced by the late government, has been altogether given up and the whole business started anew. My hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) stated that he hoped the action taken by the Minister of Railways would not prevent the contract going on within a month, as it was of great advantage to the contractor and to the work itself that it should be started at once and the road located during the winter months.

If he had been correct in this supposition, then within one month at most, the Minister of Railways would have released the suspension order which he has given and the work would be allowed to proceed. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has properly interpreted the announcement of the Minister of Railways as meaning that no release of that suspension order will be given this winter, that, in fact, new surveys altogether will have to be taken before the work is allowed to proceed. If this means anything it means that the project of the construction of the Hudson Bay railway which had been accepted by the two parties in this House for the last three or four years, is altogether set aside and everything has to be commenced anew. The hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) said that in 1908 I stated that the work of construction of the Hudson Bay railway would be proceeded with immediately, in fact he might have said that a determination upon the matter had been come to during the session of 1908 and was announced to this parliament in the session of 1909. We proceeded all that summer with surveys to determine the proper route to connect the wheat fields of the west with Hudson bay. After ample surveys it was concluded and stated to the House that the starting point should be the Saskatchewan river at The Pas. I was not aware that from that day to this the wisdom of the department ever was challenged by anybody. There was some discussion as to whether the terminus should be at the mouth of the Nelson river or of the Churchill river. This point had not been determined when the late government went out of office, but the location of the terminus was of no immediate consequence as it was agreed by all engineers that the starting point should be at The Pas and that the line should run up to Split Lake. Proceeding upon this, we gave a contract for the building of the bridge at The Pas. This bridge has been under construction for two years and the only criticism I have heard of the selection we made of that route and our course in connection with it is the criticism of the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) a supporter of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that the work has not been prosecuted with sufficient rapidity, that only two abutment piers and one or two others have been built, whereas he says the work should have been completed in one season. There is no doubt whatever in the mind of the hon. member for Prince Albert that the road was started at the proper point, and yet we are told by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) that everything has to be started again even from the starting point.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh, no.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then what is the use of having the English language?

Mr. COCHRANE. I said we just wanted time to investigate whether it was started right or wrong.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly.

Mr. COCHRANE. I suppose I could check up the surveys we now have without making new ones.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly, my hon. friend says he wanted time to investigate the starting point; that is to say it is possible to have another starting point, and possible, therefore, that the work commenced at The Pas may be altogether cast aside and another starting point taken. If the words of my hon. friend mean anything, that is what they mean. If that is the true condition of things, if my hon. friend has it in his mind that another place can be selected, other than The Pas, that means that the work cannot be proceeded with this winter and there may be a delay of two years. That means other investigations

at different points from Prince Albert down, I do not know how far. The hon. gentleman cannot do that in one season.

After giving a contract for the construction of a bridge at The Pas we gave another contract this year for the construction of 100 miles from The Pas towards Split Lake, a route as to which there can be no doubt. It has been investigated again and again, and has been agreed on as the proper location. My hon. friend cannot obtain any more information than he now has in his department. If all this means anything it means simply that the people of the Northwest will not have the Hudson Bay railway which they have expected for so many years, for three or four or five years more. The hon. member for Prince Albert has blamed us because we have not proceeded as rapidly as we should. The hon. member will have to wait a long time yet if we are to accept the announcement of policy of the Minister of Railways and he may not see the building of that railway for five or six years or perhaps longer.

Mr. BORDEN. At what date was the route settled, and was the route decided on all the way through to Hudson bay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was not settled all the way to Hudson bay, but it was settled from The Pas to Split lake.

Mr. BORDEN. When?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not say, but the hon. gentleman will find that in the Department of Railways.

Mr. CURRIE. How many surveys were made of the beginning of this route to The Pas and to Split lake and are these reconnaissance surveys, in the department to be checked up?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Surveys have been carried on every year for the last few seasons.

Mr. BORDEN. The reason I asked that question was that I have a distinct recollection that during the last session, I think, Mr. Glen Campbell inquired of the Minister of Railways as to the location of the line, asserting that on account of the way in which the approaches to the bridge had been laid out the line must have a certain definite route from The Pas towards Hudson bay. My recollection is that the then Minister of Railways stoutly denied that any route had been selected. It was for that reason that I was asking the right hon. gentleman when this route was finally determined on. The right hon. gentleman takes a very curious view. Does he suggest that because these surveys have been made and the late administration reached a certain conclusion with regard to them the present Minister of Railways is bound to accept the conclusion of the former administration without giving the slightest consideration or attention to the character of that route?

Mr. OLIVER. As I raised this point, we are not questioning the judgment of the minister, we are not questioning his right to do as he pleases in this matter. I was trying to establish that the course which he laid down to the House meant an indefinite delay in the construction of the road which was not a satisfactory implementing of the definite promises made by the Prime Minister in his tour of that western country.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) either finds fault with the Minister of Railways for giving consideration to the matter I have mentioned or he does not. I do not see how it would be possible for the Minister of Railways——

Mr. OLIVER. I am not finding fault.

Mr. BORDEN. Well, I am very glad that my hon. friend is not finding fault. I do not see how it would be possible for the Minister of Railways and Canals to assume responsibility, as he would be obliged to do, for this route, unless he gave it some consideration. If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, two or three years hence should point out to the Minister of Railways and Canals that the route selected was not the best route, would it be satisfactory for my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane), to say : 'I did not think it worth while to consider which was the best route, because the matter had been passed upon by the late government.' I do not think he would be discharging the responsibilities of his office properly if he took that step. When the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), says there will be an indefinite delay, I do not for a moment agree with him ; for I understand it to be the purpose of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to give his attention to the matter at the very earliest opportunity and to come to a conclusion with regard to it. When he does come to a conclusion with regard to it. I do not look for the delay spoken of by the hon. member. And I would like to tell my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. Oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. I am sure the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), will excuse me under the circumstances. I have been speaking of him in that way for fifteen years and find it a little difficult to get out of the habit formed during that somewhat too lengthy period. I was about to say that the right hon. gentleman has been pointing out to my hon. friend the

Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), an example that he himself did not follow. He will recollect that when he came into power in 1896, he had a proposed contract before him for a fast Atlantic service and that there was a contract already to be entered into, which the contractors were ready to execute. I do not recollect that he said : ' This is not a matter to be considered by me, for it has been passed upon by the late government and therefore I will carry it out exactly as they proposed it.' He did nothing of the kind. It is true his efforts did not result in very much advantage to the country, and in that respect were quite dissimilar to those that will be put forth by the Minister of Railways and Canals. For the only result of the efforts of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), was to bring about a contract with certain gentlemen on the other side of the Atlantic for the construction of what were known as ' bottle-necked' steamships. And we had a wonderful pæan of praise from all the Liberal press of the country because the administration of that day had succeeded in making a contract by which a very great saving to the country was supposed to be effected. But from that time up to the present, we have heard very little indeed of the proposal to build these ' bottle-necked' ships. And the last occasion when the matter was discussed in parliament, I think, was when we were called upon to return the deposit and pay interest upon it. So, the right hon. gentleman need not set up an example for the Minister of Railways and Canals, which he himself did not follow. It would be entirely out of place for the Minister of Railways and Canals not to give reasonable consideration for the purpose of ascertaning which is the best route, not only in the interest of the people of the country as a whole, but especially in the interest of the people of the western provinces. The Minister of Railways and Canals is responsible for his own utterances in this respect ; he is not responsible for the interpretation placed upon them by hon. members on the other side of the House.

Reference has been made to some observations of mine in the west. I said in the west, on more than one occasion, that I had not the assistance of surveyors' reports and the advice of engineers and other material necessary to enable one to form a definite conclusion with regard to a great question of this kind ; but that, basing my opinion upon such information as I had been able to collect—not only information brought down and laid on the table of this House, but information derived from other sources—I thought it practicable to build the road within four years from the time it was commenced. When the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House press upon a government that has been in power only six or seven weeks, the very great delay which it has caused in the carrying out of this work, I would like to remind them that they were in power for more than fifteen years and that during these fifteen years the only thing that they accomplished with respect to the Hudson Bay railway was to bring down to parliament last session an appropriation amounting to $2,000,000. And I said also, in the west, that if they did not get along somewhat faster it would take about twenty years to build the road. We expect to proceed with the construction of this road, to proceed with it as soon as we can possibly do so, having regard to what is demanded by the interests of the country both east and west, namely that the very best route shall be selected. That is the work in which my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals is engaged at the present time, a work which it will be absolutely necessary for him to perform before he can bring down and present to the House, and defend in the House, a proposal for the construction of that railway.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). My hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) stated that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) was, of course, responsible for his own utterances on the subject. The difficulty that we have on this side of the House is that the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals is not satisfactory. It was very brief indeed and I certainly understood it as my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) understood it—that if it meant anything, it meant that there was going to be delay perhaps long delay, perhaps indefinite delay, before the work on this railway would be proceeded with. The Minister of Railways and Canals did not elaborate his statement in any way; and even with the addition and explanations which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) thought well to give, and with the elaboration of my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), I can well understand that members of western constituencies are not at all satisfied with the situation yet. The complaint is not that a government that has only been in power three or four months is delaying the matter; the complaint is that they have stopped the matter, and that this may mean delay indefinitely prolonged. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce both know, as well as any member of this House, that there never was a dispute as to the starting point of the road. Le Pas was accepted by all persons as the starting point. Now, the Minister of Railways says he wants to investigate the starting point; that he has heard that the first hundred

miles does not run through proper territory; and also that he wants to investigate the proper point on Hudson Bay. These investigations take time. The statement was made in 1908 that this road would be proceeded with. The surveys were made, and they are on the files of the minister's office at this moment, no doubt. Then the location work went on, and the road was located. The bridge is under construction over the river at Le Pas. And the contract for one hundred miles of the road was actually let——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). To the lowest tenderer?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes, so I am informed. The contract was actually let. My hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) has stated here that the delay asked for will probably be only a month and that the work can be proceeded with by the 1st of January. He expressed the desire of the people of the west. He did not raise any objection about the starting point; his only objection was as to delay in going on. He said that the bridge had not been as rapidly pushed forward as it should have been; his complaint is that the late government delayed the work. Only three years have passed since the work was formally announced, and great progress has been made with it.

It is true that the Hon. Mr. Sifton said the road would be running in three or four years, and perhaps had no change taken place on the 21st of September last, the road might be running in one or two, or three or four years from the present moment. But the attitude of the present government with regard to the Hudson Bay railway now appears to be that this road is going to be changed, to be delayed, and perhaps indefinitely postponed. That is not a satisfactory condition of affairs, and any one who takes the speech of the Minister of Railways, with the additions and explanations of his desk mate, and of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, together with the statement of the Prime Minister, cannot come to any other conclusion about it.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY STATION AT QUEBEC.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for:

Copy of all papers, correspondence and orders in council in connection with the awarding of the contract for the building of the Transcontinental Railway station at Quebec, and all orders suspending work on the same.

He said: I need not say that the construction of a station and, the proper terminals at the city of Quebec is a work of great importance. It has engaged the attention of the authorities entrusted with the construction of the Transcontinental railway, of the commissioners of the government, and of the city of Quebec, for the last four or five years at least. Every precaution has been taken to locate the station at the proper place. So far back as 1906 the secretary of the Railway Construction Commission, by instruction of the chairman of the commission, issued the following circular to all the parties interested. It was dated on the 2nd October, 1906:

Dear Sir,—I have the honour by direction of the Board to advise you that the commissioners have had under consideration the matter of terminals at the city of Quebec for the National Transcontinental railway, but consider it desirable, before making a recommendation to the government of Canada on this important question, to obtain an expression of opinion from the accredited representatives of the railway and steamship companies having interests in the city of Quebec, the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and the Quebec Board of Trade, on the question of joint terminals.

The commissioners have accordingly arranged to be in the city of Quebec on Friday, the 12th inst., and would be pleased if your corporation would have a representative present to discuss the matter. The meeting will take place at the Transcontinental Railway offices, 147 Mountain Hill, in the city of Quebec, at 10 a. m. Friday, Oct. 12th instant.

Besides the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, the following corporations have been invited to send representatives to the meeting: The Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, the Intercolonial railway, the Delaware and Hudson railway, the Great Northern railway, the Quebec Central railway, the Quebec & Lake St. John railway, the Quebec Railway, Light & Power Company, the Allan Steamship Line, the Dominion Line, the Leland Line, the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, the Quebec Transport Company, Limited. Mr. E. C. Fry, Lloyd's agent, etc., the Mayor of the city of Quebec, the Chairman of the Quebec Board of Trade, the Chairman of the Quebec Shipping Interests, Mr. Power, M.P., Quebec West, and Arthur Lachance, M.P., Quebec Centre, have also been invited to be present.

(Signed) P. E. RYAN.
Secretary.

Upon this invitation, issued, as I said, on the 2nd day of October, 1906, there was a meeting held on the 12th day of that month, at which most of the interested parties who had been invited were present. At that meeting there were present representatives of the Allan Line, of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, of the Grand Trunk railway, of the Canadian Northern railway, Delaware and Hudson railway, the Quebec Central railway, the Quebec and Lake St. John railway, the Quebec railway, Light and Power Company, the Quebec Steamship Line and Lloyd's, the Quebec Transport Company,

the Intercolonial railway, the City Council of Quebec, the Board of Trade, the Harbour Commissioners, the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, and Messrs. E. A. Hoare, chief engineer Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, E.A. Doucet, district engineer, Transcontinental Railway Commission, St. George Boswell, engineer Harbour Commissioners. Upon that day the question was carefully considered, and a sub-committee was appointed who, in its turn, appointed engineers to look over the whole matter. Another meeting took place on the 7th November, at which the reports were received and plans were submitted. Another, third and final meeting took place on the 20th of November, and after full discussion, the following resolution was passed:

Recommended that the Champlain Market be made the passenger and freight station for the present, at the same time contemplating that at a future date a passenger station be built on the upper level of the city.

Mr. PELLETIER. Who were the gentlemen composing the body who passed that resolution?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All the parties who had been invited, that is, all the railway companies who were consulted by the chief commissioner. I will read them again.

Mr. PELLETIER. That is not necessary; I wanted to have the names of the sub-committee to which the right hon. gentleman referred.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The sub-committee was composed of several persons—I will pass the papers over to my hon. friend, though I do not think it matters much. The sub-committee reported to the larger committee. All these parties met at the appointed time on the 12th day of October. They appointed sub-committees of their own to look into the question and make reports; and further a committee of engineers was appointed to prepare plans to be submitted at a further meeting which took place on the 12th October. The sub-committee reported at a further meeting which took place on the 20th of November, and then the following resolution was adopted:

Recommended that the Champlain Market be made the passenger and freight station for the present, at the same time contemplating that at a future date a passenger station be built on the upper level of the city.

This recommendation was made to the commissioners. The commissioners reported to the government, and the Champlain market was approved by the government on recommendation of the commissioners as the site for the freight and passenger station of the Transcontinental railway.

I may say that these papers are not new. They have all been published in the press recently as well as upon a former occasion. Upon this site being chosen by the commissioners, approved by the government, and by the Grand Trunk Railway Company also, negotiations were entered into with the city of Quebec for the purchase of the Champlain market and, after years of negotiation, as my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) well knows, the transaction was completed between the commissioners and the city of Quebec for the purchase of the Champlain market. Plans were prepared for the building of a station, these plans were submitted to and approved by the Grand Trunk Railway Company and approved by the government, the market was demolished, tenders were asked for, and after many tenders had been submitted they were opened, the lowest tenderer was awarded the contract, and the contract was signed and delivered between the government and the contractors.

Mr. CURRIE. On what date?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The tenders were asked for before the election, the tenders were opened, if I remember aright, during the election, and the contract was awarded after the election. My hon. friend seems to think that there was something in the date at which the contract was awarded. I submit to my hon. friend's judgment and fairness in a matter of this kind that if ever there was a contract properly awarded that was the contract. An appropriation was asked for and submitted to this parliament, this parliament was apprised of all the circumstances, the site was selected in open day, negotiations were carried on between the commissioners and the city authorities long ago, tenders were invited and the lowest tenderer was awarded the contract. Could anything be clearer or fairer or more business-like than that? Yet, Sir, I do not know for what reason, the newspapers announced that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) had suspended work under this contract and had directed the contractor not to proceed at all. Nothing has been done. I have the answer which was given a few days ago in response to an inquiry by some hon. member in which he acknowledged that he had suspended the work upon this contract, and that he would not allow it to proceed. Why is this work not allowed to proceed? Is it because, as was hinted a moment ago by the hon. member for North Simcoe, the contract was awarded after the defeat of the government? I do not believe that can be the cause, I do not believe there is any one in this House who would say that this contract should not be proceeded with because it so happened that

it was awarded after the defeat of the government and before they had resigned. No, it could not be that. That was a transaction which was in course of operation, which was properly completed by the government before they resigned office. No fault can be found with the awarding of the contract. If the contract had been awarded to some one who was not the lowest tenderer I would assume that some exception might be taken to it. But nothing of the kind has happened in this case. Everything is regular. What is the reason that the contract is not allowed to be proceeded with? What is the reason that this work, which is essential to the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, is not allowed to proceed? I have been told, in fact, it has been so stated in the press, that the whole thing is to be reconsidered by the government and that a new site is to be looked into. If that be the case, if it be contemplated to change the site which has been adopted, I think it would be a most unfortunate decision and one against which, I think, the whole House would protest. Of course, in a matter of this kind there are always various interests to be looked into. One prefers this site and another prefers another site. But the papers which I shall lay on the table of the House and which I shall also hand to the Postmaster General will show that all precautions were taken in order that a proper site should be selected for such an important work as the terminal of the National Transcontinental railway.

I know that objection has been taken to this site. It has been stated that there was not sufficient ground. Who were the parties who made the selection? The Canadian Pacific railway who were represented, the Grand Trunk railway who were represented, the Quebec Central who were represented, the Delaware and Hudson who were represented,and the shipping interests all agreed that, taking it all in all, with its blemishes and good points, this was the only site to be adopted for the terminus of the National Transcontinental railway in the city of Quebec. I will reserve my judgment until I have heard what the reason of the hon. gentleman is for not allowing this work to go on, for having prevented it from being started immediately, but, if the reason is, as has been stated in the press, that another site is to be selected for the terminal of the National Transcontinental railway and if the decision that has been come to in regard to this matter shall have been reversed for very insufficient and very improper reasons, a greater calamity will have been inflicted on the city of Quebec.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, in answer to the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I beg to say that the first time my attention was called to the question of the entrance and terminals of the National Transcontinental railway in the city of Quebec was when I visited that city with other members of the government to receive His Royal Highness the Governor-General. There was a great deal of complaint not only that the entrance as proposed was expensive, but that the terminals were too cramped. I did not look over the ground at that time, but a short time afterwards upon making further inquiry, I found that the statements made were absolutely correct. The objection was made that not only was the ground selected for the station too cramped altogether, but that the roads or streets leading to the station were quite inadequate. I was told as I saw with my own eyes when I was there, that there are only two narrow streets, one, if not two, with a street railway track upon it, leading to the station. These streets are, as I say, very narrow, and they would not meet the requirements of a station of the importance of this one in the city of Quebec. On the appointment of the new Chairman of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, I instructed him to go down, look over the ground and inquire into the matter. This step has been taken merely as a precaution before such a large expenditure is entered upon, because a large expenditure will be involved not only in connection with the entrance but in providing the terminal there. I thought it was only wisdom on the part of the government to look into this matter. When men of standing in the city of Quebec, not all Conservatives, but amongst them some strong Liberals, urged objections to the site proposed I felt I was only doing my duty in reporting the facts to my colleagues and getting their permission to stop the work in order that the whole question might be thoroughly examined into. We are not delaying the larger scheme of the National Transcontinental railway at all. I am satisfied that even if a change of site takes place the terminals can be completed before the line is completed, should it be completed on time, and long before the bridge can be completed. I feel that we have the greatest justification for not going on with this work and for inquiring into the circumstances before it is too late.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw attention to the fact that this being a substantive motion, those desirous of speaking must speak before the mover closes the debate. If any hon. member wishes to speak his opportunity is now.

Mr. PELLETIER. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I would have just a few words to say because I am one of those who are

responsible for the condition of affairs to which the hon. leader of the opposition has referred.

Far from being afraid of the responsibility which I took, I am happy to assume such responsibility and I would do it again. I did it as a Quebecker, as one of the representatives of the Quebec district, and as a Canadian. I am not afraid to say that nine-tenths of the people of Quebec are absolutely opposed to the location of the Transcontinental station at the place indicated by the late government. The site is extremely narrow, and indeed there is hardly space for a good sized way-station on an ordinary railway. As a Quebecker I take it that we have reason to hope something better for the capital of our province than such a station as would be built in an ordinary town. We have been told the National Transcontinental railway would be a factor in the progress and development of Quebec, and we have been told that the fact that the bridge was built at Cap Rouge would not be detrimental to our city. If a station were built on the location proposed by Mr. Parent it would in no small way contribute to have the National Transcontinental railway stop at Quebec merely for the purpose of delivering traffic for local destination. As has been stated by the Minister of Railways, no final decision has been arrived at in the matter. We have not taken the action we have taken because the contractor belongs to one political party or the other; we have not brought into the consideration of the matter the question of Liberal or Conservative; we have tried to rise above that. We have asked the Minister of Railways to take time to ascertain if the Champlain market site is the best one. If the contractor properly obtained his contract—I shall not go into that question at the moment—and, if he is entitled to damages because the contract deed was not executed, that question this government is broad enough to consider. Our action was not taken because Mr. Gosselin, the contractor, is a Liberal, no Sir, the question is bigger than that. I think, and a good many people in Quebec think, that the station ought not to be put on that site, but that we ought to have a union central station to be used by all the railways coming into Quebec and which would be a credit to the city and a convenience to the citizens. I appeal to the right hon. leader of the opposition to state now, if he thinks that the Champlain market site is the place to have a large station which would be an ornament to the city. I say no, decidedly no. If the new president of the Transcontinental railway, who has all the qualifications necessary for him to express an opinion on the matter, tells us after looking into the question that we are mistaken, the work will proceed on the old site. However, I will say, and I cannot be successfully contradicted, that notwithstanding that the right hon. gentleman has read to us a certain number of resolutions of committees and sub-committees which were attended by certain railway men, the Canadian Pacific railway will not recognize the station if it is built at the Champlain market. I know whereof I speak when I say that in such an event they will build their own station down at the Palais where most Quebeckers desire to have a central station located. That is my opinion and I approach it not from any narrow point of view, but from the point of view of the general interest of the capital of our province. If the railway station is built at the Palais, where there is much more space and accommodation and where all the railways can unite to use it, we can erect a very fine building there with commodious terminals, and we will have that station in the constituency of my right hon. friend. As a party we owe no special gratitude to Quebec East, but I mention this as further evidence that in considering the matter we are acting in the public interest only. In these circumstances, I think the leader of the opposition will give us credit for trying to do our best. There is no need of hurry in this matter. We all know that the Quebec bridge has been unfortunately destroyed and that the new bridge cannot be completed for four or five or perhaps six years. No doubt it will be necessary to have carferries when the National Transcontinental railway is completed, to move the traffic between the north and south shores of the St. Lawrence, and we will need a large area of ground for that purpose. All that has to be considered. What would be the use of having the Transcontinental railway at all if it were to stop at the bridge outside Quebec. In all the circumstances we have come to the conclusion that we must consider the matter carefully and take time to get the very good advice which we have reason to expect from the new president of the Transcontinental railway. I think, in stating these views, I will have the endorsement of the majority of the Quebec people. I will not now refer to the statements which have been made as to there being speculation in property, and all that kind of thing. That has had no influence on us, our object is to do the best we can for Quebec. If the engineers comes to the conclusion that Mr. Parent was right, then the station will be built where he proposed. But let us not forget that in the report of the committee referred to, and which I have read carefully, it is suggested that if the station were built at the Champlain market, another station would have to be built elsewhere. That is the only inference that can be taken

from what the right hon. gentleman has read. This contract was only awarded after the general elections—I do not say that it was right or wrong for a defeated government to sign that contract, but not much work could be done this winter. We will avail ourselves of the interval of time at our disposal to try and do our best. As I have pointed out, suppose a station were erected on the Champlain market site now and in five or ten years hence, a reasonable complaint was made that the station should never have been put there, would it be any justification for us to argue that we had only carried out what the government preceding us had proposed to do?

We recognize our responsibilities in a different manner. We have to assume the responsibility for these terminals, and before assuming that responsibility we have to look into the question carefully in the effort to fulfil our duty not only to the city of Quebec, but to the whole of Canada, whose money to a very large extent is going to be expended in this enterprise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The observations of my hon. friend only confirm what I stated a moment ago, that on this question, as on similar questions, there is always a variety of interests to be considered. I know that when this matter was first taken up by the commission in 1906 different opinions were expressed as to where the station should be located. When my hon. friend says that nine-tenths of the present population of Quebec are opposed to the present location, I beg to differ with him. My hon. friend lives in Quebec and ought to know better. I represent Quebec and if nine-tenths of the population had been against the present selection, I ought to have known it. I know that there are persons in my division who would like to have had the station placed on the Beauport Flats or at some other point in that division. The first consideration which the commissioners, as well as the railway and shipping interests, had in mind was that the station should be located at Deep Water. If it had been possible to have it placed in my own division, I would have been only too glad; but unfortunately my division is not on Deep Water, but is on the St. Charles river. When Champlain market was selected as the site of the station, it was considered by the government that all the market boats should have their terminals on the St. Charles river in my division, and I hope this will be carried out. But, considering the broad interest of the community, I ask who is better qualified to judge of this matter than the railway companies and the shipping companies, which were invited by the chairman of the commission to confer with them on the subject. And I have not heard that there was a single expression of dissent from the selection we made. I know that the place is cramped; nothing is perfect, but the men who were consulted are all of opinion that though it is cramped, it has the paramount advantage of being on deep water so that passengers coming in on steamers can step from the steamer to the station, walking not more than about thirty feet. Everybody would wish that there were more space, but the men who had to deal with the question and knew the situation preferred it, cramped as it was, to any other.

Mr. BORDEN. How much land is available there?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know, but I can say that all along the front, from Sillery to Champlain Market, there is ample space, as I am informed, for all the track needed for the railway, at very little cost. I do not give this as my own opinion; I do not pretend to know anything about this matter. I rely upon the engineers and other experts appointed to deal with the matter, and I do not find a single expression of dissent from the selection on the part of any of the men asked by the chairman of the commission to give their advice upon it. With reference to the statement of my hon. friend that it is contemplated to have a union station later on, this is provided for in the following resolution:

> Recommended that Champlain Market be made a passenger and freight station for the present, at the same time contemplating that at a future date a passenger station be built on the upper level of the city.

This is the opinion of the men who advised the commissioners. They did not suggest that the union station should be placed at the Palais, as contemplated by my hon. friend, but on the upper level of the city. As to this I express no opinion. I rely simply on the fact that all the parties who were consulted gave it as their opinion that for the immediate purposes of the railway, as soon as it is built and in operation, there should be a station on Champlain market. My hon. friend says that there is no hurry, because the bridge will not be built for several years. The bridge has nothing to do with this question. The railway will be built and in operation before the bridge is built, and we shall have to provide communication between the two sides of the river by means of a ferry. So that the matter is independent of the bridge. My hon. friend says: We are dealing with the matter in the best interests of the country according to our judgment. That is the very reason we took the position we did; but this is like many other questions on which men with the very best intentions will differ. It is a question of judgment. The present plan has been formed according to the judgment of the parties most interested in the pro-

ject, and it is too late to reopen the question.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

UNIFORMITY IN NATURALIZATION.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence with and from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, or other minister of the Imperial government, in relation to the passage of legislation providing for uniformity in naturalization throughout the empire since the sittings of the Imperial Conference in June last.

He said: Members who were in the last parliament will recall the discussion on the subjects to be presented for the consideration of the Imperial Conference. Among them was the important subject of having some uniform system of naturalization throughout the whole empire. The subject has not attracted general attention but when one considers that we have the anomalous condition of affairs that a man may be a British subject in Canada or some other overseas dominion of the empire, but has no right to be regarded as a British subject in an imperial sense, one feels that it is the duty of this and every other parliament in the empire to remedy that condition. Until the Naturalization Act of 1870 the theory and principle of British law was concentrated in the maxim: Once a British subject, always a British subject, and that principle obtained throughout all the wanderings of the race which sprang from the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; but since 1870 the theory and the practice under which British subjects can, by residence elsewhere, divest themselves of their nationality, and their British citizenship, has resulted in a great number of people losing their allegiance to the empire, and now when they are returning to the self-governing colonies, the anomaly may exist that a person who is a British subject by birth may be a British subject in only one colony and not be entitled to citizenship in another portion of the empire having divested himself of his allegiance as a subject of the empire as a whole. The importance of this question, and the necessity of some uniform naturalization law common to the whole empire, has attracted the attention of the various self-governing colonies, and has been discussed in the different Imperial Conferences. At the last conference, the subject received very close attention.

There is great diversity in the method by which men can acquire naturalization rights in different colonies. In New Zealand, a man of another nationality may become naturalized the day he arrives if he satisfies the authorities that his character and personality are such as to make him likely to become a good citizen of New Zealand and complies with certain provisions of the law. In Australia a residence of at least two years is insisted upon before a person becomes entitled to naturalization. In both of these colonies there are restrictions which do not exist in Canada or in some of the other colonies of the empire under which no man of Asiatic blood or race can become naturalized. In Canada we require a residence of at least three years. But no self-governing colony has the right to declare that a man of foreign nationality is entitled to the rights and privileges of British citizenship. In England, possibly because that country is so near to the various European nations and has been for many years the asylum for the oppressed of all nations, the home authorities have always stipulated that there must be a residence of at least five years before an application can be entertained and the privilege of citizenship accorded under the laws of Great Britain. This strange diversity has always existed since 1870 if not before that. The result was that at the conference the representatives of Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa moved these resolutions:

Australia—

That this conference is in favour of the creation of a system which, while not limiting the right of a Dominion to legislate with regard to local naturalization, will permit the issue to persons fulfilling prescribed conditions of certificates of naturalization effective throughout the empire, and refers to a subsidiary conference the question of the best means to attain this end.

New Zealand—

That it is in the best interests of the empire that there should be more uniformity throughout its centres and dependencies in the law of naturalization.

Union of South Africa—

That it is desirable to review the principles underlying the draft Bill for Imperial naturalization before its details are discussed further.

It will be remembered that previous to the conference the imperial authorities had submitted a draft Bill to the self-governing dominions proposing a solution of these problems, and it was in criticism of this Bill that the resolution of South Africa was proposed. They pointed out that there were very great difficulties underlying the Bill as originally proposed by the home authorities. This question was very thoroughly ventilated in the conference, and hon. members who have reviewed the proceedings of the conference will be familiar with the effect of that discussion, and with the fact that some common ground was reached which was satisfactory to the various representatives of the different por-

tions of the empire. The view put forward by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was the view which seemed to appeal to the representatives of the other colonies.

That view is that the object of attainment should be that the man who is a British subject anywhere shall be a British subject everywhere. We hear a great deal about the glories of the empire; and the party of hon. members on the other side have been rather prone, throughout Canada's history, to claim to be the only ones who could speak for the great empire. With all humility, Mr. Speaker, as one of those who have not had either the opportunity or the disadvantage of being associated with these gentlemen who claim to be the only true imperialists in this country, and speaking for those who, though less demonstrative, are yet sincere devotees of everything which makes for the united empire, those who yield to no others in their admiration for the institutions which that empire has always embodied, I venture to say that this matter of citizenship is one of the most necessary points to be considered in dealing with all questions of the empire. If the theory be accepted that a man who happens to be born in one of our great self-governing colonies like Canada has no status within the empire when he leaves the place in which he was born, even though he goes to the Islands of Great Britain and Ireland, then everyone must agree that the very basis for the unity we should like to realize is lacking. And that unity in the highest sense is impossible unless the man born in Canada or any of the other overseas dominions is able to claim equal privileges as a British subject, as one who happens to be born in the land which, for the time being, is the centre of the empire. For that reason, I venture to make this motion, with the view of drawing to it the attention of the House and in the hope of having implemented and carried into effect at as early a day as possible the conclusions arrived at in the conference, and also for the purpose of getting all the papers, if there are any—and I presume there must be—that have passed between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and our own government, since the date of the conference in June last.

Mr. BORDEN. What is the status under the law as it exists at present of a person naturalized in Great Britain? Is he a British subject only in Great Britain, or is he a British subject also in Canada?

Mr. MACDONALD. I can only speak from the information I have gathered in reading the discussion. It would seem that a man who is a British subject in the United Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland is a British subject in any of the colonies.

Mr. BORDEN. I have not made myself clear to the hon. gentleman. I was speaking of a naturalised British subject, one naturalized in the United Kingdom. To make my meaning clearer, perhaps I may be allowed to explain that the status of such a person depends upon the terms of the Naturalization Act which is in force in Great Britain; and I observe in a recent comment, owing to the alleged restricted terms of the statute itself, that an alien naturalized in the United Kingdom is not a British subject outside of the United Kingdom. The reason I asked the question is that I thought possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) had investigated that phase of the case.

Mr. MACDONALD. It would seem to me when a man who, either by birth or naturalization in the United Kingdom, is a British subject, then, so far as civil rights are concerned at any rate, he would have such rights as a British subject in any of the colonies. Unquestionably, he would be so regarded by the home authorities in the settlement of any question that might arise abroad where his rights as a British subject might be asserted by him. And I should gather from what I have read of the discussion that the home authorities would regard such a man as entitled to all the privileges of a British subject. But the British authorities do not accord to those who have become British subjects by naturalization in the colonies, under conditions which are not as onerous in regard to residence as are applied at home, the same recognition as is given to the man who attained his rights by naturalization in Great Britain or Ireland.

After all, perhaps, this whole proposition is one which must necessarily be a subject of development. The status of the colonies is greatly improved within the last ten years. The English statesmen of twenty-five years ago regarded each of the dependencies as being under the control of the home authorities; and the theory that the empire was composed and is composed of a collection of independent nations has obtained recognition and full accord in Great Britain only within the last ten years. As a consequence, the right of each one of these dependencies, by legislation, to create British subjects who shall have all the rights that formerly had been obtained only through the central authority is a proposition which has assumed a serious phase only within the time when the recognition of the group-of-nations idea within the empire has obtained permanence in the homeland.

Mr. Churchill, at the conference, speaking in regard to this matter, explained his solution of it. He said:

We must place ourselves, in any legislation which we seek upon this subject, upon the two main principles, as I understand them, of the government of the British Empire. First of all, we must base ourselves upon the assents of local parliaments; and, secondly, upon the responsibilities of ministers. As long as we stand on those two foundations I do not think that any real difficulties will arise in practice. I certainly feel, and I am sure my right hon. friend, the President of the Conference, agrees with me, that no Imperial Act ought on this subject to deal with the self-governing colonies, unless and except in so far as it is adopted by their parliaments. We feel very strongly that, in regard to a question like naturalization, the government of the Dominion, where the certificate of naturalization is applied for, must be the judge and the complete judge. We have no desire at all that the Secretary of State for the Home Department should have the power to reach out, as it were, into the self-governing area of the South African Union or the Dominion of Canada and confer naturalization—I think that perhaps was in Mr. Malan's mind—on persons who had been refused naturalization there. We have no idea of that kind of reaching out into a self-governing area; nor have we any idea of overriding local law. That is a matter of the greatest importance. A certificate of naturalization does not entitle the naturalized person to any treatment in this country or in any Dominion of the British Empire, except as may be prescribed by the laws of this country or of the dominions in question.

Mr. Churchill was then the Secretary of the Home Department. In his discussion he indicated that an Act should be passed by all the colonies and also by the mother country as a result of which an imperial status—the word is an apt one—or an imperial citizenship should be created and which could be conferred under the legislation thus passed. He laid down as the first essential element under which that imperial citizenship should be obtained, that there should be a residence of five years within the colony. It was mooted that while the right of each colony to maintain its own naturalization laws and confer the right within the colony as a British subject upon persons who comply with the local laws, yet a supplementary period of residence and any other qualifications insisted upon as the condition of the imperial law should be necessary to the supplementary or imperial citizenship.

At the conclusion of the conference, Premier Asquith, who was chairman, said:

May I take it that we are agreed to the general propositions on which the Home Office and the Law Office will proceed to frame a Bill to be submitted and discussed at the earliest moment.

Mr. Churchill proposed:

That this conference approves the scheme of Imperial citizenship, based on the following five propositions: 1. Imperial nationality should be world-wide and uniform, each Dominion being left free to grant local nationality on such terms as its legislature thinks fit. 2. The mother country finds it necessary to maintain five years as a qualifying period. This is a safeguard to the Dominion as well as to us, but five years anywhere in the empire should be as good as five years in the United Kingdom. 3. The grant of nationality is in every case discretionary, and this discretion should be exercised by those responsible in the area in which the applicant has spent the last twelve months. 4. The Imperial Act should be so framed as to enable each self-governing Dominion to adopt it. 5. Nothing now proposed would affect the validity and effectiveness of local law regulating immigration and the like or differentiating between the classes of British subjects.

Those conditions were to form the basis of a Bill which the Home Secretary was to draw up to be submitted to each one of the colonies, and I assume also the Imperial parliament. So far as one can gather from the official documents, that has been the last word upon the subject. The direct object of my motion was to ascertain whether there had been any correspondence between the home authorities and this government in regard to legislation such as was outlined in the proceedings of the conference. I desired also to call the attention of the government to the situation, and to press upon them the wisdom and necessity of actively dealing with the question, in conjunction with the home authorities, along the lines proposed in the conference report. I need not further supplement my remarks. The subject is one which has engaged attention in the past. I have ventured to trespass so long upon the time of the House by reason of the fact that this is the first session of a new parliament. To my mind, the necessity of dealing early with this question is so apparent to every one who believes in the unity of the empire, and who recognizes the advantages of British citizenship, that I do not need to elaborate the matter. In a new country like ours where we are receiving men from all portions of the globe, who are speedily, fortunately for us and for the empire, complying with our laws and becoming Canadian and British citizens, I say the importance of this subject is one to which I need not apologize to the House for directing their attention. I ask the government to take the matter up with the home authorities, if it has not already been dealt with, so that we may have passed at an early date in Canada, and possibly our example will be followed by all the other nations of the empire, legislation of such a nature that a man who is a British subject in any one part of the empire will be a British subject everywhere.

Mr. BORDEN. The observations which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald), has addressed to the House are very pertinent, and I am glad he has brought the matter to our attention. The situation at the present time is certainly anomalous, and very unsatisfactory. My own personal view is that the goal to be aimed at is the one which has been mentioned by the hon. member, and which I think was expressed officially by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, namely, that any one who is a British subject in one part of the empire should be a British subject in all other parts of the empire. As I understand the law at present, while an alien naturalized in Canada is not a British subject within the British Islands, on the other hand, an alien naturalized in the British Islands is not a British subject in Canada. I understand that that result is brought about by the restrictive terms in which, not only the Naturalization Act of Canada but that of the British Islands, are couched. I observed in a recent article upon the subject that a circular was addressed by the Colonial Secretary to the Governor in Council on the 10th of September, 1874, in which allusion is made to the enactments then in force in the British Islands, and which I think, were substantially the same as those now in force. That circular was in these words :

> Her Majesty's government are advised that the operation of the above enactments is confined to the United Kingdom, that a certificate of naturalization granted under the authority of the Acts of 1844 or 1870 confers upon an alien no rights or privileges in a British colony.

So the situation is very unsatisfactory from our standpoint, and it is also unsatisfactory from the standpoint of those who are naturalized in the British Islands. Now it is true in one sense that the Canadian parliament, or the British parliament for that matter, has no right to legislate beyond its own territorial limits; but, nevertheless, if the British parliament should legislate in general and unequivocal terms, the status so created would, by the comity of nations, undoubtedly be observed throughout the world. But if the British parliament or the Canadian parliament sees fit in terms to restrict the rights which it grants to an alien under naturalization, and to say that those rights, by the very terms of the statute, should not extend beyond certain territorial limits, it is perfectly obvious to any of us that such statute will have no operation, and the rights created would have no validity beyond the territorial limits so defined. I have not given the same attention to the various enactments as has been bestowed upon them by my hon. friend, but I would gather that in all the Dominions of the empire, including the mother country herself at the present time, Naturalization Acts are framed in these somewhat limited terms. The subject has not been brought to the attention of the present government since it took office. I can assure my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), that we shall give it the best possible consideration and very careful attention when it does come before us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is recognized by everybody, it was recognized at the conference, that the present condition of things with regard to naturalization which exists within the British Empire, is not only anomalous, but may be dangerous also. The Imperial government has conferred upon all the self-governing Dominions the power of naturalization. Evidently those powers when exercised and framed can only apply to the territory covered by the charter of each Dominion. In Canada we are authorized to naturalize, but under our present charter our naturalization has no force and effect beyond the territory of Canada. At the present time we naturalize many thousands of people every year. These men so naturalized by us are British subjects in Canada, but the moment they leave the territory of Canada they are no longer British subjects, but they resume the nationality of the country from which they came. So if one of our numerous fellow-citizens now coming from the United States goes to Europe, the moment he leaves Canada he is no longer a British subject, but he is an American citizen.

The situation is certainly anomalous and it is conceivable that under the present circumstances it might produce very serious complications. The matter was brought to our attention at the last conference, and it was recognized by everybody to be one that required consideration and legislation. It was agreed, I think, by everybody that the principle should be admitted, that when a man is a British subject in any part of the British Empire he should be regarded as a British subject everywhere. The naturalization which is given in the United Kingdom, I believe, is of that character. If a man becomes a British subject by naturalization in Great Britain he is a British subject to all intents and purposes everywhere. That is a consequence of the Imperial jurisdiction of of the United Kingdom. Not so, however, in Canada. While the principle was admitted that the naturalization conferred by any of the self-governing dominions should be co-equal with the naturalization given by the United Kingdom, there are great difficulties in the way and the chief difficulty is the reluctance of the United Kingdom to give naturalization as easily

as we give it in the new countries of the empire. Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, all new nations with vast territories and sparse populations, are eager to attract population and facilitate naturalization. The United Kingdom, on the contrary, is not seeking more population than it has at the present time, it is not eager to attract more immigration and it is far more stingy, if I may use that expression, in the facilities for granting naturalization than the new nations of the empire. That was the stumbling block which we found at the conference. Whilst all acknowledged that it becomes imperative that a British subject, for instance, in Canada, should be a British subject everywhere the United Kingdom was not prepared to go as far as those of us who represented the new nations would have been willing to go. Canada, New Zealand, Australia and South Africa were willing to accept the principle that a man who was naturalized in any one of these countries should be a British subject in any of the others, that a man naturalized in New Zealand should be a British subject in Canada when he came to Canada, and vice versa. But, the British government were not prepared to go as far as that. We would have been willing to have had a law passed by all the self-governing dominions to the effect that naturalization granted by one should be granted by all, and that if a man had obtained naturalization in Canada he could present himself in any part of the British Empire, claim to be a British subject and be recognized as such. But the United Kingdom would not go as far as that and Mr. Churchill, who represented the British government at the conference, insisted that they could not depart from the period of probation which they now require, that they must insist upon a period of probation of five years, and that after that time naturalization was given, not as a right, but to be obtained after going through certain formalities in Great Britain. I would have preferred that our certificates should be accepted in the United Kingdom but they would not have it so, and there the matter rests. I think my hon. friend will see that it will be necessary to have a new Bill prepared to give effect to that principle.

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to continue discussion on this subject and I feel satisfied that the House will unanimously agree with the motion. However, there is one phase of this question, which, it appears to me, has been overlooked entirely in the discussions even at the Imperial Conference, and that is that there was a distinct pre-confederation promise made by the British government that this principle would be carried out, and that almost immediately. I find, Mr. Speaker, that in 1865, confederation had been agreed to and all that remained was to bring the maritime provinces into the union, and have them vote on the question. Four of the ablest men of that day were sent to Great Britain—I refer to Macdonald, Cartier, Brown and Galt—to ascertain the views of the imperial government on various subjects which had come up in the confederation discussion. I find in the journals of the House of Upper and Lower Canada of 1865, a report made by these four men of their interviews with the British government. There was Canada on one side and Great Britain on the other, and they were entering into a confederation compact with the mother country. In this report it is distinctly stated that the British government had agreed to grant this request and they did not mix the question up with the affairs of any other colony or dependency. These gentlemen were entrusted to discuss confederation with Great Britain and the following is a paragraph from the report which they made to His Excellency the Right Hon. Viscount Monck, Governor General of British North America:

> Although the subject was not specially referred to us, we did not fail to call the attention of the colonial minister to the anomalous position of foreigners who have settled in Canada and become naturalized subjects under our provincial statutes. Mr. Cardwell at once admitted the hardship of the case, and stated that it was the desire of Her Majesty's government to remedy it, and that with that view he had referred the subject to the law officers of the Crown for their opinion as to the best mode of doing so.

That was a distinct contract entered into between Canada and the mother country as a part of the confederation compact which has never been carried out by the home government, and which has apparently been overlooked by the statesmen who discussed this question at the Imperial Conference.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA AND ONTARIO.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved:

> For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, memoranda or correspondence of any kind had between the Dominion government and the government of Manitoba, or with the government of Ontario, as to the settlement of the boundaries of said respective provinces; and also of any agreement or memorandum containing any terms of settlement of the questions relating to the boundaries of said provinces or any part thereof; and also, of any documents, letters or representations made to the federal government by any person or persons relative to said settlement or the question involved therein.

He said: I move this in order to get some accurate information as to the terms of the agreement arrived at between the government of the Dominion and the government of Manitoba. We have had in the public press statements from various gentlemen as to what has been agreed upon, and then in turn we have had denials. Sir James Whitney charges my right hon. leader—who has been out of power unfortunately for this country for almost three months—with having done something terrible against the interests of Ontario, and he makes that a basis of his campaign speeches. But how my right hon. friend could have been guilty of so much intrigue against Ontario while a Conservative Prime Minister is in power is one of those things which so far I have not been able to understand. I put some questions on the Order Paper to elicit information from the Prime Minister, but, with that delightful indefiniteness which enables him to dodge Ne Temere questions, and all other questions that are supposed to be of special interest to a certain section of his supporters, he has so far been able to accomplish a complete evasion. Outside of telling us there were some financial arrangements made with Manitoba along the basis of the existing arrangements with Alberta and Saskatchewan the Prime Minister would not go. I thought it would be in the interests of all that that full information which the House likes upon all questions, in the interests of the country should be given and that before we adjourn for the festive Christmas season the Prime Minister would tell us what he really did do about this matter. I do not think it a due recognition of the rights of this parliament that the government should make arrangements of a most important character with provincial governments without giving the parliament in session immediate information as to the facts. Representatives of these provincial governments go abroad through the land, their newspapers glorify their achievements, and statements are made with more or less responsibility as to what has been done, while we the representatives of the people who ought to be the first to know, find it most difficult to extract any information from the gentlemen on the treasury benches. There are three branches of this subject: First, the question of the boundaries; whether Manitoba is longer to remain a mere postage stamp on the map is something that the members from that province would like to be satisfied about, and if in extending the boundaries of that postage stamp it is going to take something that belongs to Ontario, then Sir James Whitney wants to know. If for no other reason than personal friendship for his former leader, I am sure the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) would not sit silent at the Council Board—especially as he belongs to the north country which looks forward some day to having an outlet at Hudson bay—without protecting the interests of Ontario. Surely the hon. gentleman would be the watch-dog who would stand by to prevent spoliation, and to stay the traitor's hand before it got in any effective work on Ontario's throat. I am at a loss to understand how the Minister of Railways could stand by and permit the right hon. the leader of the opposition—notwithstanding that the right hon. gentleman happens to be out of power—to take this port on the Hudson bay from the province of Ontario, a proceeding which seems to have so much displeased Sir James Whitney. Was the Minister of Railways derelict in his duty? Is it possible he could have been present when this settlement was made, which deprived Ontario of her right to a port on the Hudson bay, and handed it over to the Hon. Mr. Rogers for the province of Manitoba? And as to financial terms; will the Prime Minister take this opportunity which has come to him to give the people of Manitoba control over the lands of their province; I have heard in former times the present Prime Minister speak eloquently about the necessity for the people of these western provinces having full control over the lands within their own boundaries. Does the Prime Minister now purpose saying to the people of Manitoba: We will pursue this policy which I have been accustomed to denounce; we will give you the money, but we will keep the land. I would gather from the answer given by the hon. gentleman this afternoon that that was now his policy, and whether it is or not he should take the House and the country into his confidence and state what he is going to do in that respect. And then, of course we remember that the Minister of Public Works has risen to his feet to denounce my right hon. leader and to tell us that the people of Quebec were not satisfied with Sir Wilfrid Laurier because forsooth, with regard to certain privileges of the province of Manitoba his confreres and co-religionists did not receive at his hands what they expected from him. We know that Archbishop Langevin is reported as having said during the last election that when the present Prime Minister came to power he and his co-religionists were going to get justice. I feel quite certain that a great number of hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Prime Minister are anxious to know what are the terms of this settlement made with Premier Roblin and Mr. Campbell that is going to wipe out all differences between the Dominion and the province, and which necessarily involves the determination of the civil rights of the people living in that northern country. No doubt, some of the supporters of the Prime Minister are

anxious to learn at the earliest moment whether any understanding has been arrived at in reference to the settlement of that once famous school question in the light of the rights of the people who live in this new territory. I have moved this motion for the purpose of eliciting all that information which I am quite sure the Prime Minister will be delighted to give us, and if there is anything that the leader of the government overlooks in his statement no doubt the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) will be very glad to supplement it.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion is made in the form of an order of the House, but seeing that it calls for papers between the Dominion government and another government, it will require to be in the form of an address to His Royal Highness. With the permission of the hon. mover I will amend it in that direction.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that on this side of this House we are all very much touched at the pleasing confidence which my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has displayed with regard to the action of the government on this question. In the course of his remarks my hon. friend has undertaken a somewhat varied task. He has first undertaken the championship of the rights of Manitoba, and then he has felt impelled to defend the rights and privileges of the province of Ontario, which as he fears are likely to be invaded. He refers to the fact that on some occasions in the past I have addressed this House on the subject of handing over to the prairie provinces their lands and other natural resources. He was good enough to say that my speeches were sometimes of great force. I can only say that they never were of sufficient force to influence my hon. friend, because he always consistently voted against every motion in that direction that I presented. But if even at this date he recognizes their force. I am sure I am deeply grateful that even at this belated period they are having some effect on the mind of my hon. friend, and I regard it as due entirely to my own defects that they did not produce that good result at times when it would have been of some importance. So far as the information that has been given to the House in answer to questions is concerned, I think my hon. friend will find when that information comes down that it is exactly accurate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. I am glad that my right hon. friend is so convinced of that at the moment that he says, 'hear hear'. I said that a basis had been arrived at with regard to the financial terms, and that the principle adopted as a basis was equality of treatment as between Manitoba and the other prairie provinces. I also said that the details were being worked out. My right hon. friend will realize at once the impossibility of our giving information to the House with respect to details which have not yet been worked out by the application of the principle that has been arrived at. We have no objection whatever to bringing down the papers. We will bring them down at the earliest possible opportunity, but I do not know that we will bring them down before those details have been worked out, because my hon. friend, the mover of the resolution will understand at once that while in the application of this principle the details are being dealt with by the two governments concerned, it would be exceedingly inadvisable from a public standpoint that papers should be brought down before the negotiations have been made absolutely complete. My hon. friend is also very much concerned with regard to the attitude of the government with respect to the Manitoba school question. I would like to remind him that if he will refer to the speech from the Throne delivered to parliament in 1897, and prepared no doubt by the right hon. gentleman who is his leader at the present time in this House, he will find therein an assurance that the Manitoba school question had been settled.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is not good enough. What do you say about it?

Mr. BORDEN. All I can say is that if the word of my hon. friend's leader is not good enough for him, I would despair of convincing him by any word of mine.

Mr. MACDONALD. Perhaps my hon. friend will tell us what he is going to do with the increased territory.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend will find exactly what we are going to do with the increased territory when the measure is submitted for the consideration of this House. He and every other hon. member will then have an opportunity to make criticism of the proposal, and we will be prepared to meet it; but I for one do not intend to discuss that measure before it is here for the consideration of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is kind enough to tell us that when he brings down his measure it will be accurate, and that we shall be free to discuss it.

Mr. BORDEN. I did not say that the measure would be accurate; I said that the information was accurate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no doubt that the information which my hon. friend has given us is accurate, because he has given us none at all. He has been asked what is the nature of the agreement made by the government with the province

of Manitoba, because Mr. Roblin said a few days ago that at last the government of Canada was disposed to do justice to Manitoba and went away quite satisfied. My hon. friend has told us to-day that they have agreed upon a settlement of the financial terms. I have no doubt that when he comes with his measure, we shall find that his statement is accurate, but he has gone all around the question in so far as it concerns the boundaries of the province. What are the boundaries which have been agreed to by my hon. friend with Manitoba? Are they such boundaries as will satisfy the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) for instance, or that will satisfy the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), for instance, or such boundaries as will satisfy Sir James Whitney? Because it so happens that at the present time the ranks of the Conservative party, which are divided upon the question of the navy, are also divided on the question of the boundaries of Manitoba.

Mr. BORDEN. I think they will satisfy every one except my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is too thin altogether. Sir James Whitney, and the Minister of the Interior cannot both be satisfied, according to the language of the one, and the language of the other. The hon. gentleman can satisfy the one or the other, but he cannot satisfy both, because on this question they are at the very antithesis—they cannot agree. We had a conference four or five years ago to try to get them to agree, because they are of the same party, and I said to them: 'Will you not agree on some boundary'? But they could not, and I said to them: 'Well, gentlemen, if you cannot agree, I do not know what can be done'. We brought a resolution fixing the boundary of Manitoba, and my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior agreed to it, but Sir James Whitney did not.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) somewhat demurred, but he at last was reasonable and agreed also to the boundaries. But now Sir James Whitney is parading and cavorting through the province of Ontario, blaming this wicked man Laurier because Laurier would not give to Ontario what belonged to Ontario, but gave it to Manitoba. That is the statement made by Sir James Whitney all over Ontario to-day, and if I were in any way to characterize his conduct I should say it is not at all patriotic on his part to undertake to create bad feeling between Ontario and Manitoba, because these provinces are both members of the confederation, and what is given to one cannot be given to the detriment of the country; whether one province or another should have a harbour on Hudson bay is, after all, a matter of little consequence so far as Canada is concerned, because the harbour will be in Canada anyway. However, Sir James attaches some importance to that, and my hon. friend does likewise, because he has been questioned four or five times upon this very matter, but up to the present he would not give an answer. Let me tell him what the answer is. The question is settled, my hon. friend has settled it with Mr. Roblin, and he has settled it along the lines agreed on by the Laurier government. Let him deny that if he can. He cannot do it. That settlement is the grievance which Sir James Whitney has against the Laurier government and upon it he is trying to catch some votes in Ontario.

As to the financial or land terms, I shall reserve what I have to say until we see the terms which have been agreed upon by my hon. friend. We have been endeavouring to give fair terms to Manitoba but I am sorry to say we could not satisfy the appetite of Manitoba on this question. It may be that my hon. friend has been more fortunate than we were, but we shall reserve judgment until we know the terms.

With regard to the school question my hon. friend was good enough to say that I stated in 1897 that the school question had been settled. I said so. I say so now. But there is a man not far from my hon. friend who says that it is not settled, and that man is my hon. friend's neighbour, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). There is another, the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and a third behind him, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel). They have all stated that the question has not been settled, but that it is to be settled by this government.

Mr. PELLETIER. When did I say that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. All the time. In your public speeches.

Mr. PELLETIER. What I said was that the matter had been settled, but not settled justly for the Catholic minority in Manitoba, that the present leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had violated one of his sacred engagements taken in the election campaign of 1896.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To make his statement complete the hon. member should have stated that he said it was to be settled by the present government.

Mr. PELLETIER. I deny that completely. I take it that the Manitoba School question was once in the hands of the Federal government to be settled——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER——that my hon. friend had it in his own hands to be settled, and that he had not settled it according to his own promises made all over the country—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what I said.

Mr. PELLETIER—That he had not settled it according to what I considered a just principle; but a settlement has been made and, whether or not it is now in the power of the Federal government to take it up is quite a different question which I will discuss later.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PELLETIER. That is what I said all along and I say it still.

Mr. TURRIFF. Before the motion is carried I would like to amend it in a slight degree so as to include the correspondence with the government of Saskatchewan. While Manitoba and Ontario are fighting for a port on Hudson Bay they are both claiming what does not belong to either of them as it is on territory which at one time belonged to the district of Saskatchewan which now largely forms the province of Saskatchewan; so if any province has a just claim to have Fort Churchill or Port Nelson included within its boundaries that province is Saskatchewan, simply because possession is usually nine points out of ten in law, and we had possession of that territory for many years. I would therefore move to add after the word Manitoba the words 'and Saskatchewan.'

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (St. John). I wish to take time by the forelock on behalf of one of the smaller provinces of Canada, and to enter my protest against any settlement being made with Manitoba or any other province which includes an enlargement of the boundaries of that province based upon the theory that such province is entitled to any portion of the public lands of Canada which now form a part of the territories. It is proposed, as I understand, to enlarge the boundaries of Manitoba and instead of the Dominion giving away a vast tract of land in that province, it is proposed to give her money in lieu of land. That implies that the province is entitled to the land. My own view, and I respectfully submit it to the attention of my hon. friends opposite, is that Prince Rupert's Land was purchased by the Dominion of Canada. It was purchased by the provinces then constituting the Dominion and became the property of the Dominion of Canada. It is not the property of any one province; it is no more the property of Manitoba than it is the property of New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia or Quebec or Ontario, and I think the government is proceeding upon an entirely wrong principle when it recognizes that the province is entitled to the land. This proposes to give the province a large sum of money in lieu of land. I can well understand that by reason of adding an additional territory to a province, involving greater expense in carrying on the government of that province, an allowance might be made to the provincial government which would be regarded as sufficient to cover that increased expense of government, but that is an entirely different thing from starting out in the first instance and recognizing that the province is entitled to that additional land, that it has some claim to it, legally or equitably, and that in lieu of transferring the land to the province, a large sum of money is to be granted to it.

Mr. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman think that we should modify the provisions in the Acts constituting the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may be a different principle applicable where an entirely new province is being created. In that case these provinces formed a part of the territories and all that was done was to carve out a portion of these territories and to make provinces. I was not in this parliament when the arrangement was made as to Saskatchewan and Alberta. Whether a wrong principle was then acted on or not I am not prepared to say nor is it necessary for my argument that I should express an opinion, but here is an old province created many years ago, brought into being under the provisions of the British North America Act and financial terms were settled between the province and the Dominion which apparently were then satisfactory to the province of Manitoba.

Manitoba became, then, a province of the Dominion, having a certain territory and having, as I say, no more right to the land to the north of its boundary than New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island had. Now, it is proposed in some way to recognize Manitoba's rights to that land, and this government propose to ask parliament to say that by reason of Manitoba not insisting on that land, which does not belong to her more than to the other provinces, a large sum of money should be given to Manitoba. I should be prepared to give Manitoba a most liberal allowance for increased cost of government that it might be necessary to incur; and, that, as I understand it, was the view of the late government. It was proposed to be liberal with Manitoba. It was not proposed to open the question of the land, but, in view of the added territory and the added cost of government, it was proposed to make Manitoba a liberal allowance. I would add also that by the terms of the statute which provides for the enlargement of the boundaries of any province it is expressly provided that in case of such enlargement provision

shall be made for the rights of other provinces. And I submit that if there is to be any enlarging of boundaries of a province or if any amount of money is to be paid in lieu of the land, consideration must be taken under the same statute of the rights of the other provinces and there must be a readjustment satisfactory to these other provinces of the terms of the union, and they should receive a proportionate share of the moneys that are being conferred upon the province whose territories are being enlarged.

I am not prepared to-night—and I suppose it is not necessary—to discuss the matter at length. But I might call attention to the fact that when the United States government made the Louisiana purchase a very large proportion of the lands obtained in that purchase was reserved for the original states and they received the benefit of it. The principle was that lands bought with the money of the federal government belonged to the federal government and to the states as a whole. And so, Prince Rupert's land, having been bought from the Hudson Bay Company with money belonging to the federal government, became the property of the people of the entire country as represented by the federal government, and no part of that land, I take it, belongs to any one province more than to any other.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I raise my voice on behalf of the province of Quebec. My hon. friend the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) remembers that when this question was brought up before the House some years ago by the right hon gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who now leads the opposition, the question of the enlargement of the Quebec boundary was also brought up. It was then decided that if the arrangement went through the province of Quebec should receive as additional territory that portion of Canada known as Ungava. It was agreed that if the respective provinces accepted the arrangement the boundaries would be fixed accordingly. Might I remind the Prime Minister that at the session of the Quebec legislature which followed the federal session during which this matter came up, the legislature of Quebec unanimously passed a resolution accepting the terms offered then by the Dominion government. I hope that in the settlement of this question of the boundaries of Manitoba and Ontario, my hon. friend will not lose sight of the fact that the terms were that the province of Quebec should be seized, as additional territory, of the area known as Ungava.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I wish to express myself as in accord with the timely protest of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I think he put the case very fairly on behalf of the people of the maritime provinces. If these extensions are made as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) pointed out, Quebec will have a right to an extension of its territory. Then, when Quebec is extended and the population increases, as will necessarily follow, what will happen to Nova Scotia at the next and the succeeding decennial census? We know what happened in the census just taken. Our population has fallen off as compared to that of Quebec and we are liable to lose two or three of our representatives. If you extend the territory of Quebec, as you will be bound in justice to expand it, as you are going to expand both Ontario and Manitoba, we in Nova Scotia, will be wiped off the map, just about, so far as our representation is concerned. As it is well known, the unit of representation is found by dividing the population of Quebec by 65. And, as the unit becomes larger, we lose more of our representatives, so we may look to the time when we shall not have thirteen members, but only five. At the time of confederation, I believe, it was never anticipated that our representation would be reduced below what it was then. On that account, I join in the protest of the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. It is somewhat amusing to observe the cool way in which the representatives of the western provinces carve up the territory still remaining within federal control without gaining the assent in the first place of those provinces that do not lie contiguous to that territory. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) take the stand he did on this question and insist that the rights of the maritime provinces should be protected, if additional territory were to be given to these western provinces. If I understand it, it was in the session of 1908 or 1909 that a tentative arrangement was made by the government with these various provinces which would have gone through if it had been possible to arrive at a satisfactory understanding between Ontario and Manitoba with regard to the Hudson Bay port. So far as the federal government was concerned everything was done that could be done and needed to be done to make this arrangement binding, and it was only the disagreement which existed between these two provinces which prevented that arrangement being carried out, and these various portions of territory added to these several provinces. The ex-Minister of Public Works was a prominent member of that administration, and, according to the statement of the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that was the whole policy of the government, and we heard no dissent—at

least publicly—on the part of the ex-Minister of Public Works, in regard to the matter. But a change has come over the spirit of his dream, and he is in a different position——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) will pardon me, if I remind him that one point in the proposed arrangement was that it was not proposed, as I understand the arrangement, to give to Manitoba any land or any money in lieu of land.

Mr. FOWLER. So much the worse for the hon. gentleman's position. They were giving lands to the other provinces and leaving Manitoba out, leaving it in the same position in which we were. That was clearly unjust.

That was clearly unjust for the rest of the western provinces, for if the rest of the western provinces were allowed grants of land Manitoba should be allowed grants as well. No provision is made for the eastern provinces. Why, during the time my hon. friend was Attorney General of New Brunswick, he was asked to place before the Privy Council at London the question of the loss of representation suffered by the province of New Brunswick by reason of her population not being able to keep pace with the growth of the population of Quebec, and one of the strong points in the argument he made before that court was that, by reason of the fact of the boundaries of Quebec having been increased, we in the maritime provinces should have a readjustment of the British North America Act, so that we would not lose our comparative representation, the added territory of Quebec allowing her to have an increased population. That was one of the arguments. That same argument would apply in the case of Ungava being added to Quebec, as was proposed under this agreement. My right hon. friend shakes his head. Why? I suppose because Ungava is such an inhospitable country that it would not be populated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am under the impression that any increase of population in Quebec by the addition of Ungava was not to be counted part of the population to be the basis of representation.

Mr. BORDEN. The resolutions were introduced at the same time with regard to Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. A considerable debate arose upon the point which my hon. friend has just mentioned, and the resolution with regard to Quebec was amended by saying that the representation of the other provinces should not be affected by such addition of territory to Quebec.

Mr. FOWLER. That was done by the members of this House. But I submit that this House would have no power to do that; I submit that the British North America Act was not confined to the boundaries of Quebec granted in 1867, but it provided that as the population of Quebec is, or the population of whatever other provinces is in question, so is the population of Quebec to the representation of that province. By no Act of this House could the British North America Act be affected in that way, that can only be done by Act of the Imperial parliament. But the point I am making is this, that my hon. friend should have taken the same ground three years ago, or two years ago, when this matter was before the House, that he has taken to-day. However,

> While the lamp holds out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return.

So there is a chance for my hon. friend to repent. I am glad to see he is repenting, and I welcome him again to the fold of those loyal and patriotic men in the maritime provinces who are always prepared to stand up for the interest of those provinces. Although I am a supporter of the government, I shall oppose any resolutions that come down here giving territory to the western provinces which do not make ample provision for the rights of the maritime provinces.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Let me call attention to the fact that the property which we are now asked to give to the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba is the joint property of all the provinces of Canada, and is not the property of Ontario and Manitoba, as some seem to think it is. Before this parliament is called upon to give this property to the province of Manitoba, some provision should be made for the other provinces of Canada, including the large province of Ontario. It is true that the province of Ontario got what is called New Ontario, and to-day we find, according to statements made by an hon. member who has just spoken, that the province of Quebec seeks to have a great expanse of territory added to its bounds. If this parliament should add that territory to Quebec, some provision should be made for the maritime provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island which, owing to their situation, cannot enlarge their territory. We cannot add to our territory any part of Keewatin, or any part of the territory lying on the Hudson bay; but we can ask this parliament to grant us something in lieu of any addition which may be made to any other province. Before this House passes an Act to grant this territory in question to the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, I think some provision should be made for the maritime provinces, by reason of the impossibility

of adding to their territory. Now, Sir, I agree with the hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler), that the members of the maritime provinces should not consent to any addition to the territory of Manitoba unless some quid pro quo is given to the maritime provinces.

Mr. ROGERS. I would not have spoken on this subject were it not for certain statements made by my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I do not regard the statements made by other hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this discussion as being of great importance, recognizing as I do the conditions and the circumstances, and the motive which has prompted the introduction of the resolution by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). I was indeed surprised to find the hon. member for St. John rising in his place and undertaking to discuss this important question from the point of view which he has chosen to take to-night. I am sure the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition will bear me out in the statement I am about to make. He will remember the time when he was good enough to invite representatives from the province of Manitoba to come here a few months ago, and discuss the terms and conditions upon which Manitoba should secure that extension of her territory for which she has been battling for so many long years. My right hon. friend and his colleague, the then Minister of Finance, suggested to Mr. Roblin and myself that in all probability it would be necessary to have an interprovincial conference before it would be possible to do for Manitoba that which we were asking.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear. Hear.

Mr. ROGERS. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite who say, hear, hear, that we were able upon that occasion, as we are able to-night, as we are able at all times, to defend the interests and rights of the little province of Manitoba, which has been penalized as no other province of this Dominion has ever been. When we were invited to an interprovincial conference that took place in this city of Ottawa a few years ago, we accepted the invitation on the distinct understanding, by a formal order in council of the government of Manitoba, that our attendance at that conference should not prejudice our rights nor the claims we were making on behalf of the province in which we lived. Now, Sir, when the First Minister of Manitoba entered that conference he presented this resolution and that order in council to the members and premiers from the other provinces, and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was then representing New Brunswick as premier of that province.

Now, Sir, the leader of the opposition will bear me out in this statement, that upon that occasion I was able to present the sessional papers of this House, which showed that my hon. friend from St. John accepted the statement made by the premier of Manitoba that the questions at issue between Manitoba and the Federal government were questions to be settled entirely between the government of that province and the government of this Dominion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend say that there is any record of the action taken by the representatives of the different governments, or was the memorandum submitted simply, filed and no action taken upon it? That is my recollection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Roblin presented the order in council of the province of Manitoba, and my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition will bear me out in saying that when Mr. Roblin presented that resolution and that order in council, the hon. member for St. John, as premier of one of the provinces of this Dominion, signed a memorandum, which is a matter of record in the sessional papers of this House, setting forth that the questions at issue between Manitoba and this government were matters to be settled entirely between the two governments. Yet, Sir, for political purposes, or for any other purpose you may choose to call it, we find hon. gentlemen standing up here to-day and giving evidence of such short memories as that of the hon. member for St. John here to-night.

The province of Manitoba has never asked for anything more than common justice, equality and fair-play with the other provinces in the confederation. We had appealed to the new leader of the opposition for seven long years in order that we might secure that position of equality and one reason after another was set up during that period of time why we should not be granted the request which we made, with the result that we were unable to secure any justice at his hands. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues undertook, during that period of time, to try to cause difficulties between the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba with respect to our boundaries. They are undertaking to do the same thing to-day, but I want to tell the right hon. gentleman and those who sit behind him in this parliament that they failed then and they will fail now in any such attempt. We are ready to be just one with the other, we are ready to be just to all the other provinces of this Dominion and, as has been stated by my leader here, a settlement has been effected and agreed to which means that the

leader of the opposition well understands that we are to secure a position of equality in the family of provinces that form this confederation. We never asked for anything more and we do not ask for anything more now. It is true that we were asking for fair terms and that we pointed to the resolution which I have quoted, signed by my hon. friend from St. John, but the Finance Minister agreed in that conference, as the right hon. gentleman well knows, that it was time for the government of this Dominion to offer some settlement and they did, but not what Manitoba would be entitled to, with the result that a proposition was made to our province that we should receive $200,000 from the government of Canada in settlement of our claims. This proposition as made by the government of that day was presented to the legislature of Manitoba and was unanimously rejected by Liberals and Conservatives in that legislature as representing the unanimous opinion of the people of that province because we did not feel that justice and fair-play were being done. Now, the position, as stated by the leader of the government here, is clear and complete. All we have asked for is a position of equality and he has acknowledged the principle. As the right hon. leader of the opposition well knows, it takes time to work out the details. We in Manitoba have had a swamp-lands account with the government of Canada, and if we are to have a position of equality it simply means the employment of an actuary to work out what that position really will be. As soon as that position is worked out I am sure that I am not saying too much when I say that we will come down to this parliament with a proposition giving to that province in which I live that position of equality for which we have been battling and which was refused by hon. gentlemen opposite for the past seven years.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, my resolution has been barren of its original intention so far as results or any important information that the Prime Minister has vouchsafed to the House are concerned. I am very glad to know, however, that it has been the means of stirring up the interest of the House upon a very important question and my hon. friend from King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) and my hon. friend from Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. McLean), while alive to the interests of the various provinces, will perhaps feel themselves well within their rights—and I would like to be associated with them in their efforts in that matter — in saying that these maritime provinces should have something to say about things these days. The master of the administration who has just sat down has told us that he is settling this whole business without any regard to this nasty province of Ontario, which my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), has been trying to get him to fight with for the last six or seven years. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), could have gone a little further. All he wanted, he said, was that his province should be on terms of equality with every other province. Equality in what ?—equality in territory, equality in finance, equality in civil rights ? What does he mean ? I think the people of Manitoba fancy themselves about as good people as there are in any other province of the Dominion. They may not have all the territory they would like, but the only reason they do not have it is because they would not take it in the manner in which it was offered to them by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. Now then, the Minister of the Interior tells us the reason that they did not take it was because this nasty province of Ontario was fighting with them. Just fancy what a wonderful man my right hon. friend must have been if he was able to manipulate Sir James Whitney and the hon. Minister of the Interior for the last six or seven years and keep them fighting with one another, forsooth, so that they could not get together and settle their differences, and because the hon. gentleman and Sir James Whitney were fighting, Manitoba was not able to secure that equality, in some fanciful respect—I do not know in what regard—which the hon. gentleman says he is getting.

Mr. ROGERS. The hon. gentleman is putting words in my mouth that I never used at all.

Mr. MACDONALD. What did you say then ?

Mr. ROGERS. I think I was clear in what I did say. I certainly did not say that the right hon. leader of the opposition had kept the governments of Manitoba and Ontario fighting. I said nothing of that kind ; I said that although he was trying to do that he did not succeed.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend distinctly stated that my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition had undertaken to keep the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario fighting over this question for the last seven years. I took note of his words. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us then that he and the Ontario government were not fighting over this question ? If they were not fighting during the last six or seven years over this question what did the words of Sir James Whitney mean a week or two ago in the local election campaign ? Everyone in Canada thought that when the hon. Minister of Railways and

Canals (Mr. Cochrane), came down here the interests of Ontario with regard to the boundaries were going to be looked after, but apparently, according to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, he has got away with the whole thing. The province of Manitoba has got everything that it has been fighting for for the last seven years, and the Minister of Railways and Canals is not in it. The real master of the administration is the Minister of the Interior, who has got what he wants, and Sir James Whitney does not know what he is talking about with regard to this matter. The man he should be fighting with when he is discussing this question is the Minister of the Interior, and I think that in the week that is left of the campaign it will be seen that Sir James Whitney has at last discovered the villain who is responsible for all this trouble, and will show what he thinks of him in that plain Anglo-Saxon that is so characteristic of the Conservative leader in Ontario. While my hon. friend has been remaking one of his campaign speeches on this great question of the boundaries of Manitoba, and apparently has vouchsafed to give us a little light about the thing, we are still in the dark, just as much in the dark as we were when I had the honour to move this resolution a little over an hour ago, and after two of the front bench members of this government have spoken with regard to this subject, I ask the House if we really know what we are doing in regard to this matter.

We are not to suppose that the Prime Minister spoke for the purpose of beclouding our minds. He did berate me that I, so late in the day, paid tribute to the force with which he advocated the claims of the northwest provinces to their lands, but even though it is late in the day he might very well have accepted my compliment with some grace. However, I did have the feeling that I began to doubt my hon. friend's sincerity and although he appeared to be forcible in his contentions about the ownership of the land of these provinces he possibly was not sincere. Now, that the opportunity has come to put in force his views he fails to carry out his promises, and it appears the Minister of the Interior has induced him to set actuaries at work to discover just how much he can manage to wheedle out of the federal treasury. Evidently the Minister of the Interior is not a federal minister, but is here as the Minister of Public Works of the Manitoba government. He appears not to have caught the spirit of a Dominion minister, and to have succeeded in turning aside the avowed policy of the Prime Minister in favour of a proposition under which actuaries can figure out for him how much money he can get for Manitoba. This debate would indicate that possibly that is all the government is going to do. If such a good settlement has been made for all parties concerned, why does not the Prime Minister take us into his confidence, and tell us what it is. We are about to adjourn for the Christmas holidays and the Prime Minister's friends from Manitoba will be able to go home and tell their people what a great Christmas present they are bringing to the province in removing its postage stamp character from the map. After Christmas parliament will be told what further is in this Santa Claus stocking, and in the meantime Sir James Whitney can continue to go about denouncing the nasty Grits. At all events I hope we will have the papers before the Prime Minister brings down his legislation on the subject. Of course the Postmaster General tells us that to-day he is not so much interested in the question as to whether or not the people of this new territory to be added to Manitoba are to have Separate schools. Apparently he does not come here pledged to see that anything of that kind is done. I do not know whether I understood the Postmaster General correctly in that.

Mr. PELLETIER. Any one can understand me, because I speak clearly.

Mr. MACDONALD. Seeing that the Postmaster General has only been in the House two or three weeks he might not become so vain-glorious all at once as to think that this House can understand so readily everything he says.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am sure my hon. friend understood me.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not imputing to the Postmaster General any inability to speak either of the languages which may be officially used in this House so as to make every hon. member understand what he means, but if the hon. gentleman intended to let the House know where he stood on the question he was singularly unfortunate in the language he used. The hon. gentleman took the cue from his leader and he did not propose to tell us whether he wanted separate schools such as Archbishop Langevin wants. I suppose we will have to wait until after the Christmas season to learn about that also. Of course, if there were not elections in Ontario, which will come off after the House rises, I am quite sure these gentlemen on the treasury benches would be more candid, and we would really have some satisfactory announcement about it. That they have not been candid is evidence of the fact that there is something they want to conceal. If they have come to an understanding in regard to the financial terms, in regard to the boundaries, and in regard to the civil rights of the people in the new territory to be added to Manitoba why should they not make a frank statement to the House as to what the arrangement is. There is some

reason for this failure to be frank with the House and the country; there is some reason why they desire to conceal the real situation. At all events I trust that the Prime Minister who is consenting to this motion will see that the papers are brought down in ample time for their study before he submits his Bill to give effect to the terms of the settlement.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BROTHERHOOD UNIONS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

For a copy of all agreements between the Minister of Railways of Canada and any of the Brotherhood Unions or organizations of the employees of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman wish this motion to go unrestricted as to date?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I want the information since 1898.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), I desire to move that the House resolve itself into a committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to consolidate and revise the Manitoba Grain Act, chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, and Part II. of the Inspection and Sale Act, chapter 85 of the Revised Statutes, 1906; to establish a Board of Commissioners to administer the grain trade of Canada, and to provide for expenses in connection therewith, and to charge the board with the operation and management of such terminal elevators as may be constructed, leased or acquired by the government of Canada.

I may say that this measure follows the lines of the old Bill which I understand was agreed to by both sides of the House during the last parliament, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce has asked me to push it forward a stage in order that the Bill may be printed so that the members will have an opportunity of reading and studying it before the House reassembles after the Christmas holidays.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 10.00 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 5, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the secretary of His Royal Highness the Governor General:

Ottawa, 5th Dec., 1911.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Hon. the Chief Justice of Canada, acting as deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at five o'clock for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and the House of Commons during the present session of parliament.

I have the honour, to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) H. C. LOWTHER,
Lieut.-Col.,
Governor General's Secretary.

To the Hon. the Speaker
of the House of Commons.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN moved:

That the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed a list of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House during the present session, presented on the 4th inst., be now concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask to have the name of Mr. Lemieux added to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. That would complete the number to 120, it is 119 now.

Mr. BORDEN. That will be done.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Jameson.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Harbour of Hamilton.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. White (Renfrew).

THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate informing their honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Béland, Blondin, Borden, Boyer, Broder, Clark (Bruce), Crothers, Doherty, Emmerson, Foster (North Toronto), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Lewis, Meighen, Pardee, Pelletier and Pugsley, as a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, namely, Beattie, Bickerdike, Bowman, Brabazon, Brouillard, Cardin, Cash, Chabot, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Currie, Douglas, Elliott, Lavallée, Lespérance, Low, Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's), Middlebro, Murphy, Nantel, Nicholson, Roche, Stevens, Verville, White (Victoria, Alta.), and Wilson (Wentworth), to act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 13) to incorporate the Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Co.—Mr. Bickerdike.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MACDONALD moved that Bill (No. 20), respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company be read the second time, and that the rules of the House be suspended in reference thereto. He said: 'I make this motion in order to facilitate the passage of this Bill through the House for reasons which were explained by the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), yesterday.

Mr. BORDEN.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood from the motion which was made yesterday that the rule in reference to this Bill had already been suspended.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of the Bill?

Mr. BORDEN. The object was explained yesterday. The time limit for the completion of the work expired on the 1st December and the company ceased to have any power to proceed with the uncompleted portion of its work. This Bill is designed to enable the company to go on and complete its work, and the time for completion is to be fixed under another Bill which will be before the House in a little while. The time for completion of the prairie section is to be limited to a period of one year, and, within such period, for such time as shall be fixed by the Governor in Council. The time for completion of the mountain section shall not exceed three years from the 1st of December, and, within such period, such time as the Governor in Council may appoint.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand how this Bill will give an extension if it is to be completed in a future Bill which gives force to an order in council.

Mr. BORDEN. There were two distinct things to be dealt with. The company under its charter, had until the 1st December, 1911, to complete its works. In case its works were not completed within that period its charter ceased in respect of everything that had not been finished at that time, and it could not proceed further. But, there was something besides that, namely, the contract of the company with the Crown and under the company's contract with the Crown, the same date, December 1st, 1911, had been fixed. They are two distinct things and it is proposed to deal with them by two distinct Bills. As far as the company's charter is concerned, it is to be extended so that the work may go on in the meantime and the company may not lose its statutory power. So far as the contract with the government is concerned, the period for the completion of the prairie section is not to exceed one year from the 1st December, 1912, but so far as the government is concerned, it may be bound to a period of shorter duration, that is to say it may be declared by order in council that the contract shall only be modified to the extent of giving the company to the 31st day of July next for the purpose of fulfilling that contract. So far as the mountain section is concerned, the outside limit is three years from the 1st December, 1911, but in respect of the contract with the government it is proposed to reserve to the Crown the power to fix a date within that period. In other words, the modification of the con-

tract between the company and the government with respect to the extension of time is to be left to the discretion of the government. Probably a new contract will have to be entered into for the purpose of modifying the former contract in that respect. The urgency of these Bills is due to the circumstance that without some provision of this kind the company loses its power of proceeding with the work during the winter if the statutes were strictly enforced.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not clearly understand it. A charter never lapses. A charter always exists. The powers under the charter have expired and you are going to renew under a future Bill. I cannot see the object of this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. It was thought desirable that the extension of time for the purpose of the charter should be the same as that fixed by the government with respect to the modification of the contract. For that reason it is provided in this Bill that the extension shall not exceed one year in respect to the prairie section, and shall not exceed three years with respect to the mountain section, and shall be for such shorter period as the Governor in Council may see fit to fix with respect to the fulfilment of the contract. I do not know whether I have made myself clear to my hon. friend.

Mr. HAGGART. I can understand quite clearly that you give power to the Governor in Council to do this, but if you get that power what is the use of the subsequent Bill?

Mr. BORDEN. For the reason I have endeavoured to explain; for example a company may have an extension of time under its charter, but that extension would not in any way affect its contract with the Crown, and, therefore, it seemed necessary not only to introduce a Bill extending the time in the company's charter, but also to introduce a Bill for the purpose of permitting the Crown to grant a certain extension by order in council of the contract which was entered into in 1904.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

On motion of the Hon. Frank Cochrane (Minister of Railways) Bill (No. 21) respecting the National Transcontinental railway was read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

THE NE TEMERE DECREE.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to call the attention of the House and particularly that of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the hon. the First Minister to the answer given to a question I asked yesterday relating to the powers of parliament to deal with the subject of marriage more especially in view of what is known as the Ne Temere decree. I do so because the matter is one of great importance. It is a matter in which the public take a very deep interest, and it is more especially important because it is the subject matter of a Bill standing on the Order Paper introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). I think the hon. Minister of Justice will agree with me that the question is one upon which the House is entitled to be advised as to what are the powers of parliament. I coincide in the view expressed by Mr. Speaker that there is no means of compelling the government to answer a question, but at the same time hon. gentlemen opposite must recognize that members of the opposition have rights in this House, and are entitled to receive answers to proper questions. I submit that we are entitled to receive an answer to the question to which I refer from the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who is the legal adviser of the government and practically the legal adviser of parliament on legal questions, and to whose opinion parliament always pays the greatest possible attention. The question I put was as follows:

> Is the government of the opinion that either it or the parliament of Canada has power to deal with such decrees?

To this question the right hon. the First Minister answered:

> The question raised as to the respective powers of parliament and of provincial legislatures is one of legal interpretation upon which eminent lawyers may differ.

Anybody would know that, but what we want to know is what is the opinion of the Minister of Justice on this question. We want to know that opinion because the matter is one of great concern to the country, because it was made a very important issue in the province of Ontario, during the last election as was stated in this House by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) and because a Bill is now standing before this House in respect of which we shall be called on to act. I submit, therefore, that with regard to this very important question, the House is fairly entitled to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I might remind the hon. member for St. John that in the last parliament I asked a question of a like character, and received, in almost the very words, the same answer from the then Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Aylesworth.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I may say that the answer which is

given is one which would receive ample justification from a great many answers given by the late administration. As a matter of fact the question put by the hon. member comes within the rule as laid down by Bourinot at page 435 of his work on Parliamentary Procedure:

Nor are questions usually put on matters which are at the time the subject of proceedings in the court, or which involve a question of law.

I would imagine, therefore, that, under this rule, an answer might have been declined altogether. I suppose the proper course would be to make a motion, or to take steps of some kind in the House to have the opinion of the law officers of the Crown communicated to the House, or to have the question referred for opinion in some other way. However, that course was not adopted in this instance.

The answer given is, it seems to me, the only one that under all circumstances could very well be given. My hon. friend says very truly that the question relates to a Bill on the Order Paper, and that, I may add, would be another reason for not answering it because it is not the practice to put question relating to measures that are on the Order Paper in advance of the time when these measures may be reached. The answer was not at all given by way of discourtesy. It was a reference to the opinion of the late Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), coupled with an expression of opinion that the matter submitted would involve a difficult question as to the interpretation of the British North America Act.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—EXPENDITURE ON RIDEAU HALL.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a question of privilege. In the Toronto 'Mail-Empire' of November 3, 1911, there appeared what purports to be a report of a Conservative meeting in the city of Toronto addressed by my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) in which he is reported to have said:

Although $100,000 was appropriated last year to remodel and redecorate Rideau Hall, prior to the arrival of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, it was doubtful, according to one man, if more than $20,000 had been spent. Where the balance had gone had not been discovered.

When I saw that statement, I regarded it as a charge of a most serious character not only against the officials of my department, but also against myself as the minister who, until October last, presided over that department. I was thoroughly satisfied that the statement was entirely without foundation, but I thought I would put a question in the House to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works as to the appropriation which had been made for this purpose, and also as to the expenditure actually made on Rideau Hall up to the 1st of November, a few days before my hon. friend was reported to have made that speech. The answer given by the Minister of Public Works is to be found on pages 562 and 563 of 'Hansard.' That answer gives in detail the items of expenditure. It shows that the appropriation, instead of being $100,000, was $50,000, and that the amount of expenditure up to the 1st of November was $46,441.84, leaving an unexpended balance at that date of $3,558.16.

Having received that answer from the Minister of Public Works, I placed a question upon the Order Paper as follows:

Did the Hon. A. E. Kemp, a member of the government, when addressing a meeting in Toronto recently, make the following statement, as reported in the 'Mail-Empire' on November 3, 1911?

Then I quoted the statement just as I have read it to the House. The answer to that question was as follows:

The general statement was made that Government House, upon the arrival of Their Royal Highnesses, was in a state of unpreparedness, and that such a condition was inexplicable.

That does not answer in so many words the question which I put to the government. My question was as to whether the hon. member had made the statement as reported in the 'Mail-Empire,' that the appropriation was $100,000, that a man had informed him that only $20,000 had been expended, and that they were unable to discover what had become of the remainder. However, I would prefer to take the answer of the hon. Minister of Public Works as a denial that my hon. friend from East Toronto had made that statement. I am very glad to believe that he did not make it. I would be very sorry to believe that a member of this House, without going to the proper department, without going to the responsible minister of that department, and asking for the information, would deliberately make a statement which would lead the people of this country to believe that there had been a misappropriation, because that is the effect of it, of the enormous amount of $80,000 or any amount in connection with the expenses of Rideau Hall.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. member that he is travelling a little wide of the mark in speaking on a question of privilege. He can give a categorical denial of the statement without discussing it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am accepting this as being a denial, though not a clear and explicit denial, of my hon. friend. But, Mr. Speaker, accepting it as a denial, I

desire to say that the conduct of the reporter of the 'Mail—Empire,' and of the 'Mail-Empire,' in publishing the statement without authority, in distorting the language of my hon. friend from East Toronto, in reporting him as saying what he did not say, in conveying to the people of this country false and injurious information, and making a most unjust aspersion against the Department of Public Works, and intended to be an aspersion against myself as Minister of Public Works, is utterly indefensible; and it seems to me that it is due, not to myself or the Department of Public Works alone, but to the public, that that newspaper should apologize for the libellous statement which it made, and should take the necessary steps to do justice.

PRIVILEGE—THE MANITOBA BOUNDARIES.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to another question of privilege. In the report in 'Hansard' of the proceedings of yesterday, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) in discussing the question of the Manitoba boundaries and the agreement which it is alleged has been come to between the government of Manitoba and the Federal government, is reported to have made this statement:

> Now, Sir, when the First Minister of Manitoba entered that conference he presented this resolution and that order in council to the members and premiers from the other provinces, and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was then representing New Brunswick as premier of that province. Now, Sir, the leader of the opposition will bear me out in the statement, that upon that occasion I was able to present the Sessional Papers of this House, which showed that my hon. friend from St. John accepted the statement made by the premier of Manitoba that the questions at issue between Manitoba and the Federal government were questions to be settled entirely between the government of that province and the government of this Dominion.

The hon. member proceeds further and reiterates the statement that in the Sessional Papers will be found a memorandum signed by me, in which I concurred in the view that settlement of further claims on the part of Manitoba was a matter entirely between the Federal government and the government of Manitoba. Now, I desire to say that I have examined carefully the Sessional Papers, for the year 1906-7, and I find in them the return of the proceedings of the conference, but I find no such document as that to which my hon. friend refers. I am sorry he is not in his place, as he might perhaps be able to point out some other return of which I am not aware. The only memorandum I can find which might possibly have some bearing on the subject is one on page 4 of the return. It is not applicable specially to Manitoba, but has reference to any claim which any province might make, and it does not state that it is a matter which would rest entirely between the Federal government and the government of the province interested. The only paragraph which I find bearing on the subject is contained in the resolution of the conference, and is as follows:

> Resolved—1. That the sub-matter of the resolutions adopted by the conference and representatives of the different provinces, held at Quebec in December, 1902, and which were shortly thereafter presented to the government of the Dominion and which were ratified by the legislatures of the then existing provinces, except that of British Columbia, be now pressed upon the government of the Dominion for immediate and favourable action, under reserve of the right of any province to now submit to such government memoranda in writing concerning any claims it may have to larger sums than those set out in the said resolutions, or to additional consideration or recognition.

As I stated yesterday, I have no recollection of having signed any memorandum, and if the hon. gentleman is able to produce it, it would of course show that I am in error as to that. This resolution does not at all bear out the statement which my hon. friend has made. It does not profess to assert that the settlement of any further claims would be a matter entirely between the Federal government and the government of any province. All it does is to reserve to any province the right to submit any further claims. Of course, if any further claims were submitted which affected the rights of any other province of Canada, it would be entirely open to that other province to present its views thereon to the government of Canada in order that its rights might not be prejudiced in any settlement that might be made. I thought it due to myself to make this statement, because my hon. friend gave to the House the positive assurance that I, as Premier of the province of New Brunswick—which I did not happen to be at the time, being simply Attorney General—had signed such a memorandum. I make this statement because my hon. friend so far as I have been able to ascertain was entirely in error in giving the House the assurance that he did.

CAR SHORTAGE IN WEST.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I desire to call the attention of the government to the fact that in western Canada to-day great difficulty is being experienced by the people in getting cars to ship their grain to the market. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I may say that I have read a number of articles in the newspapers and especially one in the

'Journal' of Ottawa of December 1, which set forth the situation very clearly. I have also had an opportunity of seeing the western local papers, and I have found that almost without exception the complaint of the farmers in that country is that they cannot get the cars to ship their grain. It is actually stated in some of their papers that grain has been drawn to market and that not being able to get into the elevators it has been dumped on the track and is rotting. I would ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) to the matter, and to see if something cannot be done to relieve the difficulties under which these people labour at the present time.

Mr. BORDEN. I will bring the matter to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) and of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), and if there is anything that can be done by the government in connection with it I assure my hon. friend that we will be prepared to do it without the slightest delay.

CAPTAIN PETER DECOSTE.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) to the fact that he has failed to answer some questions that I put on the Order Paper some days ago. The questions were in reference to the dismissal of Captain Peter DeCoste, and the answers which the minister gave will be found on page 563 of 'Hansard.' Three of the questions asked were answered. The ones that were not answered were as follows:

3. Who succeeded him, why was he dismissed, and on whose recommendation or advice?

The first part of this question is answered. The answer being:

3. (a) Captain Daniel Gillis.

The questions:

Why was he dismissed, and on whose recommendation or advice?

are not answered at all. I submit that these are fair and legitimate questions to put, and I think it would only be courteous to the House that the minister should answer them. Then, again, the question was asked:

Were there any charges made against him? If so, by whom, and what were they?

The answer to that is 'minister.' That is the only answer that is given. It may perhaps have been a mistake on the part of the clerk who prepared the answer, but I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that these questions are left unanswered, and I would ask him to furnish the answers. I submit these are proper questions to put and that we have a right to have them answered. Then the question was put:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to dismiss all officers and men appointed to positions on the government dredges and tugs by the late government?

I do not know whether that is a proper question or not, but it seems to me that it is. What do you suppose is the answer? The 'minister' again.

Mr. MONK. I am sorry to say that I have not been able to catch all that my hon. friend has stated, but I understand that his remarks have reference to the dismissal of some official.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Just so.

Mr MONK. If my hon. friend would renew his question I shall endeavour to give him all the information he requires, although it seems to me that the questions already put in that connection have been fully answered. If my hon. friend prefers to move for the papers they will be brought down at once.

SUPPLY — DELAY IN RECEIPT OF DAILY PAPERS AT GLACE BAY, SYDNEY, ETC.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) to a grievance existing in the town of Glace Bay and other towns in the county of Cape Breton in reference to getting the western mail. This matter has been brought to my attention by certain news dealers. For example, the Montreal 'Star,' the Toronto 'Globe' and other papers from Ontario and Quebec come down there only every second day. I would like if the hon. Postmaster General would take this matter into his consideration and see if this grievance cannot be remedied in a short time. I wrote to the department some days ago in reference to it, but up to the present I have not received any reply to my communication.

Mr. PELLETIER. I could not venture to answer the hon. gentleman's question, as I have not been able to hear him.

Mr. CARROLL. The grievance is this: Certain newsdealers in the town of Glace Bay, and, I understand, in the city of Sydney, get their Montreal and Toronto papers, say, on Monday, and they do not receive these daily papers again until Wednesday or Thursday. They come in

every second day. The daily papers should arrive there every day and I would be glad if the Postmaster General would take these things into his consideration and see if the grievance cannot be remedied in a short time.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will inquire into it and try to give satisfaction to my hon. friend.

PUBLIC WORKS IN CAPE BRETON COUNTY.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) to certain matters in the county which I have the honour to represent. Last summer and last fall four or five public works were ready for tender and tenders have been called for some of them, I understand. The whole of the money was not voted until the other day. Now, all the moneys for these different works are voted, and I want to bring to the notice of the Minister of Public Works that this is the very best time of the year to call for tenders for these works in the part of the country from which I come.

They are breakwaters and piers, and works that require a lot of timber and stone, and the minister will readily understand that it is easier to get that material out at this time, in the winter, than any other time, it is easier to fell the timber and to take it out of the woods. Now, if the minister will inquire into the different works in the county of North Cape Breton and Victoria he will find they have been ready some time for construction. I hope he will see that these tenders are called for, and that the successful tenderer may be in a position to go on and get the material.

Mr. MONK. I would say to my hon. friend that I will be glad to take into consideration any suggestions he may make in regard to these works. I would add that when I came into office there were certain works in the position mentioned by my hon. friend; parliament seems to have sanctioned the works. The money was voted, not a sufficient sum in most cases, but money was voted and the principle of the work seemed to be approved. Where there was no objection offered, nothing to create the impression that possibly those works were too considerable or not perhaps necessary, and perceiving that tenders were called for, and where everything was in order, the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. But where objections were raised, and it was discovered upon further reference to the district engineer that those objections were in part well founded, it became necessary to consider whether we should enter upon the work at all without being fortified by further information. That explains the delay in some cases. Some of those works are quite considerable, and although the money was voted to begin them, it became evident that it would take a very large amount to complete them; and when their urgency or necessity was called in question it became incumbent on me to look further into the matter. That has been one reason for delay in some cases. In the part of the country my hon. friend comes from there are several such works. I am anxious that they should be prosecuted, if they are really necessary, and if all the conditions are complied with. I will be glad to get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The answer which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) makes to my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) will hardly be sufficient to satisfy the people, at least in the province of Nova Scotia. A few days ago I asked the government the following question:

Has the work on the canal at Chester, N.S., been discontinued? If so, for what reason, and on whose recommendation was such work discontinued?

Yesterday the following answer was given?

1. Yes.
2. That inquiries may be made as to the necessity of the work.

This is a public work that is here called a canal, but in the strict sense of the term it is not so, as it is simply an artificial waterway connecting what is locally termed a front harbour and a back harbour. It is really a ditch to enable small boats to pass from one harbour to the other at this place in Chester. I think the total amount of money voted for this purpose was about $2,000, and it was all expended with the exception of about $300. About the middle of November a provincial election was taking place in the county of Lunenburg, in which Chester is situated, and a week or so before polling day the work was discontinued. Now I wish to submit to the Minister of Public Works that there was no justification whatever for stopping the work, and he can find nobody, even among his own political friends and supporters at Chester, to justify the cessation of the work, unless it was for purely political purposes, and locally this was the reason assigned. It is very difficult to complete the work now at this season of the year, and it is difficult for anybody to understand upon what ground the work should have been prevented from proceeding to completion. I mention this merely for the purpose of calling the attention of the House that the reason assigned by the

minister, in answer to the statement made by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria, is not altogether sufficient, and does not explain the discontinuance of the work, in certain cases at least, in the province of Nova Scotia. I trust my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will be just a little more candid in making his explanations concerning these matters.

Mr. MONK. I can assure my hon. friend that the work he mentions was certainly not suspended for political motives, it was not merely a question of $300. There were serious reasons for suspending the work, if it was suspended; and if my hon. friend will make clear to me what he has just said to the House, I will make an effort to have the work terminated at once.

THE COCKSHUTT PLOUGH COMPANY.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). I ask the indulgence of the House to make a few observations on a matter considered by some to be of special public interest. I refer to a matter that is going the round of the western press, and that was also referred to in this House during the debate on the speech from the Throne. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the other day, made reference to the firm called The Cockshutt Plough Company; and my name being connected with it, some of my friends thought I should at once reply to the hon. gentleman in so far as his remarks referred to that firm. I may say at the outset that, personally, I have nothing whatever to do with the management of the Cockshutt Plough Company of Brantford, nor have I had for twenty years past. I may say at the same time, however, for the benefit of my hon. friend who made the reflections, that the firm is in the hands of thoroughly honest and honourable men, who I think, will compare very favourably with the hon. gentleman who lays the charges against the Cockshutt Plough Company, of not dealing squarely with the west.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman is referring to a statement of mine, I want to say that I made no allegation or suggestion that the Cockshutt Plough Company was not dealing squarely with the people of the west.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman's words are in 'Hansard' of Tuesday, November 28, but I suppose the rules of the House will not permit me to read them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. A past debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is a question of privilege, I think the hon. member would have a right to read them; otherwise he could not properly refer to a past debate.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as I am concerned, I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would read them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. With the permission of the House, I will read what he said, to be found on page 463 of the 'Hansard' of November 28:

> I said something about monopolies, trusts and combines. I have given the House the result of the triumph of the monopolies, trusts and combines on one end of the farmers' transactions. Let me give a little light on the other end, that is to say, on the buying end of the farmers' necessities. It is given on good authority that the Cockshutt Plough Company of Brantford, which makes an eight-furrow engine gang plough, sells that plough at Brantford for $600. They sell the same plough in Winnipeg at $680, in Saskatoon the same plough costs $705. But this infant industry which requires a protection of some 17½ per cent tariff to prevent those villainous Yankees from selling ploughs in Canada, it appears, is able to pay a 15 per cent duty and sell their ploughs in the United States. The remarkable thing is that after paying the 15 per cent tariff duty, they sell their plough at Peoria, Illinois, at $525, and at Minneapolis at $502. The same plough that is sold in Brantford at $600 is sold in Minneapolis at $502, after paying a 15 per cent duty besides the freight. There is no manner of doubt that interests such as the Cockshutt Plough Company did feel a stupendous relief as a result of the election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is able to applaud his own words, but I think he will find that the examples in these statements are not intended as complimentary references to the manner in which the Cockshutt Plough Company do business.

Mr. OLIVER. I can quite admit that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman quite admits that. Perhaps he will admit something else before I get through. He has made certain statements there which he says are given on good authority. The hon. gentleman did not see fit to quote what he considered good authority nor to tell us where he got his authority from. It may be that he is following a blind guide, as did the right hon. leader of the opposition of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when he followed the Grain Growers' Association who came down here and led him astray before the country at the last election. It may be that this same blind guide has led the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) to make a statement that the facts do not justify. If the hon. gentleman had any proof I think he should have produced that proof at the time he made the statement, but he has not seen fit to do so. He says the statement is given on good authority.

Mr. OLIVER. We are waiting for the hon. member to give us the facts.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. But the hon. gentleman has given the facts and then he asks me to give them.

Mr. BUREAU. Do you deny them?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Wait until I get through, and you will see what I say. I say that the hon. gentleman has given us facts founded merely on his own statement and that he did not take the precaution as we have had to do to see whether there was really any truth in the remarks which the hon. gentleman has made in regard to these prices. At considerable expense we have found it necessary, in order to meet the charge that the hon. gentleman has made, to send a representative to Minneapolis and also one to Peoria. This has been done at considerable cost to the company, because this charge that the hon. gentleman makes, if correct, must be considered as a most serious one. He makes a statement that after paying thirteen per cent duty on these goods and entering them in the United States we are selling them away below what we sell them at the point of manufacture in Canada. The hon. gentleman has done what has been done throughout this reciprocity campaign, and he has got it so badly into his head that he cannot get it out. He is doing what is palpably designed to mislead the public; that is he is quoting a wholesale price against a retail one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. A wholesale price against a retail price is what the hon. gentleman has quoted there. If he is prepared to buy as many Cockshutt ploughs as one customer in the United States he will be able to get the same price from the company also, but he cannot expect that we are going to sell a farmer a plough at the same price as we sell $100,000 worth in one order. The hon. gentleman did not take any precaution to find out these facts and he sends out broadcast the statement that the Cockshutt Plough Company are robbing the farmers of the west. I have here a sheet printed in Winnipeg containing this statement, and it has been published in the 'Grain Growers' Guide' as well. The Cockshutt Plough Company have something else to do than answer all the charges which may be trumped up against it in regard to these matters in the west. But when such a charge is made as that which the hon. gentleman has made that we are taking hundreds of dollars out of the farmers and giving the American farmer a plough at a hundred dollars less I think we are entitled to produce some facts and figures to controvert that charge, and to ascertain whether the circumstances and the ploughs are the same. Let me draw your attention to what the character of this plough is because there are ploughs and ploughs. Our company—I call it ' our company '—because I am one of the humble shareholders——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. A small shareholder —make about 80 varieties of ploughs, and this is one of the varieties that the hon. gentleman is referring to. This is a steam plough or what is known as an engine gang plough. It costs in the west, as he says, about $600, but that is a very small portion of the outlay. After a man has made that outlay he will require an engine to drive the plough, and the engine costs about $4,000. These are the facts with regard to the original cost of the engine and gang plough. These ploughs are not in common use in Canada. If a gentleman says in this House that he has bought a vehicle your understanding would be that he had bought anything from a small apple cart to an automobile costing from $10 up to $10,000. The engine and gang plough, with the complete equipment, stand in about the same position with relation to the ordinary plough that the up to date motor car does to the small apple cart. Who are these gentlemen that the hon. member is asking sympathy for on this ground? Let us see whether they require so much sympathy as the hon. gentleman states. I respect very highly the farmers of Canada, we have a great many of them in Ontario, but the farmer who uses this engine gang plough is a man who conducts operations on a most gigantic scale. No man who ploughs 100 or 200 acres will ever buy one of these steam engine outfits unless he is going to take contracts from his neighbours. He is going into this thing with no small operation in view. The man who buys the engine gang steam plough is the owner probably of 10,000 acres. Let me explain how these ploughs are used in order that this House may understand thoroughly the position of this matter, because I charge here again that this is an endeavour to set the farmer of the west against the manufacturer of the east. That is what the whole argument is designed to do, and what has characterized the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is the desire of these hon. gentlemen to set the farmer of the west against the manufacturer and the working man of the east. This plough that the hon. gentleman refers to will turn twenty-eight acres of new land per day. Let us see to what use this plough is put by the man who buys it. He takes a contract from his neighbour, who is not fortunate enough to have one of these ploughs, and he charges him from $4 to $4.50 per acre for turning the land. I have known of a case in the west where a man during a season has ploughed 30 acres per day at $4.25

an acre making in all $138 per day. This is not bad business. We should consider that a very fair profit in the plough business. A man who would make that profit per day would probably have 100 days in the season in which he could do it, and after allowing $53 for labour and working expenses of the plough, he would have $75 as a profit on his day's work. If he had 100 days in a season this would give him $7,500 for the operation of his plough for a season of 100 days. So that I do not think the hon. gentleman has made out his case that this man is worthy of such an immense amount of sympathy. If he is deserving of the sympathy of all men let him have it. I have here a telegram from a representative in Minneapolis who states that the figures are the wholesale and not the retail price and further that this agent in the United States, even if he ordered a plough, would not deliver the goods in Canada. It is one thing to quote cheaply, it is quite another thing to deliver the goods, and this man, even if he quotes cheaply, could not deliver the goods. Further, the same authority that controls the plough in Peoria also controls that plough in Minneapolis as we have only the one representative in the whole of the United States, so that if the hon. gentleman states that a man is selling at the more remote point at the cheaper price that is further evidence that the hon. gentleman's figures must be a long way out.

I know that the question of agricultural implements is a burning one in the west, but I can truly say that if there is one industry in Canada of which we have more reason to be proud than another it is that very industry, and the development that has taken place in it. Thirty years ago there was scarcely an implement factory of any size in Canada, and to-day, outside of the United States, there is no country in the world where implements are sold as cheaply as they are here. That does not look as if the farmer was suffering very much. Take even free trade England, whence the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) comes, and I make the statement on my responsibility as a member of this House that farm implements are sold in protectionist Canada cheaper than in free trade England. Furthermore, so far as agricultural implements are concerned, we would not care if there was free trade with England to-morrow. It is only the high protectionist United States that can beat Canada, but give us time and they will not beat us. We are getting there, but we want a little more time. The hon. gentleman has attempted to make the House believe that the plough companies of Brantford and other centres are overcharging the farmers of Canada, but if there is such a great fortune in the manufacture of ploughs why does he not start in the business. Indeed it may be that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is about to start in that line, because I hear that a company called the Oliver Plough Company is coming to the city of Hamilton. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) will soon be in the same position as I am now in; he will have to stand for all the sins of the Oliver Plough Company, and no matter how often he denies that he is a member of the company he will still be held liable, as I have been, because of my name.

Mr. OLIVER. If I had as many shares in the Oliver Plough Company as my hon. friend admits he has in the Cockshutt Company, I would stand the blame all right.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Oh, it is only a matter of money with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) but I put my principles on a higher plane than that. I am pointing out to the hon. gentleman that there is plenty of competition in Canada to see to it that the farmers in the west are not overcharged.

Mr. OLIVER. The Oliver Company evidently does not think so.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman has a good many interruptions to make, and I expect to give him further reason to interrupt before I finish. He has alleged that the plough companies of Canada are making tremendous profits at the expense of the farmers, and are unjustly charging them high prices compared with what farmers in other countries pay. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that any man who makes money out of ploughs or other agricultural implements to-day, has got to get up early in the morning, work hard, and stay up late at night. I make that statement with the authority of one who knows something about the business, though not engaged in it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has mentioned the Cockshutt Plough Company, but he might have mentioned other plough companies which have not been so successful. He might, for instance, have referred to the Wilkinson Plough Company of Toronto. When the Cockshutt Plough Company was established in Brantford thirty years ago the Wilkinson Plough Company was supreme in the field, and it turned out more ploughs than any other plough company in Canada at that time. It has had the same protection, it has had the same field as other companies, but it has gone down, and down and down until it has gone out this year, and is in the receiver's hands. And, in the newspapers the management of that company gave as a reason, among

others, for its failure, in the first place the fierceness of home competition—don't forget that, my hon. friend from Strathcona.

Mr. OLIVER. At the risk of interrupting my hon. friend again, I would ask him to remember that I am the member for Edmonton.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Well, I won't forget that again. I was going on to say that the first reason given by the management of the Wilkinson Company for its failure was the severity of home competition, and, in the second place, it said that the proposal of reciprocity was the last straw. Let the hon. gentleman take hold of that fact; not the operation of reciprocity, but the very proposal of reciprocity was the last straw. And why? Because, he said, as soon as the bankers thought reciprocity was coming, they said: Wilkinson Company, we will finance you no longer. And so there you are. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) leads us to suppose that you can make money hand over fist by manufacturing ploughs and charging the farmers too high a price. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has taken for his example the most expensive plough on the whole list and the one that is least generally used. I have here a Winnipeg paper which states that it will take at least 1,700 bushels of barley to buy a Cochshutt plough, but let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that in Ontario the farmer's wife can walk into any ordinary town or city of Ontario to-day and carry more than enough eggs at their present price to take home a Cockshutt plough with her. That is a side of the question that the hon. gentleman forgot to mention. I can tell him further that the farm implement industry is prepared to have its values criticised by any fair tribunal and I believe the judgment will be that this industry gives just as good value, one hundred cents on the dollar, as any other industry in Canada. I repeat that the ordinary plough used in the ordinary fields of Canada to-day can be bought with as many eggs as a woman can carry to market. This plough that the hon. gentleman has referred to, is practically unknown in the east, where we still do a little bit of farming. I think I am within the mark when I say that there are not six steam ploughs in use in the great agricultural province of Ontario to-day, and so far as Quebec and the maritime provinces are concerned, I do not think there is a single steam plough in all that territory. But, the hon. gentleman has brought up this question for a purpose, and the purpose is that he wants the cleavage between the west and the east to become more marked. We, Sir, want a united country; we want a country the inhabitants of which will have respect for the principle of live and let live. So far as the prices of agricultural implements are concerned, I believe there is no just cause of complaint in this country to-day against the manufacturers of these implements.

The facts are well known to the public. It is well known that since 1878 the prices of agricultural implements have decreased. I gave the House full exemplification of that statement five years ago when I quoted the prices and showed how they had been reduced from time to time, while at the same time the prices of farm products had been raised to a very considerable extent. I do not wish to take up the time of the House further and would not have taken it up at all were it not for the fact that the hon. gentleman has forced it upon me by making the charge that we were taking too much out of the pockets of the west.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand the explanation given by my hon. friend why the price is more in one place than another is because in the one it is a wholesale price and in the other a retail. In Minneapolis ploughs are sold at $23 less than in Peoria. Why this difference?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. As regards Peoria, our agent has not yet reported. The other prices quoted, in Brantford, Winnipeg and Saskatoon, are retail prices whereas the price quoted at Minneapolis is a wholesale price. I would like also to draw attention to the fact that the freight to Peoria is only 20½ cents per 100 pounds, while the freight to Saskatoon is $1 per 100 pounds. As one of these steam ploughs weighs 5,500 pounds, the difference in freight alone is about $45 between Peoria and Saskatoon. If any hon. gentleman opposite wants to question me regarding any matter, I am only too anxious to give what information I have, but I do not care to take up the time of the House in discussing the matter. I felt bound, however, in justice to myself, when the hon. gentleman cast the reflection he did on the firm in question to show that we were dealing honourably and fairly with the people of Canada; and when a tariff commission is formed and holds an investigation the agricultural industry will, I am confident, be able to prove that it is not exacting from Canadian consumers any extravagant prices and is giving them fair value for their money. If we cannot show that, then let the tariff be cut down, but let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite, who talk about the possibilities of totally removing the duty, that it cannot be done without completely destroying the fabric of protection in this Dominion. Why? Because every subsidiary industry which supplies

raw material to the agricultural implement industry will be affected. Paint, iron and steel, malleable iron, everything that goes into the construction of those implements, will be affected, and you cannot remove the duty from agricultural implements without removing it from the raw material that goes into their construction; and in some cases these duties are from 30 to 35 per cent. I have had this matter thrust on me this afternoon just as I have come into the House, and consequently may not have been able to deal with it as effectively as I should, but I thank the House for its attention. If the hon. gentleman is going back to Edmonton for his Christmas holidays, let him carry back the good message to his constituency that the Cockshutt ploughs are good value, that they are worth one hundred cents on the dollar and that if his constituents have only the good sense to use the Cockshutt gang plough in the district around Edmonton, there is a very strong probability that they will raise 50 bushels of wheat to the acre.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure that the House is more than indebted to my hon. friend for the information he has given us with regard to the Cockshutt gang ploughs. But if he is under the impression that I, at any time, wished to say anything derogatory to the quality of that plough or to the business ability of the men who make it, he is labouring under an entirely wrong impression. The very statement he objects to so much is the best evidence that the plough is a good one. It must be a good one since the firm are able to sell it in the United States in competition with the best ploughs made there and pay the duty as well. I would not accuse my hon. friend for a moment of taking advantage of his presence in this House for the purpose of giving a business advertisement, but I would point out to him that if he had that purpose, his method of advertising the Cuckshutt gang plough is very expensive to this country; and that he has no warrant whatever for the suggestion that I made any attack on that implement. I only used the name of the Cockshutt Plough Company and the instance in which that company sold its ploughs in the United States in competition with American ploughs because that statement is in general circulation throughout the west, and not because he happens to bear the same name as the company which makes it and, therefore, he had no right to suggest that I had in any way made an improper personal reference to him. I was not dealing with the question of ploughs, but with the question of reciprocity. I was dealing with the policy of my hon. friends opposite which prevents the western farmer from selling his goods across the line where he will get a better price, while at the same time the manufacturers were selling their goods across the same line at a less price. That was the point I was trying to make. I say again that it is most creditable that the Cockshutt Plough Company or any other manufacturing industry in Ontario should find a market wherever it can and sell its goods across the line against American competition. That they have a perfect right to do, but not to line up their employees before their doors a day or two before the election and tell them that if reciprocity carries their works are going to shut down.

I say that when such tyrannical methods as that are used my hon. friend can only expect some kind of a protest from the people who are so injuriously affected by the results of those methods.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that that was done by the Cockshutt Plough Company?

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all. I want my hon. friend to disassociate the personal element from anything that I say. I said at the beginning of my remarks that I did not wish to make any particular reference to the Cockshutt Plough Company or to the fact that my hon. friend bore the same name as that company. I used an incident which my hon. friend knows was circulated through the public press of the west.

Mr. HAZEN. The same thing was done in New Brunswick.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understood the hon. gentleman to say just now that he knew of a firm that had lined up its men in front of its works, and I understood him to say that it was ours.

Mr. OLIVER. I want my hon. friend to understand that I did not refer to the Cockshutt Plough Company, and if it is necessary further to emphasize it, so far as my knowledge and information goes, the Cockshutt Plough Company is in all respects a reputable institution, that is a credit to Canada, and is doing good work as a manufacturing industry. But I read in the columns of the 'Ottawa Free Press' that the E. B Eddy Company and the J. R. Booth Company, right within the precincts of this city, or adjoining it, did so line up their employees and did so address them, and it is a simple matter of fact that they were not the only manufacturers who did so. I am quite willing to believe that the Cockshutt Plough Company did not do so, and I repeat that it is a most reputable company. But a very large number of the manufacturing enterprises of eastern Canada did that very thing, and if so many of my hon. friend's friends are sitting in this House to-day, it is actually because of

such acts of outrageous tyranny in what is supposed to be a free country.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company did exactly the same thing in both the last election and the previous election?

Mr. OLIVER. No. I am aware that there were more Grand Trunk Pacific men working in my constituency during the election than in any other constituency in the Dominion of Canada, and I am absolutely aware that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company did not do any such thing or anything approaching it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It was done in Portage la Prairie in both elections.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I will say to my hon. friend that there is a legend current in the politics of Manitoba that when my hon. friend had the privilege of coming to this House first, it was as the result of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company lining up their men on his behalf in Portage la Prairie.

That has nothing to do with the case, however. My argument was that the men who thus exercise their undoubted and proper right to sell their products across the line in the face of a low tariff are not dealing fairly by their fellow citizens in preventing them from selling their surplus products across the same line without any tariff; and, to emphasize my point, I pointed out that whereas in the case of the farmer, by selling his products across the line he got a better price, they sold their products across the line at a less price, and still they denied to the farmer that right which they themselves exercised. I did not challenge them in the exercise of their right. Every time a Canadian manufacturer can sell a Canadian product in a foreign market I am ready to hold up my hands for the energy, enterprise and business ability of the man who can do it, so long as it is done on fair terms. But I say live and let live, and if the manufacturer has special privileges and tariffs in his favour, if he has rebates and drawbacks to assist him to enter a foreign market, which he has, then it is unfair on his part to line up his employees to vote against the western farmer being allowed the same privilege. To-day the western farmer has to face a tariff framed absolutely to prevent and prohibit access of his product to the United States market, whereas the Canadian manufacturer has the advantage of a low tariff in sending his products across the line.

Mr. BEATTIE. Why did not the hon. gentleman's government arrange these matters during the 15 years that they were in power?

Mr. OLIVER. The late government was not vested with authority to do away with the United States tariff; but as soon as the opportunity came to secure the doing away with the United States tariff and at the same time to reduce the Canadian tariff, that government seized the opportunity, and went down to defeat—went down, Mr. Speaker, proudly to defeat—in the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. BEATTIE. I would like to know what the United States tariff has to do with the tariff of Canada or with the lining up of men at our workshops.

Mr. OLIVER. I am astonished that a gentleman who has occupied the position of a member of this House for so many years, and is honoured with the representation of one of our leading cities, should ask such a question. Does he not know that the late government was defeated because——

Mr. BEATTIE. That is all nonsense. The government of which the hon. gentleman was a member was in power for 15 years, and they never reduced the tariff, though they had promised many times to do so, and they were kicked out of office because they had not kept their promises.

Mr. OLIVER. The late government had made an arrangement whereby the United States tariff would be taken off, and it was because it had made that arrangement that it was defeated by my hon. friend and his friends and the friends of my hon. friend from Brantford, who, as I say again, and it has not been denied, lined up their employees, and by an act of tyranny which should be abhorrent to a free country, secured the control which these hon. gentlemen boast of so greatly to-day.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the late government was not pressed, during the last parliament, by resolutions offered in this House, to take the duty entirely off farming implements?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, they were not.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Or even to reduce it. If my memory serves me, there was a motion on the Order Paper by one of their own members to that effect in order to prevent any one else making such a motion and he left it there without taking action.

Mr. OLIVER. The late government is to-day defeated because it undertook to reduce the duties on agricultural implements and thereby secure the free entry of our farm products into the markets of the United States. I do not wish to bring into question the business arrangements or methods of the Cockshutt Plough Company. I have nothing to say against that company

except to use it as a sample of the kind of business that is being done by our manufacturers. I do not find any fault with them, but I do find fault with their arguments. While they are able to do business in the United States in competition with their competitors on the other side of the line, they still demand protection at the hands of the people of Canada on the plea that such protection is necessary in order to enable them to do business at all. I am entitled, in all fairness, to show that the manufacturers are using arguments that are not justified. If they can pay a 15 per cent duty and enter the United States and compete in the United States with the manufacturers of that country there is no reason why they cannot compete with the United States manufacturers in this country with a duty of 15 per cent in their favour.

Mr. BEATTIE. That is the point, why did the government not take the duty off?

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was delivered by Ernest John Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness, the Governor General, desires the immediate presence of this honourable body in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate.

And the House being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that his Honour, the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General, had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name, the Royal assent to the following Bills:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the year ending 31st March, 1912.

An Act respecting the National Transcontinental railway.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

SUPPLY—THE COCKSHUTT PLOUGH COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds), moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the motion is agreed to, I wish to continue the remarks I was making when the message from His Royal Highness was received.

Mr. CURRIE. I wish to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), is making two speeches in succession on the same subject, and now he is going to continue with a third. I think it is time the rules of the House were enforced. When an hon. gentleman rises in his place and speaks as often as he has done, I think he should confine himself to the one subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. The speech which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was making was upon another motion, which was withdrawn. This motion being a fresh one, he is in order.

Mr. CURRIE. I do not think the same motion can be made twice.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I must remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) that the ruling of the Speaker cannot be questioned, except by an appeal to the House.

Mr. OLIVER. I merely wish to conclude the remarks I had in view at the time proceedings were interrupted. I want to say that the appeal which my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) made for a united Canada, for a Canada in which the interests of the east and the west should be consulted, for a policy under which the east and west should find a common interest, is a principle that I entirely agree with, and I beg to assure this House, on behalf of the western country, that that principle is one they have always stood for, and will continue to stand for, as long as they are permitted to do so. But I must again say, Mr. Speaker, that the policy which refuses to the western farmer that privilege which the eastern manufacturer claims for himself, and which claim he is able to turn to advantage by reason of special legislation, and special administrative acts, is not the way to build up a united Canada. Let the manufacturers of eastern Canada play fair, let them give to other parts of Canada what they themselves claim and there will be no trouble about a united Canada. But if they, by reason of having the bulk of votes in their locality, are able to control the destinies of Canada, and to produce economic conditions at their pleasure whereby other sections of Canada are penalized, as the prairie west of Canada to-day is penalized, to the extent of $12,000,000 on the crop of this year, I beg to assure them that there are serious difficulties in the way of building up a Canadian national sentiment, or a united Canada under these circumstances.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question? I do not quite understand his argument, I want information. What is the law that the manufacturers have succeeded in getting passed by which they are depriving the farmers of a similar law, and want to prevent the farmers shipping their stuff to the United States with a tariff against them, any more than the farmers wish to prevent the manufacturers from shipping

their stuff into the United States? What is the unfairness?

Mr. OLIVER. The manufacturer has access to the United States market under a minimum tariff with special advantages.

Mr. LANCASTER. What special advantages?

Mr. OLIVER. Special legislation in the matter of drawbacks and rebates on the duties on his raw material, on manufactured articles which he exports. And it is the boast of my hon. friends on the other side of the House that the manufacturing interests of the province of Ontario have been able, by their votes, and by the votes they controlled during the recent elections, to prevent the going into effect of an arrangement whereby the prohibitive tariff now existing against farm products going into the States would be removed, thereby preventing the western farmer from getting the benefit which the eastern manufacturer to-day enjoys, and which I want to say, the western farmer has no objection to his enjoying, and is willing to support him in that enjoyment.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is all the row about?

Mr. OLIVER. The row is because the western farmer, the prairie west to-day, is penalized to the extent of $12,000,000 on the crop of this year, by the result of the action of those interests.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the nature of the penalty?

Mr. CURRIE. What is the proof?

Mr. OLIVER. The proof has already been given to the House, and my hon. friend, who has already objected to my repeating what I said on the previous occasion, has only to read 'Hansard,' and he can get the proof. I want to say again that the statement put upon 'Hansard' has not been denied and cannot be denied.

Mr. LANCASTER. What statement is it the hon. gentleman means? I am here to deny the statement. If the hon. gentleman means that the farmers of this country are penalized, he is talking absolute nonsense.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman is not able to make an intelligent denial, because he does not know the facts.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is no penalty on the farmers of this country, never has been.

Mr. OLIVER. The facts are on 'Hansard,' and they have never been denied, and cannot be denied.

Mr. LANCASTER. They have been denied.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend denies without knowledge which is not an effective denial. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) challenged the figures I gave the House on a previous occasion. I did not give them as authoritative, I said I got them on what I believed to be good authority. I said that this particular variety of plough was sold in Brantford at $600, and was sold in Minneapolis at $502, after paying 15 per cent duty and the freight. My hon. friend or his company has sent a commission to Minneapolis, and they have found out that the figures I gave to the House are absolutely correct.

But he says that the Minneapolis figure was a wholesale figure, and the Brantford figure a retail figure, and that that accounted for the difference. Accepting the hon. member's statement that the figure of $502 at Minneapolis is a wholesale and not a retail figure, I still submit that the spread is entirely too great to allow the Brantford factory to remain in a position to claim the need of protection in order to enable it to compete with American manufacturers. In order to land their plough at Minneapolis the Brantford manufacturers have to pay an American duty of 15 per cent. If they have put in their plough at a fair valuation that duty will be not less than $60; therefore their plough at Minneapolis stands them not more than $442 against, not $600 at Brantford, but against $680 at Winnipeg, the point to which the same freight rate will prevail or ought to prevail as to Minneapolis. So that there is a spread as between the retail price at Winnipeg and the wholesale price at Minneapolis of the difference between $442 and $680, $238 on an article that sells in Minneapolis for $442. The conclusion is irresistible, taking the hon. member's own figures, that the Canadian company must in all fairness be able to compete within Canada against United States manufacturers at a lower rate of duty than that by which they are protected at present, and that when they say they cannot compete in Canada against United States manufacturers, the figures are here on record, the figures that my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) himself has agreed to as correct, as showing that there is absolutely no warrant for the statement. My hon. friend made the suggestion that if I thought there was money in the manufacture of ploughs I had better go into the business myself in order to compete. I am not a plough manufacturer and I have not the capital and I do not know that if I had I would put it into plough making, but I shall tell you what I did, what I tried to do, what the party with which I am allied tried to do: We tried to secure effective competition with the Canadian plough factories from insti-

tutions and organizations that could efficiently compete.

Mr. CURRIE. When?

Mr. OLIVER. By the agreement for reciprocity.

Mr. CURRIE. May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I think the hon. gentleman is through asking questions. We did not ask them to compete free of duty, we did not say that the duty should be taken off agricultural implements. All that we asked was that the duty should be made equal on both sides of the line. That was all we asked and they refused the request, they brought into play every argument of passion or prejudice, lying, disloyal arguments and then lined up the men who were under their control, who depended on them for their daily bread and told them: If reciprocity carries you will be out of work.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. And these men talk about Canadian national sentiment and the union of east and west! I have before me a statement that may bring into a vivid light the condition as respects the western farmer and the eastern implement manufacturer at this moment. I find it in the Winnipeg 'Tribune' of Wednesday, November 29. It is headed: The Purchasing Power of Barley. In that Mr. Mackenzie writes as follows:

While in St. John, a small town in Dakota, three or four miles from the Canadian border, inquiring into the prices paid for grain, I saw a farmer being paid 92 cents per bushel for barley in the grain elevator there.

If that barley was brought to a grain elevator in Brandon, Manitoba, it would realize 40 cents a bushel.

An eight-foot McCormick binder sells at St. John for $150.

In Brandon, the same machine costs $175.

A little figuring will show that in St. John, 163 bushels of barley will pay for an eight-foot McCormick binder.

In Brandon, 437 bushels of the same class of barley would be required.

Eighty-one bushels of barley will buy a farmers' wagon in Dakota.

It takes 212 bushels to buy the same kind of a wagon in Brandon.

The Dakota farmer gets eight gallons of coal oil in exchange for one bushel of barley.

A Manitoban must be satisfied with slightly over one gallon for the same quantity.

Had reciprocity carried, the price of barley would be the same in Brandon and St. John, freight rates to terminals being the same from both places.

It is said that the Cockshutt Plough Company of Brantford, Ont., sell their eight-bottom power gang ploughs in Minneapolis around $500, where barley sells from $1 to $1.15.

In Manitoba they charge $680.

In other words, the Minnesota farmer can draw 500 bushels of barley to an elevator and bring home a Cockshutt plough fully paid for.

But the Manitoba farmer would have to haul 1,700 bushels to an elevator in this province to get the same plough.

The Minnesota farmer can get a Cockshutt two-furrow plough for 81 bushels of barley.

The Manitoba farmer exchanges 212 bushels for the same article.

Truly the Manitoba farmer pays dearly for that brand of loyalty and patriotism which is represented by the Canadian manufacturer.

These facts and this condition are known only too well throughout western Canada by the people who are affected by them, and I take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the people of eastern Canada and the representatives of the people of eastern Canada and, if you like, the representatives of the manufacturing interests of eastern Canada, to those conditions which prevail in the west, and to ask them in the name of Canadian patriotism, in the name of loyalty to our country, to raise the heavy hand they have laid on this country and to allow the western farmer fair and equal opportunity to secure the advantage proper to the conditions which surround him. I ask that as a means of establishing in this country a Canadian patriotism. But I say to these gentlemen that it is not the way to establish patriotism to tell the population of by far the larger area of this country that they must submit to conditions that are essentially unfair even though they are exhorted to do it in the name of loyalty and patriotism. If there are to be sacrifices for loyalty and patriotism—and every one should be willing to make these sacrifices—let the sacrifices be on both sides; let them be in the east as well as in the west. We are willing to bear our share of the burden of the nation or of the burden of the empire, but we do not like to have to bear the burden of the nation and of the empire and the burden of the tyranny of the Manufacturers' Association—that association of mergers, trusts, combines and monopolies in this eastern country—in addition to the proper and reasonable burdens of the state and of the empire.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). This is a very interesting discussion and it is of vital importance to the people I represent. I feel that I would not be doing justice to my constituents, to the people of the west or to the farmers of all Canada, were I to permit this opportunity to pass without notice. I had not the pleasure of being in the House when the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) introduced the discussion, and as far as the manufacturing concern with which he is associated in a business way goes, I think the discussion may result in giving the product of that concern a very valuable advertisement. I

am willing to take the hon. gentleman's word as to what his intentions were in introducing the discussion, but I am not so sure that possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) had not an eye to that when he introduced the subject. I hope to show before I finish that another effect of the discussion will be to absolutely prove that so far as the Canadian farmer is concerned he is not getting a square deal from the Canadian manufacturer. Seeing, that the price charged by the Cockshutt Plough Company to the Canadian farmer is the illustration of that fact under discussion, I shall confine my remarks to that particular illustration. I notice that when my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) was concluding his remarks some gentleman on the other side of the House seemed very happy when he read from the columns of a western newspaper the penalty that the western farmer is paying as the result of the defeat of reciprocity. I wonder what these gentlemen opposite were smiling at.

Mr. LANCASTER. The excellence of the joke.

Mr. NEELY. That remark from my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) shows just how much sympathy he has with the people of this country who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. I believe, Sir, that the estimate made by the member for Edmonton as to the loss sustained by the western Canadian farmer on this year's crop as the result of the defeat of reciprocity is a very conservative estimate. I can tell my hon. friend from North Simcoe that this Mr. Roderick McKenzie to whom reference has been made, is a responsible person, and even though not a member of this House he is equally responsible with my hon. friend from North Simcoe. He is the editor of the 'Grain Growers' Guide' which is published in the interests of the farmers of the west, and he is a gentleman who operates a farm in the vicinity of Brandon. A short time ago Mr. Roderick McKenzie shipped two car loads of barley across the line to the United States. On that barley he paid $764 duty, and he realized over and above that $614 more for his barley on the American market than he could in his own market in the city of Brandon. So you see that so far as this particular farmer is concerned he at least lost a very considerable amount, as the result of the defeat of reciprocity. My hon. friend from Brantford undertook to give an explanation of the charges which have been again and again repeated in the columns of western newspapers and especially in the columns of the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' that the Cockshutt Plough Company was actually paying 15 per cent duty on ploughs which they sent to the United States and were selling these ploughs a great deal cheaper to the American farmer than they were sold in Canada to the Canadian farmer. I came into the Chamber when the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) was undertaking to explain that the price the ploughs were sold for at Minneapolis, as quoted by the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) was the wholesale price. I want to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) that it appears to me to be a very strange thing that the company which has had this charge laid at their doors for months past has not thought fit to refute it. It was brought to the attention of the Prime Minister on his western tour, because at a certain meeting he promised a farmer that he would look into that condition at the earliest possible opportunity. It is a strange thing that the member for Brantford is not able to furnish a better defence to that charge which has been laid at the doors of his company for months past than he has this afternoon. As incidental to the reading of the documents I have in this matter I may say that a year ago this month when the farmers' deputation came from the west, on the way back I discussed matters of interest with a young farmer who originally came from across the line and settled somewhere west of Saskatoon and he was complaining very bitterly of the treatment the western Canadian farmer was getting from the agricultural implement manufacturers of this country.

I took his address and he told me he would send me some figures in this connection. He did so. He sent me the original letters, of which I read two copies this afternoon. Both these letters give quotations of the Cockshutt ploughs. One was sent from the branch office at Saskatoon, and the other from the branch office of Avery and Company, Peoria, Illinois, at Minneapolis, although their head office is at Peoria. These letters are in response to requests from two farmers—the one living in Saskatchewan, and the other in the state of Minnesota. Both ask for prices on the Cockshutt plough, and the quotations cannot be in each instance wholesale prices. The first letter is written from the Saskatoon office:

Saskatoon, Sask., March 13, 1911.

Mr. F. J. Sandmeyer,
Coblenz, Sask.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of 8th inst. addressed to our Winnipeg office has been referred to us for our attention as your district comes under the supervision of this branch, and as requested now wish to quote you on an 8-furrow engine gang fitted with breaker bottoms and fin cutters, and which would cost you f.o.b. Saskatoon, $740, on the following terms:

$175 cash on delivery of plough.
$200 payable July 1st next.
$365 payable October 1st next.

Or one cash payment of $705 on delivery of plough.

You will note that we make a special inducement to our customers who can pay cash. We are mailing you under separate cover, a copy of our engine gang catalogue in the event of your not being already supplied with one of those and will be pleased to hear from you further with regard to your requirements in an engine gang and also to receive your valued order for same.

We may just add that we are represented at Coblenz by Mr. A. Bell, who will no doubt be pleased to give you any further information you may require and also receive your valued order which we will be glad to give prompt attention.

Thanking you in the meantime for the inquiry and trusting to be favoured with your valued order.

Yours very truly,
COCKSHUTT PLOUGH CO., LTD.,
Per Jno. Adams,
Manager, Saskatoon Branch.

That is the cash price at which a farmer in Saskatoon can get a Cockshutt engine gang plough for, $705. What is the price at which the farmer in Minnesota can get it:

Avery Company,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 14, 1911.
Mr. F. F. Sandmeyer,
St. James, Minn.

Dear Sir,—We have received yours of March 13 in regard to the Cockshutt plough and are mailing you the Cockshutt plough price list herewith. We wish to call your further attention that on the inside of your contract, you will find the Cockshutt ploughs listed. If you will take the discount mentioned in the contract, you can very easily figure up any combination that you want. We are afraid that you have not looked the contract over to get the prices on those goods.

Now, an 8-bottom gang, either stubble or breaker, is listed at $700. If you want extra lays with either one, they are $4.50 apiece. If you want rolling coulters with either one, they are $2.50 apiece. The fin cutters are 50 cents apiece. Now, take it on an 8-bottom, either stubble or breaker, the list is $700. Eight extra breaker shares, if the party wanted them, would be $36 more. If he wanted rolling coulters, it would be $20——

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understand you to say that this is a retail purchase?

Mr. NEELY. Exactly.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. He is evidently a contract agent since he refers to a contract. He is a contract agent and is getting a wholesale price.

Mr. NEELY. He is a young farmer.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. And a contract agent.

Mr. NEELY. He was only buying one plough, as the letter explains:

—or $756 in all. At 30 per cent off the list cash, it would be $529.20, plus Peoria freight to Minneapolis in carload rate, which would be about $12. Add the $12 and it would be $541.20 for that kind of a plough f.o.b Minneapolis. We believe with this price list before you, you would be able to figure out any combination.

The last paragraph will explain whether or not the price was a retail or wholesale price:

Now, we are not selling these ploughs to any one, unless we are getting cash right down for them, or one-half cash and the balance June 1; for the reason that we are unable to get them fast enough to take care of the orders. We have three coming which will undoubtedly be here inside of the next two weeks. If you want one, you will place your order at once, or we would be unable to get it for you. It is not a matter of selling them——

If my hon. friend wants an advertisement, I am doing him a good favour for I am giving him a little better one than the one he gave himself:

—it is simply a matter of getting them from the factory. It does seem as though everybody wanted Cockshutt ploughs. When they can't get them, then they turn to some other kind as second or third choice.

It is just the same as the children with castoria—

When they cannot get them, then they turn to some other kind as second or third choice.

Yours truly,
AVERY COMPANY,
J. M. Orton, Mgr.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I may inform the hon. gentleman that an agent is not required to take more than one of them, that is, a contract agent. I have had a wire from a Winnipeg representative who is in Minneapolis, stating that this price was quoted to an agent, not a farmer.

Mr. NEELY. I may tell my hon. friend that I have met farmer after farmer in the west who has priced these ploughs in Minneapolis, and they say that these figures are correct. I want to say further that the gentleman who gave me these letters told me that this man who writes to the office at Minneapolis, was, like himself, a young farmer farming in the state of Minnesota. So that I do not think there can be any doubt as to the contention of the western farmer that it would pay him to go across the line into the United States if he wanted to buy his agricultural implements in the cheapest market. Now, Sir, 15 per cent on the price of this plough must be paid before it crosses the line, on a valuation of $400 this amounts to $60.

Mr. THOBURN. Are we to understand from the statement that the hon. gentleman makes, that the manufacturer of agricultural implements pays the duty in sending them into the United States?

Mr. NEELY. I am not making any statement as to who pays the duty, because it

has no point so far as this argument is concerned. The point is that this plough is manufactured in the city of Brantford, Ontario, and that 15 per cent duty is paid on it when it goes into the United States.

Mr. THOBURN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the manufacturer had to pay the duty.

Mr. NEELY. I said nothing about that. I said that $60 duty is paid on it. The manufacturer on this side of the line has his profit on the sale that he makes to the company across the line that handles the plough, and still the farmer in the vicinity of Minneapolis can get it for $165 less than the farmer who goes into Saskatoon and plunks down his hard cash. Now, I think that is a perfectly fair statement, because I do not want to be unfair. I do not think there is a man on this side of the House who wants to make an unfair statement against the manufacturers of this country.

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), has stated that to his knowledge the price stated by the hon. gentleman is a price to the agent in the United States, not a price to the ordinary retailer. I think the hon. gentleman must accept that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood that the hon. member who is debating accepted the statement of the hon. member for Brantford, but he endeavours to present arguments to show that it may not be absolutely correct.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I do not mind a sensible interruption, but when my hon. friend from North Simcoe undertakes to place in the mouth of another member of this House a statement which he did not make, then I object to that sort of interruption. The hon. member for Brantford did not say as a member of this House that he was satisfied that was simply a contract price to agents. He said he had a wire or some information to that effect from some of his agents across the line. But I say that the information that I have is absolutely authentic, and I am satisfied, ought to demonstrate the point I am making to the House. I was going on to say that no member on this side of the House wants to make an unfair statement against the manufacturers of this country or against any industry of this country. We do not want to have any schism, east, west, north or south; but what we do want and what we have tried to obtain for the farmers is the right and the privilege now enjoyed by the manufacturers of selling their goods in any market where they can get a good price.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock I had almost concluded my argument, giving evidence of the well established fact stated by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that the price for which a certain plough manufactured in this country is sold in Canada is very much higher than the price for which the same plough is sold in the United States, after a duty of 15 per cent has been paid on it. I overlooked one point in the explanation given by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) who said that the company who handle their ploughs in the United States, their sole agents, were also engaged in the sale of engines which they sold in conjunction with these ploughs, and because of the high price they received for the engines they were able to sell the ploughs practically at cost. But in the quotation I gave with reference to the price at which these ploughs are sold in the United States, there was no reference to an engine being sold as part of the outfit, it was simply a question of the sale of a plough by itself, so that this argument of the hon. member for Brantford does not justify this great disparity of price in favour of the American farmer who wishes to purchase a Cockshutt plough. The letter I read from the agency of the Cockshutt Plough Company at Minneapolis referred to the sale of one individual plough and this demonstrates that this is a retail price to any individual purchaser of a plough in the United States of America. Further, my own information obtained from the gentleman who got the quotation on a Cockshutt plough sold at Saskatoon was that the man who had obtained the information from the Minneapolis agent of the Cockshutt Plough Company was an actual farmer and that the quotation to him was as an actual farmer. As we have said, we have no desire to be unfair. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) opened this discussion himself and since he has brought it up it seems to me it would be just as well to clear the atmosphere as far as we can, and allow the House to see the viewpoint of the farmer of western Canada in connection with these questions. As evidence that the manufacturers of ploughs and other agricultural implements do not enjoy too much protection under the present tariff, the member for Brantford pointed out that a great plough company, the Wilkinson Plough Company, which had existed for many years in Ontario had recently gone to the wall. The last straw that broke the camel's back was not the passing of reciprocity, but the bare prospect of the passing of reciprocity. That was the statement made by the hon. member for Brantford. The banks

refused to come further to the assistance of the Wilkinson Plough Company just because there was the bare prospect of the passing of reciprocity. That seems a strange thing. Does the hon. member undertake to say that the proposed reduction in the duty on ploughs entering Canada from 20 per cent to 15 per cent was sufficient to put out of business one of the oldest manufacturing concerns in Ontario? Does he undertake to say that the 15 per cent protection which was still afforded by the reciprocity agreement on the item of ploughs was not a sufficient burden for the taxpayer of this country to bear in order to protect the manufacturing industries of this country? It seems a strange corollary to that argument that the company with which my hon. friend is associated can sell its ploughs in the United States of America, that somebody can pay 15 per cent duty on these ploughs and yet they can be sold there much more cheaply than they are actually sold to the Canadian farmer. It is a strange argument that this proposed reduction of 5 per cent on the item of ploughs was sufficient to lead the banking institutions of this country to say: We will no longer lend support to the Wilkinson Plough Company. My hon. friend's argument was very inconclusive. Many industries have gone to the wall in this country from time to time, but that was not necessarily due to lack of sufficient protection in the tariff. My friend knows well that the question of the management of a company has a great deal to do with its success or failure. So I repeat the hon. member will have to give us some further evidence that the 15 per cent on ploughs entering Canada from the United States is not sufficient protection for the plough manufacturer in this country. If I have any fault to find with the manufacturers of eastern Canada it is that in the proposed reciprocity pact the reduction of duties on manufactured articles, confined as it was very largely to agricultural implements, was so inconsiderable that I can find no justification for the attitude assumed by the majority of manufacturers in their opposition to this agreement.

My hon. friend has accused the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) of undertaking to stir up strife between the east and the west. If there is any feeling of bitterness in the hearts of the farmers in the west over the defeat of the reciprocity agreement it is due to the attitude of the financial interests, and the manufacturers of Canada. If there is any division it is due to the fact that these interests and these gentlemen took a position in opposition to the reciprocity agreement which was not justified by the contents of the agreement itself. There is evidence on every hand, and the evidence continues to multiply from day to day, that there was a conspiracy on the part of the financial interests of the east, the manufacturers and others, to defeat the reciprocity agreement and prevent the Canadian farmer from getting what these gentlemen claim for themselves, the right to sell their goods in the best possible market.

My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) gave us an evidence of that conspiracy when he told us that the banks refused further to go to the assistance of the Wilkinson Plough Company, at the mere prospect of the passing of reciprocity. Is that not evidence of conspiracy on the part of the financial institutions of this country when the banks—a fine spectacular effect, a splendid dramatic effect, this—when the banks say: 'We will not come to the aid of this Wilkinson Plough Company because there is a prospect of the duty on ploughs coming in from the United States being reduced from 20 to 15 per cent. Now, Sir, that that is the case, that there was such a conspiracy, that it was well conceived and well carried out, the results of the election on the 21st of September absolutely demonstrate. That there was such a conspiracy there is evidence accumulating on every hand, and some of the methods that were adopted by some of the manufacturers of this country were of a very subtle character indeed. I want to say that so far as this particular manufacturing company is concerned, I am not finding any more fault with it than with any other manufacturing concern. The manufacturers of Canada naturally take advantage of the tariff, they would hardly be human if they did not. The fault I have to find is with the condition which permits them to take such an unfair advantage, as I claim they are taking, of the consumers of agricultural implements at the present time; the fault I have to find with them is this, that they exerted their enormous influence in eastern Canada for the defeat of a proposition which, as regards duties on manufactured articles affected them but slightly, but which certainly gave to the farmers of this country free access to the splendid market which we may never again have an opportunity to give to those farmers.

I have said that the methods adopted by these manufacturing concerns and other interests to defeat reciprocity, were of a subtle character. I do not know what part the Cockshutt Plough Company took in the elections, and I am not concerned about it. But there is another big concern that manufactures another kind of agricultural implement for the benefit of the farmers of this country, and more especially for their own benefit, that is the Massey-Harris Company, which manufactures binders, mowers and other machinery of that kind. Now I believe that the hon. member for Portage la

Prairie (Mr. Meighen)—I do not see him in his seat—in his resolution of a year or two ago dealing with the question of the reduction of duty on agricultural implements, twitted the late government on the fact that some of the manufacturers at least were friends of the late government. Now, Sir, I want to say right here and now that in my judgment the events of the last three months have made the fact absolutely clear, that in this Dominion of Canada we have certain interests that, when it comes to a question of their own pockets, have no friends, have no patriotism, have no citizenship and have no country. Now what are the facts in that connection? As an association, probably the Manufacturers' Association will tell the farmers that they did not take a part in the recent election. But what are the facts in regard to that matter? I have in my possession copies of two letters which were sent from the branch office of the Massey-Harris Company in the city of Saskatoon, to one of their agents—I am not at liberty to give the name of the agent who gave me these papers, but any member of the House may assure himself of the authenticity of the documents. One of these letters was dated the 11th of September, just ten days before the election. The letter reads as follows, addressed to the agent, of course:

Dear Sir,—Gasolene Engine Trade—Following up our advices of a few days since we are mailing under separate cover latest catalogue giving full particulars in a descriptive and illustrated way, and of which a supply is going to your agency under separate mail for judicious use in connection with your canvassing work. The catalogue is well prepared and well written up, and supplies a deal of useful data, and will be effective in closing business.

You will notice that in these documents there is absolutely no reference to the election, none whatever. But we can draw our own conclusions.

Prices.—Now that we are about the 1st October (the date upon which our last schedule for maturities was based) we are enclosing revised schedule from which to work with the trade now to be booked. Some of our staff have been asking a retail 'spot-cash-price.' You will notice from the schedule that this has been embodied. These prices, both the spot-cash and the time term prices, are 'rock-bottom'——

So you see there is such a thing as a rock-bottom price in the trade in agricultural implements.

—and should enable you to get a good safe trade. We draw your attention to the schedule so that it may be fully understood and trade booked in accordance with the same. Acknowledge, please, receipt of catalogue and schedule, that we may know same has safely reached your hands.

(Signed) MASSEY-HARRIS CO., LTD.,
By their agent

Now that was on the 11th of September, ten days before the election.

Mr. CURRIE. Will the hon. gentleman put that document on the table now, having read it?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I am not obliged to accede to the dictation of my hon. friend. It is not a public document, it is a private document. That letter was written, these catalogues were sent out, these rock-bottom prices were sent out, on the 11th of September, ten days before the election.

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Speaker, I again claim that the hon. gentleman having read that document and made it public, should lay it on the table.

Mr. NEELY. I leave the hon. gentleman in your charge.

Mr. SPEAKER. If a minister of the Crown were quoting from a public document he would be obliged to leave it on the table. But that rule does not apply to private letters, it is not necessary to table them.

Mr. NEELY. Now on the 23rd of September, two days after the elections, when it was absolutely demonstrated to all the people of Canada that the late government had been defeated, and that the reciprocity pact was no more, the same agent receives the following letter, from the same agent at Saskatoon:

We issued last week a schedule of new prices and terms on these. Please cancel same and do not act upon them until further advices authorized you. Meantime, this is to advise that trade in engines will require to be booked and cared for upon the basis of the schedule advised to you last spring under date of March 1. Kindly acknowledge receipt of this correction and return with your acknowledgement of schedule issued last week that there may be no misunderstanding and oblige.

Yours truly,
MASSEY-HARRIS CO.

Now, there was no electioneering in that—none whatever. It was simply a little catalogue sent out on the 11th September bringing the prices of binders, mowers and other farm machinery down to rock bottom. But these catalogues were short lived, and on the 23rd September another circular was issued calling them in and the price is again put up to the place where it was before. I am told that since the defeat of reciprocity on the 21st of September, while the price of the binder in its entirety has not been raised, a large increase has taken place in the price of the parts of the binder. That is a considerable item so far as the farmer is concerned because he has breakages, and must have repairs and the prices for repairs have gone up from 50 to 150 per cent. I ask this House if this

is not an intolerable situation in so far as the farmers of western Canada are concerned. They have absolutely no quarrel with the manufacturer of the east excepting that they want a square deal from the government. Does the manufacturer not know that when the western farmer prospers he must share in that prosperity? Does he not know that if the western farmer gets more for his barley, his wheat and his live stock he is going to have more money with which to purchase agricultural implements in the east, Cockshutt ploughs and Massey Harris binders, if you please? The story was told by many of the employers of labour in eastern Canada during the recent contest that if this reciprocity pact went into effect the result would be to throw a great many employees out of work, whereas the fact is that the increased business that would have come to the manufacturers in eastern Canada would have given more employment to the working men of these eastern provinces. Let me show you what was the main argument that was used against giving to the farmer the same privilege that the manufacturer already enjoys in this country. If the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) were in his seat he could tell us something about the reason why reciprocity was defeated on the 21st of September. He could tell us about that manifesto that was signed by eighteen Liberals in the city of Toronto, in which number he himself was included, in which the strong argument was the effect that the agreement might have upon our Canadian nationality in that it would cause trade to pass north and south instead of in the present channel east and west, between Canada and the mother country. I said a moment ago that when it comes to a question of dollars and cents there are certain interests in this country that have neither patriotism nor citizenship. Has not that been absolutely demonstrated in the course of events? What was one of the first things that took place after the election of the 21st of September? The manufacturers of Ontario assembled in a body and passed a resolution, which they knew would get a sympathetic reception from the new government, that it would be injurious to the interests of Canada at the present time to increase the British preference. Yet these very same people helped to defend the late government by raising the cry of loyalty. Just as soon as the elections were over they take advantage of the very first opportunity to put a block in the way of making it possible for this country to buy more than it does at the present time from the British manufacturer instead of the American manufacturer. These are facts that no hon. gentleman can refute and I want to express my gratitude to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) for having brought this question before the House. It is a question that is important enough to occupy some of the time of this House. It means dollars and cents and a great many of them to the pockets of the great mass of the farmers of this country. I could not allow this opportunity to pass without raising my voice on behalf of the men of the west who have absolutely no desire to injure any industry in this country, but who resent, and will continue to resent, the attitude taken by certain interests who have prevented them for the present at least, from obtaining free access to the great market of the United States.

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to waste the time of the House in discussing a subject that seems to have been on the brain of hon. gentlemen opposite ever since they came back to this parliament. Hon. gentlemen have been wasting the time of the House discussing this subject which was brought up by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). He made a fair statement to the House. He stated that there is a plough made in Brantford by the Cockshutt Plough Company, and sold in the United States by an agent who sells it as an accessory to a steam traction engine. By the way, one of the chief officers of that company, as many hon. members on the other side of the House from Ontario know, Mr. Frank Cockshutt, is a very good Liberal. That is something that the House should know and, what is more about this cry about the agricultural implement manufacturers is this, that almost every manufacturer of agricultural implements in Canada is a hide bound Grit and nearly every one of them has been put in the Senate by the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Frost & Woods firm, has given a member to the Senate, so has the Massey Harris firm and, I suppose, if the right hon. gentleman had won the election, the Cockshutt firm would have had a member in the Senate. That is the strangest part of the whole proceeding. We have been listening patiently to all this talk and we have been endeavouring to temper the wind to the shorn lambs on the other side of the House. Hon. gentleman opposite have been endeavouring to find some consolation for themselves by explaining how they happened to get into the cold shades of opposition. One member says that it was nationalism in Quebec, another member says that it was the cry of loyalty, another member, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), says it was due to Father Vaughan, then the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) spent four or five hours talking about this question and he assumes that it was the Ne Temere decree that did the harm. Has anybody opposite mentioned anything about the

Oliver charges playing a part in this election?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has made some mention of the Oliver charges. I would like to say that there are no Oliver charges up to date, neither made inside this House nor outside this House. And if my hon. friend has any charge to make or if any of his hon. friends behind him——

An hon. MEMBER. Or in front of him.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, either in front of him or behind him, have any charge to make, now is the time for them to make it. I ask Mr. Speaker that my hon. friend withdraw the suggestion he has made to the effect that charges have been made against me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. CURRIE. I simply ask if anybody in the House has heard any of the Liberals state that what happened to them in the elections was due partly to the Oliver charges. I did not make any charges against a gentleman named Oliver, but I have a distinct recollection that there was a committee of this House named last session to investigate certain charges against a certain gentleman of the name of Oliver.

Mr, OLIVER. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the reference made by the hon. member (Mr. Currie) is unparliamentary.

Mr. CURRIE. All right, Sir, I will go on. Then there was the Fielding subscription list, and nobody told us that hurt the Liberal party in the last election. The people of Canada were heartily tired of the Liberal party and a great many things conspired to destroy that party. The country had lost all faith in the leader of that party. They had lost faith in the great idol that had been set up and worshipped until it fell off its pedestal on the 21st of September. Now they are endeavouring to roll it back on that pedestal to see if the people will worship it again, but let me tell the right hon. gentleman that the greater portion of his own party will no longer bind phylacteries around their brows—I think those were the words used by the right hon. gentleman on an historic occasion—and worship longer at the great Laurier shrine. Since this session opened hon. members from the west have endeavoured to raise the cry of the western farmers against the eastern farmers, but I can not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely), who has just spoken, is a very true representative of the farmers. If the embattled farmers of the west are so anxious to have a voice in parliament, they should send some of their own kind down here, as the farmers of Ontario have done, rather than doctors and lawyers. The hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), day after day is trying to bring grist to his own mill by setting up the west against the east, and especially against the province of Ontario. One would think that in the province of Ontario nothing grew but factories, but it may be a surprise to some of these gentlemen opposite to know that the province of Ontario produced last year forty-seven million dollars worth of field products more than the whole of the west combined. And, I can tell these hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who come from the west, that the farmers of Ontario voted almost to a man against reciprocity, and they did so because they found that the American farmers had been sending into the Canadian market over thirty million dollars worth of farm products which should be grown in Canada. If a man wants to grow food for the Canadian people he should grow it in Canada, and if a man wants to manufacture agricultural implements for the Canadian farmer he should manufacture them in Canada, all of which is good, sound, national and loyal doctrine. That is the idea that permeates the people of Ontario ; that is the idea of the old National Policy, and that is the idea that triumphed on the 21st of September. For many years when the Liberals were in power and the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) sat in the government, that government did not take one step to improve the condition of the western farmer. I have here a copy of the Payne tariff passed by the Congress in 1909, and item 476 reads :

476. Ploughs, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines, and cotton gins, fifteen per centum ad valorem: Provided, that any of the foregoing, when imported from any country, dependency, province, or colony, which imposes no tax or duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be imported free of duty.

That means that the Americans offered reciprocity in these very ploughs that we hear so much about, when the Canadian government placed ploughs on the free list, and yet the Liberals who were in power then, never availed themselves of that offer. Does not that take all the point out of the argument made by hon. gentlemen opposite ? They will find it hard to explain to the farmers of the west why they did not take advantage of that offer without waiting for the reciprocity treaty. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), is a great believer in reciprocity and I hope he will keep on believing in it and attacking Ontario, because so long as he does—

and his own leader will confirm me in this —he and his party will remain in opposition. Now, I will ask the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) if he believes, like all the rest of his free trade friends, that the consumer pays the duty ?

Mr. OLIVER. Sometimes he does and sometimes he does not ; it all depends on circumstances.

Mr. CURRIE. Well, that's no answer. During the campaign the farmers would come and say to me : ' Mr. Currie, can you tell us how it is that according to the Liberals we are going to get more for our products if we have reciprocity, and that the people who buy these products will pay less for them.'

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. member like me to answer that question ?

Mr. CURRIE. Sure.

Mr. OLIVER. I will answer it by reading an item from the ' Ottawa Citizen,' which I clipped out this morning.

Mr. CURRIE. We don't want a speech.

Mr. OLIVER. It will be an answer to your question. It reads :

MATTHEWS-LAING ISSUE.

A public issue of the Matthews-Laing Packing Company's 6 per cent bonds will shortly be made by C. Meredith and Company, Limited, of Montreal, who purchased $1,200,000 worth of these securities. It is understood that most of the bonds have already been placed with financial houses, who are attracted to them by the splendid earnings of the companies. For the past three years the earnings have been more than four times the bond interest. The bonds are being issued against 60 per cent of the assets of the combined companies.

It is in the profits of companies such as this that the answer to my hon. friend's question is found.

Mr. CURRIE. That is no answer to my question. I asked the hon. gentleman a simple question as to whether he believed the consumer paid the duty, and as a free trader he should answer.

I want an answer one way or the other, but instead of giving an answer the hon. gentleman reads a lot of papers. We in the east are not so ignorant of western conditions as the hon. gentleman and some of his friends think we are. We are told that if we go west and take up land and farm, we can make a profit of fifty per cent on our money. A great many farmers of the west farm under conditions which are dissimilar to those which obtain on the smaller farms of Ontario. The average farm in the west is 1,000 acres of land which, taking the average value at $25 an acre amounts to $25,000, and the men who work those lands make from $12,000 to $15,000 a year net profit. There is no better paying industry in Canada than farming in the west. Those great farmers surely are not the men who are crying out for government assistance. If the hon. gentleman would ask the government to look after some of the poor and unfortunate homestead settlers who have just gone into the country and are now suffering owing to the sudden snowfall, if he would ask this government to give them some aid, instead of making long harangues against the National Policy or the eastern manufacturers, he would also do far more for the settlers who are thus suffering, many of whom have written to me complaining of the crop conditions than in crying out against a policy which the late government, of which he was a member, carried out during many years—the old Conservative policy. That government just continued the old Conservative policy. True they made great and many promises, but that government never kept a single promise they ever made. The strangest thing of all is that the one promise, namely, that they would give our people reciprocity, which they did make and they tried to implement and keep, defeated them in the last election. The present government has only been in office a short time, and it is quite true that it has received large support in the east. Well, what the people of the east mainly desire is to have industrial and commercial peace. They do not want when they go to bed at night to dread waking up the next morning bankrupt by some act of the government, but they want to feel that their business interests and property are protected and secure. They want to get rid for ever of those continual cries of sectionalism, raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, exciting the manufacturers against the farmers, and vice versa, and the working men against both, and they emphatically decided to put an end to those cries on the 21st of September last. They wanted to put an end to the inciting of race against race, raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. They wanted to end the policy of sacrificing the interests of the country either to Great Britain or the United States. There came a time when there was not one member among members opposite to say a word on behalf of Canada. Was it any wonder that they lost the confidence of the Canadian people and were defeated on the 21st of September last?

The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) asked if we had forgotten that there has been an election. Well, no, but we feel a great deal of sympathy for him and those behind him. We feel a great deal of sympathy for men like Mr. McKenzie of the Grain Growers' Association who was to be grain commissioner under the Bill which

the late government had in contemplation, and we sympathize very much with the Grain Growers' executive and members of the opposition, whose leader was so unfortunate as to be compelled to turn over to our party the plum tree, as one of them has said, with the plums on it. I am very sorry indeed that these hon. gentlemen opposite have not been able to pluck all those plums. Day after day we find the journals of the United States offering the highest offices in the gifts of the government to the right hon. the leader of the opposition and his followers. The New York 'American,' which is the great family journal of the leader of the opposition, stated the other day that he was to be the Lord High Commissioner from Canada to London. That journal evidently forgot that there was an election on the 21st of September.

As regards this question of ploughs, my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has explained the circumstances. There is a plough made in Brantford called the 'Cockshutt' plough, which is the best plough made in Canada or the United States. It is covered by a patent and is sold not only in Canada and the United States, but in Australia, New Zealand, the Argentine Republic, Great Britain and Ireland, Germany and France. That is an enterprise which is a credit to Canada, and Canadians if they are allowed to work out their own salvation without the interference of the government can always succeed. These ploughs sell around $600 a piece, and an American firm has the agency for selling them in the United States. That firm, I understand, makes the best traction engine in that country, and combines its engine with the Cockshutt plough. The price of the engine is from $4,000 to $5,000, whereas that of the plough made in Canada is $600. The profit on the plough bears no comparison with that on the engine. Any one who knows anything about the manufacture of engines will know that the manufacturer will reap fully $1,000 profit on each one he sells, and that there cannot be any such profit on the plough. The plough is merely an accessory of the engine, and for that reason the American manufacturer could give the Cockshutt plough away at a reduced price or even free and still have a good profit on both combined. As a matter of fact he has a monopoly to sell the combined plough and engine in the United States and they cannot be bought from any other firm as both are covered by royalty and patent.

As I have said the late government, of which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was a member, had from the United States an offer of reciprocity in ploughs before it during two years and it never took any action. What did the defeat of reciprocity mean as regards the price of ploughs? To hear hon. gentlemen opposite one would think it meant thousands of dollars. Well, all it meant was a difference of $12 in the price of the plough, that being the difference if we had reciprocity. And as a plough lasts 12 years, all that the farmers of the west can possibly lose is one dollar per annum on every Cockshutt plough.

The people of the east and all over the country are getting tired of those cries. The farmers of the west desire to be on good terms with the manufacturers of the east, and the people of the west hope some day to manufacture these implements in that country themselves. That is the desire which all those who believe in Canada would like to see realized. We are anxious to see the west manufacture for itself. What we on this side desire is that if a man wants to grow or manufacture for Canada, he should do so in Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Currie) has taken hon. gentlemen on this side somewhat to task for having brought up this discussion. But what I would like to point out to him is that the discussion was not brought forward by any member on this side, but by one of his own colleagues. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr Cockshutt)

This matter has been so well and ably discussed from the farmers' standpoint on this side of the House that there is not very much that I need say. But one thing I want to take exception to as strongly as I can, and that is the argument that is being put forward on the other side of the House that it is the people of the west who are trying to make a cleavage between the people of the west and the people of the east. It is nothing of the kind. The western farmer has no desire to do anything to separate the east from the west; nor has any western representative on this side of the House. It is the action of our hon. friends opposite and their supporters who are making the cleavage between the east and the west, if there is any cleavage. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), who is not in the House at the present time, made the statement in the city of Montreal just before he took his seat in this House that there was great danger of a cleavage taking place between the east and the west. Why did he say so? As a western man he knows perfectly well that if the manufacturers, the financiers, the combines, the mergers and the monopolies of the east continue to do in the future as they have been doing in the past, they are bound to force a cleavage between the people of the east and the people of the west. It is not our doing or our desire. We do not want to see anything of the kind, and all we are doing is to point out to this

House and to the people of the country that it is the action of certain interests in eastern Canada that is going to bring this about if it is brought about at all. I do not think it is possible to make the people of the west disloyal to Canada. I have never seen anything to make me think otherwise in all the years that I have spent in that western country. At the same time, I wish to point out that if you want to have a contented, happy and prosperous people throughout the Dominion of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, there must be a spirit of fair-play from one end of the country to the other. You cannot have one condition of things for the manufacturer in the east and another condition of things for the farmer of the west or the farmer of the east. If you want to have a contented and prosperous people, you must have fair-play; equalize the burden; do not put all the taxes on one class of the community, which is pretty nearly what is being done at the present time. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) tried to make out, in the few minutes that he devoted to the question before the House, namely, the question of the different prices for the Cockshutt plough in Canada and in the United States, that it was a mere trifle, only about a dollar a year on a steam plough; and he tried to make this House believe that a steam gang plough that would cost $500 or $600 would take a $5,000 or $6,000 engine to draw it, and he told us that he among others in the east knew something about conditions in the west. Well, if his general knowledge of conditions in the west is no more accurate than his knowledge on that point, he does not know as much as he imagines; and I imagine that his own friends on the other side of the House do not think he knows as much as he imagines he knows, or if they did, he would now be directing the affairs of the Militia Department instead of somebody else. My hon. friend has a good deal to learn before he undertakes to lecture people from other parts of the country.

Now, I have not a word to say against the Cockshutt plough. I have seen them in the west, they are good ploughs, and it is a credit to Canada that we have such a factory as that of the Cockshutt Plough Company. But I do say that when the Cockshutt Plough Company can make the ploughs in Canada, ship them to the United States, and either themselves or their agents there, pay 15 per cent duty on them, and in addition pay 45 per cent duty on all the repairs that go into the United States to keep the ploughs running, then why in the name of common sense cannot they sell them in the Dominion of Canada at as low a price as they do in the United States? It is all very well for the hon. member for Brantford to say that the farmer to whom my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) refers was an agent. That is all nonsense, and I venture to say that the hon. member cannot substantiate the statement that every plough sold in the United States is sold to an agent. They are sold to the farmers. My hon. friend from Simcoe spoke as if it were something wonderful to see a Cockshutt plough or any other kind of gang plough. Well, it may be in that part of Ontario from which he comes, because I can understand that where there is not a great deal of grain grown and the farms are not exceptionally large a steam gang plough would not be advantageous. But I could take my hon. friend to a section in the Northwest and show him 40 or 50 steam or gasolene gang ploughs at work at one time, and I know agents who have sold 70 or 75 complete outfits in a season. Even if my hon. friend could show that in the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Humboldt it was an agent, though it was a farmer, who bought the plough I can give him a case in which it was not an agent. I can give him the case of a man in my own constituency who a few years ago was a farmer in the United States, and who bought a Cockshutt plough while there. If the statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe is true, that the company in the United States that sells these ploughs has an absolute monopoly through patents and royalties on them, why is it necessary for them to quote a price in the United States below the price in Canada? That statement will not bear investigation, nor will the statement of my hon. friend from Brantford that it was the wholesale price to agents that he quoted.

I can give him the case of a farmer in the United States who bought a Cockshutt plough for $500, a gang plough for a steam engine. A year or so after buying the plough in the United States he came into Canada and settled near Weyburn in Saskatchewan. He started farming on a large scale. He said the Cockshutt plough was a good plough and when he wanted another steam plough he thought he could not do better than get another Cockshutt. You know it is an advantage to a farmer to have two implements of the same make owing to the greater convenience of repairs. My hon. friend went to the Cockshutt office and asked about another plough. What was he told? For the very same plough for which he paid in the United States, $500, the same make, the same number of bottoms, the same size, in every way identical, the same plough manufactured by the Cockshutt Plough Company of Brantford, he was asked over $700. Does any hon.

gentleman imagine that that sort of thing can continue and that the people of the west will remain satisfied? I claim that when the Cockshutt Plough Company or any other plough company can manufacture goods in Canada, pay the duty and send them into the United States and sell them at 20 per cent less than they are sold at home, the farmer of the west is being robbed in broad daylight. There is no other name for it.

Mr. STAPLES. In what year did that transaction take place?

Mr. TURRIFF. The price was quoted in Weyburn this summer.

Mr. STAPLES. When did he purchase the other plough?

Mr. TURRIFF. I could not give the exact year but it was within the last three years. So I say it is absurd to think that the people of the west will remain satisfied with that condition of affairs. What are the people of the west dissatisfied about? You have not heard them complaining very much about the prices of manufactured goods. Under this reciprocity agreement they were not asking for the duties to be touched practically on manufactured goods, they were asking for the American market, they were asking for exactly the same rights and privileges that every manufacturer in Canada insists on having for himself, that is the right to sell his goods in the best market and to buy his material in the best market also; but they were not asking for a general reduction on duties in manufactured goods. They felt that if they got the American market, the finest market in the world for the products of the western farmer, they were getting, to a large extent, what they had been wanting all these years, and that it would have enabled them to prosper even if they did pay a somewhat high price for much of their manufactured goods. We on this side of the House were defeated on this question of reciprocity largely by the combined eflorts of the manufacturers, Liberals and Conservatives alike.

An hon. MEMBER. And by the votes of the farmers.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend says by the votes of the farmers. Some farmers may have voted against it in the east and some possibly in the west, but I think it will keep my hon. friends very busy in Ontario to make the Ontario farmer believe for very long that he was not fooled——

An hon. MEMBER. Don't you believe yourself.

Mr. TURRIFF—that he was not bribed with his own money. I think it will give my hon. friends from Ontario some trouble, after a little, to make the farmers of Ontario believe that they were not fooled in reference to this question, that they were not led away by the cry of disloyalty, a cry that my hon. friends on the other side of the House always put up when it is going to do them any good. The interests represented by my hon. friends on the other side of the House are very prone to talk about their loyalty. They are always loyal as long as they are allowed by law to put their hands in the pockets of the consumer and extract a little more than they are entitled to. They are always loyal then, but when it comes to a fair deal between themselves and the farmers, their loyalty does not amount to much. They talk about their loyalty to Great Britain and that it would be a disloyal action on the part of Canada to sell our products to the United States if we could get a better price. But the moment the election is over these same interests get together and pass resolutions saying that we do not want any increased preference to Great Britain. Every one of these same interests did their utmost against the preferential tariff to Great Britain when it was passed, and I will venture to say that if the government of my hon. friends opposite proposed to increase that preference to Great Britain, you would see every one of these manufacturers Liberals and Conservatives alike, coming out flatfooted against any further preference to Great Britain. That is the way they show their loyalty. They are loyal to Great Britain as long as it pays them; as they put it in one of their resolutions a few years ago: Make the preferential tariff high enough to keep out all British goods and then put the general tariff up double as high. That is the class of loyalty that these big interests have. The western farmer is not asking to buy his material in the United States, he is only asking for the privilege of selling the product of his farm where he can sell it to the best advantage. My hon. friend the member for Brantford stated that when this tariff commission was appointed the whole matter would be investigated. That is just another piece of the fine work of the manufacturers. The manufacturers of Canada have been for many years past clamouring for a tariff commission. I quite understand that it is not intended that the tariff commission should have the power to pass laws, that their recommendations would have to be submitted and passed upon by this House, but I would point out that when you have a tariff commission altogether in sympathy with the manufacturers of Canada, spending their whole time in gathering information to lay before this House and before the people of Canada——

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We won't have that kind.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend from Souris says they won't have that kind. I imagine my hon. friend will not be very much consulted as to the nature of the commission that will be appointed to consider this question. At all events, I can point out to my hon. friend that it is what the manufacturers have been asking for all these years. It is not what the farmers have been asking for. They want reductions, they want markets; it is the manufacturers who have been clamouring for a commission to deal with these questions.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the hon. gentleman aware that his leader in Montreal promised the manufacturers that he would appoint a tariff commission if they desired it.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend is pointing out something of which I am thoroughly aware, and it just shows that the manufacturing interests in the east, Liberal and Conservative, have very strong influences on both sides of the House.

The fact that a tariff commission would be appointed by either one side or the other does not necessarily make it the proper way to deal with the question. I am not going to say that a tariff commission could not get a great deal of useful information, but what I am afraid of is that, under the present government, a tariff commission will be appointed so absolutely in sympathy with the manufacturing interests who have done so much to put my hon. friends opposite where they are, that the farmers will not have an even chance with the manufacturers under that commission, no more than they have now in the markets of the world. My hon. friend tried to make a great point by saying that if the duties were taken off agricultural implements the manufacturers of steel, and paints, and canvas, and other materials that go into the manufacture of implements, would all suffer. But I venture the assertion that neither the company with which my hon. friend is connected, or any other manufacturing concern, will pay the Canadian maker of these goods one-tenth of one-per cent more than they can buy the same goods for in Great Britain, Germany, France, United States or any other country in the world. I think they are perfectly right in that, it is quite right that they should have a free market in which to buy their goods. But the House should bear this in mind also that not only on the goods they export do they get a rebate of all the duties paid on the material used in those implements, but they also get a rebate on the implements sold to the consumer in Canada, they get a rebate of the duties that were paid on the raw material that goes into these implements. So the implement manufacturer is in a splendid position to supply the people of Canada with implements just as cheaply as they supply them to the farmers of the United States. When the farmer of the United States can buy Canadian implements so much cheaper than the Canadian farmer can buy them, don't you think, Mr. Speaker, it would be reasonable to allow that same Canadian farmer who has to pay the extra price on the implements that produce his wheat, to sell his wheat in the American market if he can get a better price for it there? If he cannot get a better price for it there, he won't send it there. But I venture the assertion that there is not one day in the month, year in and year out, that the western farmer cannot get a better price for the products of his farm in the United States than he can get at home; I make that assertion without any fear of successful contradiction, simply because it has been proven time and again. There are numbers of my constituents who never sell a bushel of wheat, or of grain, in Canada, who never sell one head of cattle in Canada, who never sell a pig in Canada, who draw it all across the line and pay the duty, and sell every dollar's worth of goods there.

Mr. CURRIE. Who pays the duty?

Mr. TURRIFF. The people who buy them pay the duty.

Mr. CURRIE. How does the Canadian farmer lose in sending his stuff to the states?

Mr. TURRIFF. These farmers in my constituency draw their wheat over, they drive their cattle over, they draw their hogs over, and the buyers over there pay a higher price than the farmer can get at home, and pay the duty, and the farmer gets a much better price after paying the duty. Imagine the difference it would make if they could send those goods across without paying the duty. I have letters from my constituency at the present time, pointing out that, owing to the damaged condition of the wheat, the poor quality of the wheat, there is a lot of wheat in my constituency for which farmers can get only forty cents a bushel, whereas if they could send that wheat across to the United States they could get almost double price for it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What do they use it for over there?

Mr. TURRIFF. It is a low grade of wheat that they grind to make flour. The farmers could get almost double the price for it in the United States, but owing to the reciprocity agreement being defeated, they cannot get that market, and it was defeated by the very interests that we are discussing to-night, among others the agricultural interests. Throughout my whole constituency during the campaign, the Massey-

Harris Company sent out circulars to their employees, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sent out circulars, at least they were sent from the Canadian Pacific Railway offices to their employees throughout that country; the Ogilvie Milling Company sent out circulars to their employees, and a special circular to the farmers, pointing out what they would lose. At the same time it has been proven clearly that for years back the Ogilvie people and all the big milling companies, have bought their wheat for at least ten cents a bushel less than the Minneapolis millers pay for their wheat.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Has the hon. gentleman got these circulars?

Mr. TURRIFF. I have.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to see one.

Mr. TURRIFF. I imagine my hon. friend saw those circulars during the election.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I did not.

Mr. TURRIFF. At all events, they were circulated through the agents of the companies, I have a copy in my possession, not here, but down at my house. So you see it was these interests who were so active in bringing about the defeat of reciprocity. The Canadian Pacific railway circular pointed out what would become of the Canadian Pacific railway if trade went north and south instead of east and west. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), whom I see now in his seat, in the political address he gave us a few days ago, also told us what would become of the railways if the traffic went north and south. Well, all I can say is that I do not think anybody need worry about the Canadian Pacific railway, or any other railway company. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is in about the best condition of any railway on earth, I imagine. My hon. friend from Brandon said the cost of the road fixed the price, and he referred to the high cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and said the freight rates would be excessive. If that is the case, the freight rates on the Canadian Pacific railway should be exceptionally low, because they got in cash from the government of Canada, and in land that they have sold for tens of millions and scores of millions——

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You people said it was no good.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Canadian Pacific railway offered to the government that my hon. friend supported at the time the whole land grant for a dollar an acre, and they would not take it. So my hon. friend's friends of those days did not have a very high opinion of the same land. But that land to-day, the portion that is not sold, at the prices they are holding it at now, and at the prices they are getting for it, will bring in $200,000,000. Therefore, if the cost of the railway is to fix the price, then surely the Canadian Pacific railway ought to be able to carry freight at a very low rate from the prairie provinces down to this part of the country.

The Canadian Pacific railway built a road through my constituency into the United States. Who asked them to build that road? Not the people of Canada. They built the road to carry traffic north and south between Canada and the United States and make money for themselves. The Canadian Pacific railway have half a dozen roads running from the prairie provinces and British Columbia into the United States. The Canadian Pacific railway got a large cash subsidy from the Dominion of Canada to build that part of the Soo line between North Portal on the boundary line and Moosejaw where it connects with the mainland. They built hundreds of miles in the United States right south of the line. But they did not get a single dollar of subsidy, or an acre of land, or any exemption, or any bonus, for that portion of the line south of the international boundary. At the same time the Canadian Pacific railway to-day are carrying freight for the farmer in Dakota where they built the road themselves for from 35 to 40 per cent less than they are carrying freight for the people in western Canada where the government and the people of Canada granted a large bonus to them.

Mr. STAPLES. Why did not my hon. friend air all these grievances during the last fourteen or fifteen years? Why has there been a change of heart?

Mr. TURRIFF. I have on more than one occasion pointed out in this House the condition of Canadian railways and the way they were acting, and I have on more than one occasion taken the matter up with my own friends who are now on this side of the House. I noticed, however, that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), did not propose to do anything in the way of reducing the freight rates on the Canadian Pacific railway. They are now paying 10 per cent on their common stock, a great deal of it watered, and every now and then they cut up a melon and distribute millions of dollars' worth of common stock among the shareholders of the company at very much less than the market price. My hon. friend, knowing all about this, being one of the ablest and most prominent members on that side of the House, being a representative from the west where the people are suffering over these high freight rates, and especially as with his assistance they

have been denied the right to sell their product in the United States, I take it for granted that he will take an early opportunity to bring pressure to bear on the government for the purpose of having freight rates reduced in that western country.

The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) made the statement that the western farmer farms about 1,000 acres. There are odd men in the west who farm 1,000 acres, there are odd men in the west who farm 10,000 acres, but the great bulk of the farmers have only a half section. They would average about 320 acres. A great many have only 160 acres, some 480 acres, others 640 acres, but I imagine the average size would be something like a half section, or 320 acres. It is all very well for my hon. friend to say how much money they make, but if he would take a trip out through the country to-day where they have, although a large crop, a crop that is poor in quality and an expensive crop to harvest, he would find that the western farmer feels bitterly sore at having his market cramped. In a year like this the grain buyers are very careful when buying grain. I am not going to put so much blame on the grain buyer because it is a pretty serious matter for a grain buyer to load himself up with a large amount of wheat when he is not certain that he will be able to get it out before the close of navigation. They have to protect themselves and they cut the price down. In a year like this the large milling companies reap their harvest. They crowd the price down as the grain is lowered by wet and snow a couple of grades in appearance, but in reality is not hurt very much for milling purposes. That has been proven time and again. When navigation is about to close at the head of the lakes the price is crowded down, and as my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) pointed out to-day the farmers of the west are losing $12,000,000 on account of not having the American market in which to market their crop. When they are losing so much in that respect, do you not think there should be some redress in the matter of what they have to purchase? It is fair that these agricultural implement concerns, in spite of a duty of 15 per cent on their main product and of 45 per cent on repair parts, should be put in a position to sell their goods to farmers in the United States competing with our farmers at a price 20 per cent less than that which they exact from the farmers of Canada? I think it is a most unfair proposition, and it is just this sort of thing that is going to make an agitation throughout the whole country for agricultural implements to be put on the free list altogether instead of there just being a reduction in the duty as was proposed. If such an agitation arises it will simply be because the manufacturers are not willing to be fair to the consumer, are not willing to play the game in a fair manner. Take one of these concerns that my hon. friend from Edmonton mentioned to-day—the E. B. Eddy Co.; a day or two before the election they marshalled their men and told them that if reciprocity carried they would be out of business. Yet that same company with a million dollars worth of insurance to place would not deal with any Canadian concern but placed every dollar of it in the United States. If they are entitled to do that, and I claim they are, because it is a business matter, why should not the farmer who buys their product have the right to sell his goods in the United States if he can better his position by doing so?

Take the financial interests. We have never had a better exhibition of what the financial interests are prepared to do than that which was given by the hon. member for Brantford when he said that the banks refused to protect the Wilkinson Plough Company because it was thought that possibly there would be a reduction of five per cent in the duty on ploughs and because there was a probability of reciprocity going into force. That just shows that the manufacturers and financiers behind them joined together hand-in-hand to prevent reciprocity passing, to prevent the western farmer and the eastern farmer from getting the advantage of the market that was right beside his door, and they did that in order to keep themselves in the position which they occupy to-day of being able to put their hands into the farmers' pockets and extracting more than they are entitled to extract. There is a combination among them all for that very purpose. It is quite possible that my hon. friends may take the result of the 21st September as a justification for them to raise the tariff.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, they have started in to do it already. During the campaign in the west the lumber manufacturers made the statement time and again that if the government were defeated a duty would be put on the rough lumber that was coming in free from the United States, they would prevent the competition which the Canadian mills have to-day in the western portion of Canada.

But, since this government has come to power the lumber manufacturers of British Columbia have waited on them, and as a result they have been able to report to the press that they were going home jubilant because the government had promised that the law would be so interpreted that a class of lumber which formerly came in free would now have to pay

duty. The Liberal government wanting to help the farmers interpreted the law to mean that this lumber would pay no duty, but under the present administration we get in this the first dose of higher protection.

Mr. STEVENS. Did the farmers of the Northwest purchase the lumber that was dressed at the same figure that they purchased rough lumber from the manufacturers of British Columbia?

Mr. TURRIFF. My information is that they were purchasing that lumber chiefly from the State of Oregon and were getting it for $2 per thousand less than they were getting exactly the same lumber from British Columbia, but this $2 per thousand duty being put on it would make the Oregon lumber the same price as the other lumber, and the Canadian buyer in the west will naturally buy Canadian lumber, and owing to the ruling of the Minister of Customs he will pay $2 a thousand more for it. And so we are beginning to see the effect of the manufacturers having come into power on the 21st September last. The farmers of the west are not getting a square deal from this government, and they don't intend to give them a square deal if they can help it. We can judge that by their action so far. I can tell this government that they may be able to go on in their policy for some time, but at the rate the west is growing, and Liberal and Conservative alike in the prairie provinces being in favour of lower duties and lower tariff, the end will soon come.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman think that lumber that is clearly dutiable under the law should be allowed to come in free?

Mr. TURRIFF. If it was clearly dutiable the law ought to be amended, but it cannot be clearly dutiable in this case, because the Board of Customs Commissioners have had this matter up time and again, and under the late administration they ruled that this lumber was not dutiable and so no duty was collected hitherto.

Mr. WRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is clearly in error; the matter was never considered before the present administration took office.

Mr. TURRIFF. No matter what hon. gentlemen opposite may say the fact is that under the late administration, in order to help the farmers, that class of lumber was allowed to come in free of duty, but under the present administration that same class of lumber under the same law is charged $2 per thousand.

Mr. WRIGHT. In other words the late government winked at the violation of the law.

Mr. TURRIFF. There was no violation of the law.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the hon. gentleman say that the late administration allowed lumber planed on more than one side to come in free of duty?

Mr. TURRIFF. I was told by lumber dealers in the west that lumber dressed on two sides by a fine saw—building lumber, scantlings, joists and dimension lumber—this lumber dressed by a fine saw which left a rough surface came in free of duty under the late administration, and that the lumbermen came down here and interviewed the government and arranged with the government that in future such lumber would pay $2 per thousand duty.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is not a fact. The lumber that they complained of coming in was lumber that was planed on two sides. Lumber, such as the hon. member refers to, comes in free. But if the lumber is planed on two sides and the planing is shown, of course there is a duty on it. If the hon. member says that the late government allowed this lumber planed on two sides to come in free, it means that they allowed it to be smuggled in contrary to the provisions of the tariff law made by themselves.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Minister of Customs is in error, the late government did not allow any lumber to be smuggled in. Every carload of lumber was entered through customs and there was no trying to evade the law in any way. This is lumber that was dressed on two sides by a saw.

Mr. STEVENS. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) does not understand the matter. Let me ask him, was it not an inspector of customs who first discovered this evasion of the law and reported it to the government. In the second place, is it not a fact that this fine saw is used to rough the planed edge in order to evade the law and not to dress the lumber.

Mr. TURRIFF. Taking what the hon. member has said at its face value, the fact remains that under the late administration the farmers got that class of lumber free of duty, and under this present administration the farmers of the west pay two dollars per thousand more.

You cannot get away from that fact, argue as long as you like. You cannot get away from the fact that, under the late government, the farmers of the west got that lumber free of duty and now they pay $2 duty per 1,000 feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is not the case.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) made the statement that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has been coming to this government humbly asking it to do something for the people of the west for charity's sake. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I, at all events, am not here to ask for any charity whatever for the people I represent. All we ask is a fair deal, such as is given to the manufacturers of the east. All we ask is the right to sell our products in the best markets and to buy our goods where we can do so to the best advantage, Let not my hon. friends from Ontario run away with the idea that the people of the west are looking for charity in any shape or form. All we want is the fair treatment which the manufacturers of the east are asking for, owing to whose subscriptions and energies the late elections were carried. Our farmers are beginning to see the fruits of that election, in the one article I have pointed out, and no doubt they will still more bitterly realize, the results to their loss in other respects before the present administration is much older.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon). It is said that when a machine expends its steam in whistling it has no power to turn its wheels, and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) is an example of such a machine. The works in his head were not moving. The hon. gentleman said that the people of the west are just now reaping the fruits of the decision on the 21st of September. But he does not appear to understand that the seed cannot be sown and the harvest reaped so rapidly as that. He seems moreover to have forgotten when the seed was sown which has produced all the difficulties of which he complains. It has been truly said that 'in the field of destiny we reap as we have sown,' and when the hon. gentleman complains that in Canada to-day there are mergers which scorpion like, are injuring the farmer, let me ask him who was it that hatched the egg which produced that scorpion, whose was the sowing that produced combines. For 16 years the Liberals were in power, when they came to power in 1896 there was no complaint that there were mergers in Canada. If mergers have since arisen, under what administration were they born? If the Liberal government had been true to the country and just in their administration, would these mergers have arisen? It is stated that combines have been nurtured, well, who nurtured them? The hon. gentleman says that the combines and manufacturers established in Canada have been putting their hands into the pockets of the consumers to their detriment. But who was it that originated these combines? Who fostered these manufacturers? Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the present administration is so all powerful that since the 21st of September their policy could have given birth to such mergers and combines? Surely there is no logic in his argument. The right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has told us that by virtue of his administration the country had prospered. That was a splendid conceit. Does any one think that the country prospered by virtue of his administration? Was it so mighty that it made the sun to shine and the rain to fall and the dews to come? Was it the Laurier administration that created the industry in our population that produced the prosperity? The right hon. gentleman almost claims that the Liberal administration did produce all these results. Surely, he must also claim that the Liberals for 16 years nurtured, as well, these mergers and combines, if such exist, and aided the manufacturers to produce the detrimental results which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) declares have been produced. Let their chickens rest on their own roosts; let their progeny be kept at the home of its parent and not transferred to this side. Of their changelings, we want none. Let me take another illustration of the style of argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite. He refers to this lumber question. As I understand it, there is a statute which declares that certain lumber is to come in free and certain other lumber has to pay duty. The recent decision, with regard to this lumber, as I understand it, was based upon the finding of the customs board established by the late administration to decide upon these very questions of a technical character which might be submitted to them. I do not know that under the late government that question was submitted to the board, but the present government did properly obtain their decision and enforced the law accordingly. It is one thing for parliament to legislate and another thing for the government to administer the law as they find it; and if in defiance of that law, lumber is admitted into Canada without paying duty, it is no excuse and no palliation of that offence to say that the government, which was appointed by the people to enforce the law, acted in complicity with those who were smuggling the lumber. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) has further said that by virtue of the defeat of reciprocity, injury has been done the farming community. There are farmers in eastern Canada as well as in western Canada, and the farmers of eastern Canada and very many of the farmers of western Canada, possessing just as good judgment as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff), have decided that they will not have reciprocity. I had thought that after the debate on the speech from the Throne that the funeral obsequies of reciprocity were over, and so

far as this side of the House is concerned, they were very pleasant obsequies, but it appears that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) thinks that the wake is not yet finished and like a good Irishman he wishes to continue the fight. There is one thing we must not forget, one question to be considered : Would the reciprocity agreement have protected the farmer, for whom he is so solicitous, against the combines and the mergers which he so strongly condemns ?

The effect of reciprocity was to take away protection for the farmer, but it did not in almost any respect take away the protection of the manufacturers—why? Because the recent administration had nurtured those mergers which they say exist, had fostered the combines they talk about, had helped to establish the manufacturers they now condemn, and were apparently solicitous about the mergers, combines and manufacturers and wished to retain them while delivering the farmers over to the competition of the United States and other favoured nations

The hon. gentleman referred to freight rates, saying that the member for Brandon had suggested that they might be increased because of the large cost of the National Transcontinental railway under the late administration. Although the hon. gentleman practically admits the enormous cost of the construction of that railway and the statement that it will prevent a reduction of rates, he says that does not prevent the Canadian Pacific railway from reducing its rates. Look at that for a moment. Assuming that the Grand Trunk Pacific cannot reduce their rates, and that under some system or arrangement the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern railway do reduce their rates, then what would happen? We know that the Grand Trunk Pacific is operating in western Canada as well as the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern railways. Then there would be one rate for the Grand Trunk Pacific, a lower rate for the Canadian Northern, and perhaps a still lower rate for the Canadian Pacific railways. So that (unless there is an equality of rates on all the railways) the person desiring to ship his goods would send them by the railway having the lower rate. Then what would happen to the Grand Trunk Pacific? It would go to the place where it might have gone under the late administration, into liquidation or bankruptcy, a thing not to be desired for any large railway company. I say there has been fastened or may be fastened eternally on Canada, by virtue of the action of the recent administration, a burden of freight rates which the people of the west, and the people of the east too, may have to bear, because they were not careful enough about the cost of construction of the Transcontinental railway. But I do not intend to continue on this subject it is not at present necessary. It seems to me that any person listening to the argument of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down would see that he is self-condemned. You cannot expect to gather figs from the thistles, nor grapes from the thorns. Hon. gentlemen opposite have sown thistles and thorns and as they have sown Canada must reap, and we must let the country understand that the present administration is not responsible for their sowing or for the objectionable results it has produced on the country.

Now, with regard to differences between the east and the west. Do I understand from the hon. gentleman that he desires the trade of the west to go south and not to come east? That is practically what he is arguing for. Am I mistaken? No. Then, if that be so, how can the hon. gentleman reasonably say that between the east and the west there should be no division. Certainly burdens should not rest on the west that do not rest on the east. In the east there are great factories and industrial establishments, providing home markets which the farmers of Ontario and of eastern Canada generally appreciate, and it is to be hoped that we shall have in western Canada, as I believe we shall have under the policy of the present administration, similar industries established, providing home markets for the farmers of the west. Thus there will be a similarity of trade conditions in the east and in the west. Then, by means of the interchange of trade between them the east and the west will understand each other. It is only by becoming acquainted with each other that the east and the west shall have confidence in each other, and when one hears such speeches as that which has just been delivered about the oppression from the east and burdens on the west, one is astonished; for, instead of trying to bring the east to understand the west, and the west to understand the east, hon. gentlemen opposite show a disposition to irritate and keep them separate. There is an east and there is a west, we cannot close our eyes to the fact:

> For the East is the East and the West is the West,
> And neither the twain shall meet,
> Till earth and sky stand presently
> At the great judgment seat.
>
> But there is neither East nor West,
> Border, nor breed, nor birth,
> When one strong man meets another strong man,
> Though they come from the ends of the earth.

So I say that by an interchange of business and the establishment of similar conditions there as here the west will understand the east and the east will understand the west, and if they become acquainted

with and have confidence in each other, there will be neither, east nor west in Canada. I am not afraid of the east or of the west they will be truly Canadian. It is true, we should have a reduction of the duties on agricultural implements, and I hope that will come soon. Hon. gentlemen opposite have opposed a reduction of the duties on agricultural implements.

Mr. TURRIFF. Might I ask the hon. member who proposed the reduction? Did the Conservative party propose it?

Mr. STAPLES. Yes, Dr. Schaffner, the member for Souris.

Mr. AIKINS. I have no doubt that the present administration, recognizing the failure of the recent administration to give relief to the farming community, particularly in the west, by the reduction of the duties on agricultural implements, will now do what they think should be done for the agriculturists, both east and west, in some reduction of duties. I know not what those reductions will be, but I have confidence in the administration, and I believe that the people of the west and the people of the east have confidence, that there will be a reduction of the duties on ploughs, harrows, rakes, mowers and reapers generally, which are the staple implements of the agriculturists of the west. A reasonable reduction of these duties will, in that respect, I think, create a greater confidence of the west in the east and of the east in the west. I have no doubt that the time will come when there will be such a close approximation of the views between the east and the west, that we shall no longer hear hon. gentlemen opposite attempting to create disunion between different parts of Canada by such remarks and such an endeavour to shift responsibilities as those made by the hon. gentleman who has preceded me.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I am forced to oppose a statement made this evening by an hon. gentleman who sits on this side of the House, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

The hon. member said that the E. B. Eddy Company marshalled their men to the polls. I rise in protest. The E. B. Eddy Company is a company which I greatly admire. Its seat of business is in the county which I have the honour to represent. It has gone on increasing its capital from year to year and I want it clearly understood that the E. B. Eddy Company did not marshall their men to the polls to vote against me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am glad to see hon. gentlemen applaud, but I have not quite finished. They did not marshall their men to the polls to vote against me—but they tried just as hard as a company ever did to do so. I must apologize to the electors of the county of Wright for the statement of the member of Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) when he says that the electors of the county of Wright were marshalled to the polls. Mr. Speaker, the electors of the county of Wright are amongst the most independent electors of the Dominion of Canada, they are not men who can be marshalled to the polls by the E. B. Eddy company, by the J. R. Booth Company by the Matthews Pork Packing establishment, or by any other manufacturing establishment to vote against reciprocity when they believe reciprocity to be in the interests of the country.

Having said this much and not wishing to follow in the furrow of the Cockshutt gang plough, with which I am not very familiar, I would like to say a word about the manufacturers of the county of Wright who were mentioned during the course of the remarks of different speakers to-day. The E. B. Eddy Company opposed reciprocity. They had a perfect right to oppose reciprocity. The E. B. Eddy Company are engaged in the manufacture of paper, and they do not want competition in the manufacture of paper. They knew full well that under reciprocity new industries would grow up in the Dominion of Canada and there would be competition in the manufacture of paper. Why would the E. B. Eddy Company vote against their own interests for the sake of the farmers of Canada? We on this side of the House should imagine they should do so in the interest of Canada, but they, in the interest of their pocket, did not think they ought to do so. I might make the same remark respecting the J. R. Booth Company. Now a word about the pork packers. We have in the county of Wright, and some hon. gentlemen representing western constituencies may not be aware of this, one of the largest pork packing establishments in the Dominion of Canada known as the Matthews Pork Packing establishment. They opposed reciprocity and they were right in opposing reciprocity according to their views. They did not want competition in meat, they wanted to form a merger in this country in order to command the price that they would give to the farmer for his meat and to command the price that they would sell meat to the labourer in the cities. Immediately after September 21, this association of which I am presently speaking, formed one of the greatest meat mergers in Canada. They were perfectly within their right in doing so and I am sorry that any hon. member on this side would gainsay that right; it was in the interest of their pockets.

Having answered the arguments of my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) I do not think I would be justified in continuing to advertise the Cockshutt gang plough at the expense of the country by placing upon 'Hansard' remarks to show that it is better than any other plough and that it can be sold to the Americans at a cheaper rate than it is sold to Canadian farmers. I feel that this is not the duty for which we were called together at this session of parliament. I could not resume my seat without assuring the farmers of western Canada that they have the sympathy of the farmers of eastern Canada in connection with the efforts made by the manufacturers of Canada to become rich at the expense of the farmers of both the west and the east. I understand that in the great development of Canada we must have a revenue, but as a member representing a constituency composed in part of farmers, I want to protest against this revenue being raised at the expense of the farmers for the benefit of the manufacturers.

Mr. W. WRIGHT (Muskoka). I do not wish to occupy the time of the House, but I wish to protest against the very evident intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to start a race war in this country. Those of us who are acquainted with the political history of Canada will remember that soon after the passing of the National Policy in 1878 that old knight of blue ruin, the late Minister of Trade and Commerce, associated with the right hon. gentleman who is now leading the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and their followers started out on a rule or ruin policy for this country, their policy being that if the people would not allow them to rule they would do their best to ruin the country. So they went up and down the side lines and concessions trying to make the farmers believe that the manufacturers were scoundrels, that they were robbers great and robbers small, thieves, every name in the vocabulary of hon. gentlemen opposite was used. I do not believe that the manufacturers of this country are thieves or robbers or any worse than any other class of the community. Let us suppose an ordinary farmer with three or four children. He brings them up in the best way he can. One becomes a doctor, a lawyer, or a professional man and another becomes a merchant. One of them stays at home on the farm, but one has a mechanical turn and he becomes a manufacturer after a while. They are all brought up on the one mother's knee, all taught the same code of morality. Does the fact that one of them becomes a manufacturer prove that he is a scoundrel and is trying to rob his neighbours? I do not think it does.

I represent a riding partly rural and partly manufacturing. There are some of the largest manufacturers of Canada in my county, and it rather amuses me when I hear hon. gentlemen opposite telling fairy tales about how all the manufacturers of Canada got together and conspired to do something that would damage the farmers of the country, shut them out of some market, keep some goods from their reach. Why, Sir, every large manufacturer in my riding not only went against me, but came out in the press over their signatures and stated that they were positively in favour of reciprocity. In discussing the question with one of these gentlemen I said: 'How is it going to help the farmers? He gave his shoulders a shrug and said: 'I think the farmers have been getting pretty good prices for a while, and they can sell their stuff for a little less now.' So they voted for the reciprocity pact, not to help the farmer, but to make the farmer take a little less for what he had to sell. If they honestly thought the farmer was going to get less prices, they should have got up in this House and said so, then we would have known that they were introducing this pact with the object of making the farmer sell his stuff for a little less, so that the consumer would be able to live a little cheaper in the cities. After all, that would have been possibly the logical outcome of the proposition. What I am objecting to was the dishonesty lying behind the agitation. How it was going to help the farmers of this country to let in American competition, with every advantage on their side, was one of the things I could never understand. Situated as they are down below the boundary line, everything coming in a little earlier, why, they would get the cream of all our market, as they have been doing to some extent under present conditions. They have been able, under conditions that have existed in this country, to sell over $32,000,000 worth of agricultural produce in Canada, whereas we have only been able to sell them less than $14,000,000 per annum. Would not the same disparity continue if you made all the articles free? They have been able to come into Canada and under-sell our farmers to the extent of $2 worth of agricultural produce for every dollar's worth we have been able to sell them.

Now we have heard a good deal about certain conditions in the west. Hon. gentlemen from that portion of Canada have told us that the western farmer would have profited by this pact, even if it did damage the farmer in the east. I do not believe it would have profited the farmer in the west, and I know something about the conditions in the west, perhaps quite as much as any hon. gentleman opposite who has spoken on this matter. We are told that the farmer out there is being taxed

too much for the implements that he purchases. There may be something in that contention. When the late government was introducing their tariff measure in 1907 this matter was up for discussion. The then Finance Minister proposed to reduce the duties on certain agricultural implements by two and a half per cent, and he promised great things to the farmers by enabling them to buy their machinery at two and a half per cent less than they were paying before I took it upon myself to point out to him on that occasion that the reduction of two and a half per cent would be absolutely of no value to the farmers, either in the west or in the east, and I think I knew something of what I was talking about.

The outcome proved conclusively that I was right, for I want to say that there is not a farmer in Canada who has profited one cent by that two and a half per cent reduction, not one. I hold the wholesale price list, and can substantiate what I state here now. I believe it would have taken a reduction of at least ten per cent to have produced any appreciable effect upon the prices the farmer would have to pay in Canada for his agricultural machinery. Looking at it from that standpoint, I joined with others who were then sitting in opposition in asking that the reduction be made ten per cent instead of two and a half. But those gentlemen who are now shedding crocodile tears over the farmer left the House, and those of them who did not go out voted against the proposition and said: We are going to leave the farmer just where he was before. That is how much their sympathy was worth on that occasion. Let us look back a little to 1896, when they had not such a strong feeling against the manufacturers of this country. Leaders of the Reform party, went to some of the largest manufacturers of this country and entered into a secret agreement with them, whereby these manufacturers were to get certain privileges in the way of cheaper rates upon certain things that enter into the manufacture of their machinery, and certain drawbacks. Some of those manufacturers had become a little sore with the Conservative party because they didn't get privileges enough, and they said, We are going to make a bargain with the Grits, and they did. That agreement was carried out, and when they came into power in 1896 they gave these pet manufacturers these privileges, and they left the poor farmer they had been shedding barrels of tears over just exactly where he was, and they left him there for ten long years. That shows how much sympathy they had for the farmers of this country. It is amusing, Mr. Speaker, the cheek of some people.

Mr. WRIGHT (Muskoka).

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure we will all agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. To see men stand up in this House and profess so much sympathy for the farmer, and then sneak out and not dare to vote for a reduction of ten per cent, is cheek of the first quality. How much did they care about the farmer? All they want is his vote. They say now: If we cannot get it this way, we will try and get it some other way, if we cannot humbug him in this way we will humbug him in some other way. That is just how much sympathy some hon. gentlemen opposite have for the farmer. God help the farmer of Canada if he has not better friends than are to be found on that side of the House. There are some men who know what will benefit the farmer, what will really help him, and I venture to say that before many months are passed, or before many years are passed, we will be able to adopt a policy that will really help the farmer, that will bring him something substantial instead of fake sympathy, leaving him on the rocks as these hon. gentlemen have done.

Now some reference to lumber has been made in this debate, and I simply wanted to say that in reference to lumber there has been a similar course of conduct towards the farmer of the west. There has been an attempt to show that he has been getting lumber apparently cheap under hon. gentlemen opposite. But they have a different story to tell me when I go out to the west, they tell me that for ten long years they have been paying enormous prices for lumber under the policy that was inaugurated in 1896 to help the farmer. It does not seem to have done very much for the farmers. In fact, the men who have profited by any lumber arrangements that have been made out in that western country are men of a different calibre to the farmers of that country. They were men who sat in this House on the back benches, and some of the front benches, on the government side during the régime of the late government.

These are the men who profited by the lumber manipulation out there while the poor farmer was made pay the piper and he has been paying the piper ever since. There is a claim made with regard to the benefits which accrued to the farmer from some particular arrangement whereby the Minister of Customs would allow certain lumber to come into this country without paying duty. We are told that the tariff authorities in Canada made a certain ruling upon lumber whereby the farmers benefited. I know that the farmers did not benefit a five cent piece by that ruling. There was a class of men who did benefit and these were the big American lumber combines who were thereby enabled to

bring into Canada a class of lumber that they could not otherwise have brought in. These are the men that put the profits in their pockets. Some suggestions have been made that it was a source of a certain amount of revenue to help some hon. gentlemen out in that western country in the last election. After all we cannot so much wonder at their having a great deal of sympathy for the big lumber combines of the United States.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend made a suggestion; would he put it in definite words?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would point out that I tried upon one occasion to ask the hon. gentleman a question when he was making a speech and he flatly refused to allow me to ask it as he did not wish to be interrupted, so that if I answer the question of the hon. gentleman on some other occasion I think he will be satisfied. I am treating him exactly as he treated me and that ought to be fair. I want to point out that wheat can go over to the United States from the Canadian side partly duty-free as long as that wheat is ground up over there and sent out of the United States in the form of flour or even in the form of wheat. There is practically no duty. While the duty may be collected at the border, ninety-nine per cent of it is refunded when the product is shipped abroad, so that all the difference that free wheat would have made to the farmers of the west would have been with respect to that portion of the wheat that they might grind up and use for American consumption. The American people shipped out of the United States last year, either in the form of wheat or flour, 120 million bushels. It ought to be plain to any man who has given it a little thought that if wheat goes over from Canada into the United States it will displace just that much wheat which must be sent abroad, and that wheat will be consumed in eastern Canada, in England or in some other part of Europe. The price will be fixed by the world's price and therefore such an exportation of wheat to the United States could have no other effect. I have read all the speeches that were delivered in the United States congress on the question of reciprocity and one of the best speeches on the wheat question that was made either in this House or in Congress of the United States was that made by the Senator from North Dakota, who went into the question thoroughly. In his address before the United States Senate he pointed out that very little Canadian wheat would cross the line, but he said the very fact that it is there and can come in, will lower the price of wheat to the American farmer, because the price will come down to the figure at which wheat sells on the Canadian side. That would be the whole effect of reciprocity. The farmers of Canada would get nothing out of it and the United States farmers would lose. So, on the whole there was nothing in it for the Canadian farmer, possibly a loss to the American farmer, and it is hard to see where the gain would come in to anybody except it might be to the American millers on the small amount of Canadian wheat that they would get extra to grind and to the American railways on the small amount they would get for hauling that wheat to the great American centres. If the Americans were not producing enough wheat to satisfy their market then I would say let us try and get into that market, but when they are producing more wheat by 120,000,000 bushels annually than they can consume it is hard to see how we can go into that country with any quantity of wheat and dispose of it.

I want to say a word with regard to ploughs. I have some little knowledge of that article of machinery, and I think there is a good deal of want of knowledge of the technicalities of the business, because when men get up and discuss a question like this I think it would be well that they should have some little knowledge of the trade. One gentleman opposite—I forget which one—a little while ago made some comparisons of the prices of ploughs at certain places in Canada, and the prices at a certain spot in the United States. He took the retail price, I think, at Saskatoon and compared that with the wholesale price at a certain spot in the United States. From the knowledge I have of the business and from what he read out to substantiate his position, I know that he was quoting the wholesale price of the article because the list that he read from specially referred to the contract. There was an attempt made to show that because only one plough was ordered it must have been an individual buying a plough for his own use. I will confidently deny that statement. Any man acquainted with the business knows that a retail agent does not keep a stock of these very large and expensive ploughs, but only one at a time. These ploughs are made in various sizes running from five furrows to a dozen furrows and each farmer who buys a plough will buy according to what he needs; therefore, the agent who would stock himself up with a large number of these ploughs would be very foolish because he might not have the one that the farmer wanted although he had a dozen ploughs on hand. As a rule an agent only keeps one plough in stock, and many of them would not do that were it not for the fact that the wholesale dealers or manufacturers compel them

to buy one plough. There are different methods of handling the machinery. Some manufacturers handle it direct with the consumer; that is they send an agent or their own to some particular spot, if there is a large amount of business there, they pay him a salary and he goes on retailing these implements over the country. That is pretty largely done away with in the west to-day and the great bulk of the business is handled through agents. The agent has a fixed price quoted to him, he has to settle with the company, either with farmers' paper, or otherwise, for the article at that price and the company becomes responsible for the collection of the notes. Over on the other side of the line a great deal of the business to-day is done through wholesalers. The manufacturers at Milwaukee, Chicago, Batavia, Moline, or any of the other great centres of manufacture in the United States, sell this machinery to some firm or company, say, in Minneapolis, who buy it right out and become responsible for the sale and collection of the money. These articles are sold by these manufacturers at very short dates, and they are enabled to sell them for a great deal less because the agents assume the responsibility of collecting the notes.

In discussing with the representative of one of the big companies in Winnipeg, the question of the price on the American side which is generally speaking ten per cent less than on the Canadian side, he pointed out that the Canadian goods had to come from eastern Canada and had to pay nearly ten per cent more in freight rates than the American goods which came the shorter haul from Chicago. He also pointed out that the Canadian manufacturers had to become responsible for the collection of the notes while on the other side the farmers were paying cash. I was informed that in the month of May last, in Manitoba, they had only been able to collect 58 per cent of the notes due on the 1st of October of the previous year, in Saskatchewan 48 per cent, and in Alberta 49 per cent, so that an enormous capital had to be carried to do business in this way. I told this gentleman that I thought they were charging a pretty high rate to the farmers for carrying these notes, and his answer was that they would much prefer to get the cash because in many instances they had to repossess the articles after 2 or 3 years at very great loss. Any one who considers the question will at once see that the method of selling must cause a vast difference in the price of the article sold. However, this is a question which should be thoroughly gone into. I have very great sympathy with the farmers of the west and the farmers of the east as well, and I believe we should have a board which would go into these questions thoroughly, make thorough inquiries at all the factories in the country, and see whether they are selling their goods to the consumer at a reasonable rate. The creation of such a board is now under the consideration of the government, and if they deal with it in a tangible way they are entitled to our sympathy and our support. I for one will not stand for the manufacturers of Canada charging larger prices than they should legitimately charge, nor do I think this parliament would stand for it. But, we must have actual facts before we take action, and the best way to obtain these facts is to appoint a tariff board for the purpose. I have not much sympathy with those who contend that the Canadian manufacturers should be compelled to compete with the manufacturers of Great Britain and other countries who are paying their workmen less than half what the Canadian manufacturers are paying. Our workmen have to live in a severe but healthy climate; their children must be educated; we have a higher standard of living than they have in England or France or in Germany, and our prices must be regulated on a standard that will be not only fair to the workingmen and fair to the farmers and the consumers generally, but fair to the manufacturers as well. I cannot too strongly deprecate the efforts made by hon. gentlemen opposite this session to set the people of the west against the people of the east, to set the farmer against the manufacturer, and generally speaking to set one class of the community against the other. For many years when they were in opposition before they followed that line of policy, but I appeal to them now to join with us on this side in doing away with this miserable attempt to raise sectional cries. Let us stand for a Canadian nationality and for the rights of all classes in this country to a fair living. If out of these discussions we can evolve a plan whereby every class in this country will get British fair-play then good will result from them. We on this side of the House appeal to hon gentlemen opposite to aid us in carrying out a policy that will make for the advantage of all classes in our country.

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

Progress reported.

Mr. ROGERS moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What business will be taken up to morrow?

Mr. ROGERS. Notices of motion, and the balance of business on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 6, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAZEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 31) to amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act, 1899.

An hon. MEMBER. Explain.

Mr. HAZEN. I may say, in explanation to my hon. friend, that the harbour commission of Quebec now consists of nine members, five to be appointed by the government, two by the shipping interests for three years, one by the Quebec Board of Trade for three years and one by the Lévis Board of Trade for three years. The intention of this Bill is that the commission shall consist of three members to be appointed by the government, the same as the harbour commissioners in the port of Montreal.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not had an opportunity of looking into this Bill to ascertain whether it should be preceded by a resolution. In the meantime it will have to go as it is.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GRAIN ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it is within your province, Mr. Speaker, to allow it or not, but with your good offices and with the consent of the House, I would like to move a resolution on page 16 under government orders. I want to get the resolution through and have the Bill introduced before we rise so that the Bill may be printed and placed in the hands of members for their information before they come back after the first of the year. If there is nothing to prevent it, or if the constitution would not be broken entirely, I would ask that I be allowed to do this.

Mr. SPEAKER. It could be done by moving that we pass on to government orders, and if that motion is accepted by the House it may be agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I move that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This resolution, I think, is in almost the same form as one which was adopted here last session?

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution was not adopted last session although I think it should have been brought in by resolution, but the Bill is the same.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The effect is the same?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. I assume that my hon. friend will come back to the order of questions.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. Is this the same as the Senate passed last session?

Mr. FOSTER. I will explain it when I get the motion through, if my hon. friend will allow me, I therefore, beg to move that government orders be taken up.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to consolidate and revise the Manitoba Grain Act, chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, and Part II. of the Inspection and Sale Act, chapter 85 of the Revised Statutes, 1906; to establish a Board of Commissioners to administer the grain trade of Canada, and to provide for expenses in connection therewith, and to charge the board with the operation and management of such terminal elevators as may be constructed, leased or acquired by the government of Canada.

He said: I may say in reference to this that I think it is right that this procedure should be commenced by resolution, and that is the reason of this resolution being put on the Order Paper. When the resolution is through I desire to introduce a Bill and I might just as well explain it now as then, I suppose. The Bill is the same Bill as that which was passed through the Senate last session after many conferences, and a great deal of discussion. I may say that all parties seemed to be pretty well agreed to the Bill, it finally passed through the Senate, came down to this House, and was introduced here, but was really not carried any distance in the House owing to the lack of time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Owing to obstruction.

Mr. FOSTER. No, owing to lack of time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought it was obstruction.

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill is, as I said, almost identically the same, there being only some small changes of verbiage or phrases.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no radical difference?

Mr. FOSTER. It is practically the same, and when it comes before the House I am going to invite the whole House to give it the benefit of its consideration. There will be some amendments which will be introduced by the government itself.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The resolution provides for the establishment of a board of commissioners, 'to administer the grain trade of Canada.' I do not see why we should go that far. I quite understand that they are to have the administration of terminal elevators and of the grain business so far as it applies to the terminal elvators, but when it proposes that they shall administer the grain trade it seems to me that the words are too broad. I should be very sorry to commit myself to an Act which would give to these commissioners power to administer the grain trade which would imply the buying and selling of grain and, generally dealings in grain. It would seem to me that it should be limited to the storage of grain in terminal elevators and the inspection thereof.

Mr. FOSTER. The limitations of the legislation will be shown in the Bill itself. At least you can see that it is broad enough to allow the legislation to be based upon it. It is a little too broad to suit my hon. friend if it is meant that the legislation should be as broad as the line laid down in this resolution. It is not the intention that the commission shall have everything to do with the grain trade everywhere, but it has to do with more than weighing in and weighing out and the inspection of the grain at the terminal elevators. It is a consolidation of the two Acts already on the statute book with the commission as an added feature.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend see that it would strike the country as being very peculiar if the House should unanimously commit itself—as I presume we will unanimously commit ourselves—to a resolution in favour of establishing a board of commissioners to administer the grain trade of Canada? It does seem to me that the words are entirely unsuited to what it is intended to do.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the country will be very much startled if my hon. friend is not. The resolution itself is not an Act and if the Act goes too far in the opinion of my hon. friend and this House, there is the time, I think, to make the limitation.

Mr. EMMERSON. In 1909, I think, there was a resolution introduced with respect to the naval service. Some members have thought since that it went too far, and they have not felt reconciled to the wide terms of that resolution. This resolution, if adopted, will commit individual members to a principle which I think they will hesitate to accept under other circumstances, and it seems to me that the Minister of Trade and Commerce should qualify the words in the resolution, as to elevators and trade. Perhaps there might be some words of limitation in the resolution, otherwise we would be committing ourselves to a principle to which I am sure even my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would not be willing to commit himself.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I do not think there is any danger to be apprehended. If this was the ultimate legislation, the objection taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) might have a good deal of force. It does not say here that it is to administer all the grain trade of Canada but it does administer a very large proportion of that trade.

Mr. EMMERSON. The trade of Canada would mean all the trade.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Oh well, it might.

Mr. PUGSLEY. East and west, including the maritime provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. (Toronto). I would not like to take the responsibility of limiting it, because it might not then be sufficiently wide for our purposes. The drafting was arranged by the Law Clerk, and I take his version of it as being the proper form.

Mr. MACDONALD. I understand my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to say that he is adopting the policy of the late government in the Bill which he proposes to introduce and for myself I would be satisfied on that assurance to let the resolution go.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) knows what I did say, that the Act, as it will be introduced, is almost exactly the Act which was passed by the Senate. If the late government was behind that to such an extent we take that as a groundwork. But I also stated that we would be prepared to suggest some amendments for the consideration of the House.

Mr. NESBITT. I understand my hon. friend to say there will be a full discussion of the Act when it comes down.

Mr. FOSTER. I should hope so.

Mr. NESBITT. Do I understand that?

Mr. FOSTER. I should hope so and fear so. I should hope there will be a discussion, and I should fear there will be too much discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With that reservation, I do not feel like pressing the objection further. My recollection is that the Bill was introduced in this House as a government measure, and we all regretted that owing to circumstances for which the late government were in no way responsible, but which I think the then opposition

were responsible for, the measure was not put through, and the country has been deprived for a good many years of the benefit of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). We have already discussed who was responsible for last year's business, and there is no use again going into the matter here.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am glad to hear the statement of the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce that there will be a full discussion when the Bill is brought down. I would like to ask one question if he will be good enough to enlighten me in regard to it. I would like to know if it is the intention of the government, either in the Bill to be introduced, or in the amendments which they have in mind, which will make it impossible for any person, having any interest in terminal elevators, directly or indirectly, to have any interest in the ownership of the grain that goes through them? Do the government intend to make such an enactment?

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to tell my hon. friend just now—I would not like to undertake to say what will be the whole of the enactment. What the Bill does do, in the greater part of it, is to incorporate and consolidate the two Acts already upon the statute-book, which have wide reference to the conduct and supervision of the grain trade of the west. It also provides for the appointment of a commission and that commission has its powers outlined in the Bill itself. The great grievance, so far as I have looked over the papers of the grain producers and a part of the grain handlers, is that they are not treated fairly by reason of selfish interests which worked to their detriment, in the elevators more particularly, and the object of this legislation is to alleviate and do away with that as far as it possibly can be done.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am quite satisfied that the minister has answered me as fully as he can at this stage of the proceedings. I want, however, to take this opportunity of impressing upon the minister, if he will permit me, that this point which I have tried to make, is the most important point in the whole Bill. If you take away from the owners of the elevator any interest in the grain or in the classification of it, you remove from them every motive for manipulating the grain. There is no feature of the Bill, I think, to which the hon. minister can address himself which will be more profitable to the grain growers than to see that those who have an interest, either in their own personal names, or through shareholders, in the terminal elevators, have absolutely no interest in the grain. Once you have that principle established and make severely punishable any infringement of it, you take away the great motive which is there for manipulating the grain, which is the serious trouble.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce for his consideration as to whether the word 'regulated' should not be substituted for the word 'administered.'

Mr. FOSTER. It is more than regulation.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 32) entitled An Act respecting Grain.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND :

1. How many commission agents for placing immigrants as farm labourers have been appointed in each province in each year since this method was adopted?
2. How many were employed in that capacity in each province during the year 1911?
3. What number of immigrants on whom a bonus was paid were placed in each province since this method was adopted?
4. Has any company, corporation or society, been paid a commission for placing immigrants as farm labourers? If so, what are their names and what amount has been paid to each in each year since 1900?
5. What number were placed by these companies, societies or corporations in each province since the year 1900?

Mr. ROGERS :

1.

Year.	Ontario.	Quebec.	Manitoba.	British Columbia.
1907	182	2	..	..
1908	174	25	..	..
1909	117	19	..	..
1910	97	19	..	..
1911	88	19	2	1

2. Ontario, 84; Quebec, 19; Manitoba, 2; British Columbia, 1.

3. The total number placed is 20,859, but the government is unable to state the number placed in each province, no record having been kept.

4. Yes. The Salvation Army.

Amount paid in—

1907	$ 6,118
1908	2,634
1909	1,000

1910	$ 356
1911	3,492
	$13,600
Refund, 1907	1,884
	$11,716

5. The total number placed by the Salvation Army was 10,153, but the number in each province is not shown in the records of the department.

Mr. SUTHERLAND :

1. Have British booking agents been notified that no bonus would be paid on farm labourers booked to the Ontario government's office at Toronto, from which applications for farm labourers to the Ontario Government's Bureau of Colonization and Immigration are supplied?
2. Has any order or regulation to that effect been passed?
3. If so, what is the date of the passing of such order, and when did it come into effect?
4. Was the government or those responsible for such order or regulation regarding immigrants booked to Toronto, aware that the Ontario government were and had been for some time advancing by way of loans large sums to British farm labourers to enable them to come to Ontario, guaranteeing them employment on their arrival at Toronto?
5. Is it the intention of the government to rescind such order or regulation?

Mr. ROGERS :

1. No bonus has been witheld on farm labourers booked to cities in Ontario and Quebec where no Canadian government employment agents are located; such cities include Toronto.
2. A circular to the above effect was issued.
3. Circular announcing order was dated July 5th, 1911, and became operative upon immigrants arriving in Canada on and after October 1st, 1911.
4. Yes.
5. Matter now under consideration.

Mr. MACDONALD :

1. Does the government intend to introduce any legislation to provide for the exclusion of Japanese or of other Oriental races from Canada?

Mr. ROGERS. The matter has not been considered.

ROBERT HAM.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

Was Robert Ham of the Trachoma Hospital, Halifax, dismissed from the employ of the government? If so, on what date, by whom, and for what reason?

Mr. ROGERS. No. Records show that this man left the service on his own account on or about October 10, 1911.

Mr. ROGERS.

THE 'MINTO' PILOT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who has been appointed pilot for the D. G. S. 'Minto' for the season of 1911-12?
2. Is the person appointed a licensed pilot? If so, for what pilotage district?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Captain Buote has been appointed temporarily.
2. No. He has been for years sailing in and out of all the ports in Northumberland Straits in command of a vessel.

PICTOU-GEORGETOWN WINTER SERVICE.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

Are the supplies required for the boats on the winter service between Pictou and Georgetown to be furnished by the stewards of the steamers, or to be purchased directly by the department?

Mr. HAZEN. All food supplies will be purchased and supplied by the stewards with whom the department has contracts.

THE OTTAWA PLAZA.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Is the Minister of Public Works responsible for the fence around the Plaza works in this city?
2. Is the said minister responsible for the continuance of the advertising posters on the fence in question?
3. Is the said minister aware of a large poster facing Rideau street in which men and boys are invited to join the Canadian Navy?
4. If so, does he approve of the same?

Mr. MONK:

1. The specification states that the contractor shall provide fences or other precautionary measures for the protection of persons and property, during the construction of the work, &c.

2, 3 and 4. The attention of the minister has not been drawn to said posters.

RIDEAU HALL IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. CURRIE:

What amount of money has been expended upon improvements at Rideau Hall in each year respectively from June 30, 1896, to November 30, 1911?

Mr. MONK:

1896-97	$ 19,401 83
1897-98	15,276 68
1898-99	14,466 38
1899-1900	15,324 40
1900-1901	30,473 12
1901-1902	23,924 65
1902-1903	29,268 14
1903-1904	20,143 86
1904-1905	36,172 04
1905-1906	64,836 52

1906-1907	$ 60,460 43
1907-1908	29,946 62
1908-1909	29,553 28
1909-1910	24,630 57
1910-1911	23,505 91
1911-1912	51,296 19
Total	$488,680 62

DISMISSAL OF IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any dismissals been made in the Immigration Branch of the Interior Department?
2. If so, how many immigration agents have been dismissed?
3. What are the names of the agents dismissed and the places?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Nine. (Agents, inspectors and clerks.)
3. Franklin Tier, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario; J. A. Osborne, Fort Frances, Ontario; George Ruffel, Moosejaw, Saskatchewan; A. Hallonquist, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Jas. Cummings, St. Andrews, New Brunswick; N. S. Dow, McAdam Junction, New Brunswick; Dr. M. Chisholm, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Dr. A. C. Hawkins, Halifax, Nova Scotia; C. H. Brannen, St. John, New Brunswick.

CONTRACTS WITHOUT TENDERS.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What contracts have been given, without tenders, by the Minister of Public Works, since the first of October, 1911?
2. What is the amount of each such contract and the names of the contractors?

Mr. MONK. 1 and 2. None.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What contracts have been given without tenders in the cities of Montreal and Quebec since the first of October, 1911?
2. What is the amount of such contracts, if any, respectively, and the name of each contractor?

Mr. MONK. 1 and 2. No contracts have been given without tenders, in the cities of Montreal and Quebec since the first of October, 1911, by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. HAZEN:

1 and 2. None, so far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned.

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1 and 2. No contracts in the customs service have been given without tenders in the cities of Montreal and Quebec since the 1st of October, 1911.

BREAKWATER AT ANSE AUX CANARDS.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any tenders been invited for the construction of a breakwater at Anse aux Canards, county of Gaspé?
2. If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the amount of their respective tenders?
3. Has the work been started? If not, why not?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. Tenders are still under consideration, and it is not customary to give such information until the contract is signed.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN FRANCE.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many immigration agents are there in France?
2. Is it the intention of the Minister of the Interior to increase this number?
3. How many immigrants came from France to Canada during the last six months?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. One Canadian information agent and office assistants.
2. The matter has not been considered.
3. 1,419.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN BELGIUM.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many immigration agents are there in Belgium?
2. Is it the intention of the Minister of the Interior to increase this number?
3. How many immigrants came from Belgium during the last six months?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. One Canadian information agent and office assistants.
2. The matter has not been considered.
3. 865.

MARINE AGENCY AT GASPE BASIN.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to create a new marine agency at Gaspé basin in the Bay of Gaspé?

Mr. HAZEN:

The matter has not been considered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

DISMISSALS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved for:

Copy of all papers, correspondence and orders in council in connection with and relating to the dismissal from office of public officials from each of the departments of government since the 1st day of October last past, including both the inside and outside service.

He said: On this motion, Mr. Speaker, I propose to avail myself of the opportunity of discussing very briefly the matter of the dismissal of government officials, and I understand that the government are willing to extend to hon. members the widest latitude possible in discussing this matter, just as if this motion were presented in amendment to Supply.

The dismissal of government officials is inevitably bound to be the subject of discussion in this country upon the defeat of any ministry, owing largely to the method of appointment to the Civil Service prevailing in Canada. I do not propose discussing the matter at any great length, my chief purpose being to secure if possible from the government a declaration of its policy as to the dismissal of members of the Civil Service and those generally in the employ of the government.

I suppose we can safely predicate it as a fact that dismissals have already been made and that the government propose making others. I have no intention of discussing any specific instances of dismissal; and if I should refer to any in the constituency I represent, I shall do so very briefly, reserving to myself the liberty of future discussion in connection with any particular dismissals.

Dismissals have been made already in the county of Halifax. Within forty-eight hours after the defeat of the government on the 21st of September last, prominent members of the Conservative party arrogated to themselves the executive function of the dismissal of officials, without the intervention of members of the government, directly or indirectly.

Some days ago the following question was put upon the Order Paper by myself:

Was Robert Ham, of the Trachoma Hospital, Halifax, dismissed from the employ of the government? If so, on what date, by whom, and for what reason?

To that question the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) replied today as follows:

Records show that this man left the service on his own account on or about October 10, 1911.

The truth of the matter is that on or about October 10 the colleague of the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Borden) in the recent election, ordered, directly or indirectly himself, that Mr. Ham should leave the service of the government; and Mr. Ham, being a young man, without any experience in such matters, assumed that any instructions or orders from a colleague of the First Minister was tantamount to a decree from the government and he accordingly left the service.

I do know further than many officials in the government service in the county of Halifax were threatened with dismissal immediately after the defeat of the government by prominent members of the Conservative party in that city, and I do know that a harvest of dismissals and appointments were promised followers of the Conservative party in that constituency.

I know further that in the county of Lunenburg, which I formerly had the honour to represent, the Conservative committees in certain districts have made claims for the dismissal of many officials, many of whom cannot be considered as being partisan in any sense of the word, since their appointment, unless the simple exercise of their franchise can be so considered; and I do know that such committees have decreed who shall be the successors in office of those whom they have designated for dismissal.

I do not propose to discuss much further the question of dismissals that have already been made or dismissals that are contemplated. I would like to believe that the Prime Minister, my colleague from the constituency of Halifax, will adopt a policy of justice in this regard, and one in the interest of the country, and of the Civil Service. I will be inclined to believe that until I am convinced to the contrary. I quite appreciate the difficulties that confront the Prime Minister in his constituency, but still I look to him to be just enough to be strong and strong enough to- be just in this respect. In view of the manner of appointments to the Civil Service—I refer to the outside service particularly—I readily acknowledge that there will be many cases wherein the dismissal of officials might properly occur, and will be naturally looked for by such officials, particularly those who openly, and with apparently no idea of concealing the same from the public or any person indeed, were active politicians while occupants of government offices. What was the policy of the late government with respect to the dismissal of officials is, I think, pretty well known to most hon. members. That this policy may have been occasionally violated, even perhaps without just cause, frequently inflicting grave injustice upon those dismissed, I do not doubt. That the policy, which I trust the government will declare, will be wantonly departed from I have not the slightest doubt. I am not blind to the human and political elements which enter into a question of this kind, and the whole matter must be treated in a generous fashion by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. Assuming that the policy of the late government was dismissal for partisan causes altogether, and assuming further an occasional departure from this policy on the part of that govern-

ment, it is still to be remembered that in the various constituencies of this country thousands of officials in 1896 were permitted to remain in office who were active and avowed political partisan up to that date, and who were never dismissed. I know that in the constituency of Lunenburg in the year 1896 there was not a single important office which was not held by a prominent Conservative, and these men were as active political workers as any Conservative who ever stepped into the constituency as a candidate. From 1896 down to the present day not a holder of the class of office to which I have referred, was, if I remember correctly, ever dismissed. I do not pretend to say that on many occasions demands were not made by friends of the government party for the dismissal of such officials, but I do say that ultimately better counsel prevailed on the part of the party leaders within that constituency and the ministers of the Crown, and I, therefore, venture this remark that the policy of the late government as declared shortly after their accession to office in 1896 was not open to substantial or extensive criticism.

While the government of that day laid it down as their principle that dismissal was only to be justified by reason of political partisanship, yet that policy was generously interpreted and generously applied. It may be, of course, that my experience in connection with patronage affairs was limited ; I admit it was, and I was always very pleased that such was the case. Personally, I should like to see the Civil Service Act gradually extended so as to cover all cities and towns of a certain population. I think that neither of the two political parties in this country have ever openly or covertly approved of the system prevailing in the United States based upon the principle that to the victors belong the spoils. I am led to believe and, I trust, correctly, that it is the desire of both political parties to emancipate the Civil Service from political control. Naturally this same question came up before parliament in 1896 after the defeat of the previous government, and many views were expressed by hon. gentlemen who then sat in opposition, as to what should be sufficient ground for dismissal and what should be the procedure to be followed in the way of investigation prior to dismissal. One principle was generally laid down and it was generally concurred in by the opposition of that day, a principle that I wish this afternoon to impress upon the government, and that is that a careful and honest investigation should precede any dismissal. I think that ground is substantial and just. The government of the day will have recommendations for dismissals largely based upon probable falsehoods, unjust suspicions and recommendations which will emanate from pure selfishness. These recommendations in many instances will come from gentlemen who are absolutely without moral sense, who have no spirit of fair play, and who have not the sligtest interest in the public service, and whose political gospel always is: To the victors belong the spoils. The government will also receive recommendations for dismissal from some members of parliament, and from some of the defeated candidates and these recommendations will not always be based upon the highest considerations. In such cases, it is essential that the ministry should exercise the greatest precaution and conduct the fullest investigation before dismissing any official of the government. Therefore, if there is one thing which I wish to impress upon the government more than another this afternoon it is the necessity of careful investigation into each case, and the importance of giving notice to the official under suspicion of wrong-doing, prior to the dismissal, that he may be able to present to the government his defence before final action is taken. This is a proposition which I feel sure will meet with ministerial favour. I submit it is fair, and that in the last analysis it will be found a protection to the government itself, as well as an instrument of justice to the official who is under the charge, or under the suspicion of wrong-doing. I will not go so far as to say that in every case it should be the duty of the government to appoint a commission or a commissioner to investigate the complaint against any official.

I think that frequently, and even in most cases, these inquiries could be made by the individual members of the government themselves. This is a view championed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), in 1896, at least. In discussing this matter of the dismissal of officials, he laid special stress, as I am now trying to do, upon the necessity of giving the official the opportunity of registering a defence to charges preferred against him. The Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke as follows on the occasion, I refer to, as reported at page 504 of the debates of the second session of 1896:

> Least of all would I like to see a change by arbitrary dismissal, by mere whim of the minister, upon information which must at best be second-hand, coming to him from a partisan source. I would not like to see action taken simply upon such charges. But if there is a charge against any official for neglect of duty, for offensive partisan conduct or unbecoming or ungentlemanly action, the charge should be laid before him as an accusation, he should be allowed to answer, and an investigation should be carried out, and it should be dependent upon that investigation whether punishment is meted out to him or not. I do not think that we, as a par-

liament, should ask for anything less. I do not think we should limit our civil servants to any greater extent than that. I believe that if this line of policy were carried out, it would prevent the unrest and disquiet which is now abroad in the country, and will continue unless a very clear and satisfactory line of policy is taken at this time.

I entirely concur in that expression of opinion by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I very much regret that he does not himself to-day, as a minister of the Crown, seek to live up to the declaration he made at that time. I submit that the principle that he enunciated is a sound one and should be the basis of the policy of the government in the matter of dismissing officials. And I trust, notwithstanding the fact that it appears that members of the government have already departed from the principle laid down by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1896, that it will be observed in future.

Now, there is one branch of the public service, wherein I am told, a great many dismissals have already been made and a great number more are to be made——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) before he goes into another branch of the subject, would substantiate his inference that I have gone back on the principle enunciated in 1896, so far as my own department is concerned.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not propose taking up the time of the House to substantiate that statement, because I believe that hon. members on both sides will concur in it. I do know that in the county of Halifax at least, public servants have been dismissed without having been afforded an opportunity of defence. I would like the Minister of Trade and Commerce to state whether he gave to the persons engaged in the Annuities Branch of his department an opportunity to submit a defence to him before he dismissed several of them a few days ago.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend wants an answer to that question now, I have dismissed none, with one exception; and I dismissed that man for cause, and not for partisan reasons.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That is the very point at issue. The hon. minister (Mr. Foster) assumes to settle what is a sufficient cause. I say he has no right to arrogate to himself that power. The proposition I am setting forth is this, that before he dismisses an official, he should give that official an opportunity to submit his evidence, in order to assist the minister himself in reaching a conclusion whether or not there is cause for dismissal.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). And furthermore I gave my hon. friend an opportunity to get the papers in that particular case. If he wants them brought down I will lay them before the House.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not see that that is an answer to the statement I make. Have the papers been placed upon the table of the House?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Well, that was the hon. gentleman's promise—that these papers were to be placed upon the table of the House that I might have the opportunity of seeing them.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What I promised was to bring down the papers with reference to the transfers of the Annuities branch. I expected to have them ready, but they are not ready. With reference to the other matter—the dismissal of McArthur—the hon. gentleman will remember that I said that if he wanted the papers, all he had to do was to ask for them.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Possibly the hon. gentleman is right. I am not very much concerned about that matter now. I was about to refer to one branch of the service wherein many dismissals have already been made and wherein, it is anticipated by a large number of hon. gentlemen on this side, a great number of dismissals are yet to be made. I refer to the Post Office Department. Now if there is one department of the public service to which the rule of dismissal for partisanship ought not to apply, I think it is the post office.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You should have thought of that before.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think it is most reprehensible on the part of any minister of the Crown or any member of parliament to urge the dismissal of a country postmaster on the ground that he has been a political partisan. I observe that the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) smiles at this, but I do not entertain the idea of his comprehending the principle which I set forth in connection with the dismissal of country postmasters. The average country postmaster should be regarded as a public philanthropist, rather than a public servant. He should have liberty of political action, his freedom in this respect should not be curtailed by reason of the fact that he is a postmaster. Personally, I never during my political career recommended the dismissal of a postmaster, especially of a country postmaster, on the ground that he had been a political partisan. I have even had the experience of a postmaster opposed to me politically, keeping within his own control political literature mailed by myself for

my political friends, so that there could be no effective distribution in a particular district prior to polling day. I do admit any hon. gentleman, perhaps, would be justified in asking for the dismissal of a postmaster guilty of such misconduct.

But the point I wish to make is that, speaking generally, no postmaster should be dismissed for taking an active part in the politics of his country and that the position which he holds should not be regarded by the Postmaster General or by the government for this purpose at least as an office held under the Crown. If the Postmaster General favours dismissing postmasters who are Liberals upon the ground that they have been active in politics, what does he propose to do with the postmasters who are Conservatives, who are friends of the government and who have, every year since 1896, been active partisans? Will he apply one rule to one and another rule to the other? I would like to ask the Postmaster General if, upon my recommendation and upon satisfactory evidence being given to him, he will dismiss postmasters who are friends of the government and of his party upon the ground of being active in political matters. I wish for a moment to refer to a matter which is, so far as I am concerned, one of local interest. A few days ago I wrote a letter to the Postmaster General saying that it had been represented to me that an effort was being made to change the post office at a place called Spry Bay, in the county of Halifax, from its present location. In my letter I asked him if he would, before deciding to make the change, grant me the favour of an interview with him. I told him in my letter that I did not think there was any justification for the proposed change. My letter was written on the 28th November, and on the 29th, the day following, he very promptly and kindly acknowledged the receipt of my letter in regard to the postmastership of Spry Bay, and said in reply that the matter 'will receive my immediate attention.' Of course, I assumed that, when the Postmaster General wrote that letter to me, he meant to give the contents of my letter to him some consideration, but it appeared on the following day that, while in his letter to me he promised immediate attention, the attention he meant was to immediately dismiss this postmaster and not to pay any attention to my communication to him. I imagine that prior to his writing his reply to my letter he had already decided upon the removal of this office, for on the following day he answered a question previously asked him by me in connection with this particular matter. I cannot place my hand on the question just at the moment, but in effect, the answer was that it had been decided by the department to dismiss the present postmaster and reappoint one dismissed in 1896. This was the justification for the removal of the post office. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was not so much concerned with the change of the postmaster as I was with the change in the location of the post office. I do not know and neither do I care, upon what ground the postmaster acting in 1896 was dismissed. I want to say to the Postmaster General that the reason which he assigns in answer to my question is not a justification for the removal of the post office from its present location. If the location of the post office was changed in 1896 it was not primarily to get rid of the then postmaster, but it was to place the post office in a better location. A grave injustice will be done to the residents of this particular section if the Postmaster General removes the post office from its present location. I can suggest to him a way of overcoming this difficulty, and that is to remove another post office about three or four miles from the post office at Spry Bay to the place of residence of the man whom he proposes to make postmaster in the place of the postmaster now acting at Spry Bay. I should be very glad to go down to the hon. gentleman's office to-morrow or next day to discuss this matter with him. I would like to know what manner of man he is, at any rate, and this might be a justification for making the acquaintance of the Postmaster General. If he will promise me now and here that he will not take any further action in the matter until I have had this opportunity of an interview with him I shall be very glad indeed.

Mr. PELLETIER. I shall receive the hon. gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I thank the hon. gentleman, and I will take advantage of his kindness.

Mr. PELLETIER. I did not catch the date of the answer given in the House to the question put by my hon. friend.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think it was on the 30th of November. As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, the matter of the dismissal of officials was a subject of discussion in the first session of the parliament following the elections of 1896. The hon. gentleman who now leads the House and is Prime Minister of the country was in that year elected as a member for the county of Halifax, and it so happened that his first parliamentary utterance was upon the subject of the dismissal of officials. Speaking on August 28, 1896, the Prime Minister said:

It seems to me that those gentlemen who are in the Civil Service of this country ought

to have the same right, as other electors, not only to vote, but to work during the elections, subject to certain limitations. which I shall endeavour to submit to the House. In the first place, I entirely agree that if any such official is guilty of any corrupt or dishonourable conduct in an election contest while working for one party or the other, such conduct ought to have only one result. In the second place, if, for the purpose of supporting one party or the other, he neglects his duty in any way as a public servant, and employs the time for which the country has paid him in furthering the interests of either party, it seems to me that such conduct is reprehensible and ought to be punished.

I willingly concur in the principle laid down by the Prime Minister on that occasion. The Prime Minister then was fresh from legal fields, and new in the parliamentary field, his mind and judgment were then free from political colouring and readily responsive to reason and to logic. Now I wonder if the Prime Minister has suffered any deterioration with respect to his excellent judgment during his fifteen years of journeying in the political wilderness, or I wonder if his sudden and unexpected triumph has affected adversely his judgment in that respect. Is he willing to-day to adhere to the opinion which he then expressed?

Will he force this opinion upon his colleagues to-day? Will he condone to-day what he condemned in 1896? I trust the Prime Minister will to-day, when declaring the policy of his government, see fit to adhere to the policy which he laid down in 1896 in discussing this matter. Further, on this occasion, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had the honour of a seat in parliament and, as would naturally be expected, he addressed the House upon this subject, and I would ask the attention of that hon. gentleman and of the House, to the views expressed by him upon the occasion in question:

'He would investigate a charge such as was made and if he found a gentleman was guilty of offensive partnership, then he would feel that punishment ought to be inflicted with the loss of his place.'

The hon. gentleman was there quoting a declaration made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce proceeded as follows:

'I think the whole matter is found there, and in one other fact, and that is—the duty which a man has to perform. It does seem to me, that if a public servant performs the duties assigned to him by the government of the day, if he is not guilty of offensive or unbecoming conduct in his canvass or in the expression of his opinion, he has a perfect right, not only to his ballot, but also to his expression of his opinion, whether it be by voice or by pen. The only limit that ought to be placed upon him in the interest of the service and in the interest of the country is that his duties shall not be in the least interfered with, and in the second place, he shall not lose sight of the fact, that, as an employee of the government as represented by the party in power for the time being, he is to keep that courteous line of conduct which is becoming in every employee towards the person who employs him, towards the party which employs him, towards the party which employs him as the representative of the government of the country. Now, sir, it does seem to me, that we ought not to go beyond that, we ought not to suppress an expression of opinion by men belonging to the most intelligent classes of the people, those who are its office-holders, we ought not to keep them from depositing their votes, we ought not to keep them from a fair and courteous and becoming expression of their opinion, and if civil servants perform their duties faithfully and live up to those rules, I think they have a perfect right, not only to vote, but to express their opinions and to let them be felt upon the country for the good of the country, as they, as intelligent, reasoning beings, according to their light, think to be in the interest of the country.'

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that no hon. gentleman on this side of the House could find any fault with the principle respecting dismissal of officials laid down by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. Possibly, he was a little over-generous to the official, and possibly we might not exact of him strict adherence to the principle enunciated on this occasion, and as I have read it. I do not propose occupying the attention of the House at any further length. The chief purpose I have in addressing the House upon this matter this afternoon is to secure from members of the government, a declaration of their policy upon the matter of the dismissal of government officials, and I trust that the Prime Minister and his colleagues will frankly and candidly give to the House this afternoon the policy which has moved them in dismissals during the past few weeks, and also indicate what shall be their policy in the future respecting these matters.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). My hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House the matters which he has discussed in a very moderate way. I have no fault to find with the observations which he has addressed to us from his standpoint. I recollect very well the occasion to which he alluded when I spoke upon this question in the House of Commons in 1896, and I am bound to say, at that time I was impressed with the wisdom of the procedure which I indicated. But I found myself, I found my voice, very much as that of one crying alone in the wilderness; I did not get very much support on one side of the House or the other. At that time, there was a good deal to be said for that point of view, and it did impress itself upon me coming into this House for the first time, that that is a rule which could very reasonably be adopted by both parties in this

House. I will not say that I have not considerably modified my opinion in that regard, because I have seen some incidents in the fifteen years in which I have been a member of parliament which would indicate to me that the rule which I then thought a good one would be liable to very great abuse. However, I would like to point out to my hon. friend what he seems to have forgotten, that with respect to both the inside service and the outside service this matter has been settled. In the first place by a statute of Canada concerning the inside service, in the second place by a resolution of this House, concurred in by both political parties with regard to the outside service. So far as the inside service is concerned, the statutory provision to which I desire to call attention is to be found in the Act of 1908 introduced and passed by the late administration. Section 43 of that statute is as follows:

No officer, clerk or employee in the Civil Service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election if under the laws governing the said election he has the right to vote; but no such officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work in connection with said election.

The words of that section do not seem to restrict it to the inside service. My impression of the interpretation of the Act is that the language is restricted to the inside service. However, that is a matter to which we can very easily determine upon an examination of the earlier part of the statute. Sufficient it is to say for the present that it does lay down a definite and specific rule so far as the inside service is concerned.

Now, so far as the outside service is concerned, the rule was embodied in a resolution of the House of Commons moved by Mr. Lake on the 17th July, 1905, and accepted by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who was then leading the government, and that rule is in these words:

That whilst it is desirable that every official in the employ of the government of Canada, should enjoy perfect freedom of political opinion, and the untrammelled exercise of his franchise in accord therewith, no official should be engaged, or permitted to engage, in partisan work of any description in the election of a representative to the provincial or Dominion legislature.

I remember very well the debate which took place upon that resolution and there was only one difficulty which my right hon. friend opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had with regard to it. He stated in the course of his remarks, if I remember correctly, that it was doubtful as to whether or not the rule should be extended to partisan work in a provincial election, but summing up all the considerations one way or another he finally came to the conclusion to accept and he did accept, the resolution in the very words in which it was moved by Mr. Lake. Therefore, so far as the rule is concerned, it seems to me that is a matter which has been settled in the first place by statute, and in the second place by the resolution alluded to, and that it makes pretty clear what are the duties and the responsibilities of any man who is a public servant of Canada.

My hon. friend alluded to some incidents which he says took place in the county of Halifax. I happened to be detained a little in coming to the House to-day so I did not have the advantage of listening to my hon. friend's remarks with regard to these alleged incidents. All I have to say is that no committee in the county of Halifax has any authority to dismiss any official. No committee since this government came into power has had any authority to dismiss any official, and officials whether in the inside or the outside service, can only be dismissed by this government or by the minister responsible for the administration of the department. If any such incidents as those alluded to have really taken place, they have taken place without the knowledge, the sanction, or the approval of the government.

Now, my hon. frined has spoken of what should be necessary to convince the government or a minister of the Crown that an official has taken an offensive part in any election. There are obviously some cases in which inquiry would be rather futile. For example, on the 21st of September last, I myself personally saw three office-holders of this country engaged in active partisan work in the city of Halifax. I arrived at one polling division just after one of those officials had gone inside of the polling booth and assaulted a representative of mine.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There was no such thing as an assault. I know the incident.

Mr. BORDEN. I was not present at the incident. My hon. friend may have been present at it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I was not present, but I am satisfied nevertheless that there was no such thing as an assault.

Mr. BORDEN. I will not bandy words with my hon. friend about that. All I say is that I was told by the Conservative representative that he had been assaulted in that way. But, apart from that, I know that those men were engaging in active partisan work. In that case I would not grant an inquiry, because I saw it with my own eyes. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the action of the late government. I am not going into details with regard to that to-day; but I am bound to say that their action in the county of

Halifax did not come up to the high ideals which my hon. friend has put before the House this afternoon. I have not searched the records in respect of such matters but I know of two postmasters in that county who were dismissed without any inquiry whatever; I know the particular incident on account of which one of them was dismissed, because I was present at it and know all about it. The postmaster concerned, who is the honoured and respected father of a member of this House, was dismissed without the slightest inquiry, and with respect to an incident of which to my personal knowledge he was absolutely guiltless. My hon. friend alludes to the case of the postmaster at Spry Bay, and says that he was removed for political reasons; but I think he will be satisfied of the contrary when the papers are brought down. I would like to tell him that W. Charles Henley, of Spry Bay, held three offices at the time the late government came into power: he was postmaster, preventive officer and receiver of wrecks. They dismissed him as postmaster, my hon. friend says, for the purpose of removing the post office. I ask why, then, they dismissed him as preventive officer, and why they dismissed him as receiver of wrecks? It was not necessary to do that, because of the alleged necessity or desirability of removing the post office to another place. He was dismissed, as the evidence shows, in consequence of the incessant clamour which came about the ears of the then Liberal member for the riding, who telegraphed or wrote to have this man dismissed, until, as he says, he was absolutely tired of using his pen for that purpose. Now, my hon. friend is anxious that inquiry should be had in proper cases, and so am I. No one is more unwilling to dismiss officials than I am, but where the government or responsible minister is convinced that an official has been guilty of violation of the plain terms of a statute or of a resolution of the House of Commons concurred in by both political parties, by which his conduct ought to be guided, I would ask my hon. friend what alternative would a government have in a case of that kind? These men have gone on, in the face of a statute or in the face of a plain resolution of the House of Commons. That resolution was concurred in after ample debate in this House by both political parties as represented here, and it seems to me that any official, going on in the face of that statute or of that resolution, goes on at his peril. For my part, I hope the day may come, and in the not distant future, when the Civil Service Act may be extended to a portion at least of the outside service, and I hope eventually, as fast as it can be reasonably done, to the whole outside of the service of this country. Assuming that the statute, which I quoted a moment ago, does not extend to the outside service at the present time, as soon as the Civil Service Act was so extended to that outside service it would take effect by its very terms and, therefore, these men would be prohibited by statute from engaging in any partisan work in any election. If, in the face of a statute of that kind, one of these men undertakes to be a politician, I think the answer might very well be made to him which was made by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition in 1896, when he said:

> If any official in the Service chooses to be a politician, he shall be given every opportunity by this government of being a politician.

That was the principle the right hon. gentleman laid down in this House on the 1st day of September, 1896. I am very well aware that in the debate on that occasion there was very much said with which I agreed, with regard to an inquiry in such cases; but I would like to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite, and to my right hon. friend himself, that the principles which he laid down in that debate were not very well carried out in the two or three years that succeeded it. I do not desire to go into the details of that question to-day, although I am ready to do so at any time that can be named, because we have the details and can give them to this House if necessary. I might just mention two of them. J. B. Ryan, in the Inland Revenue service in the city of Halifax in 1896, was dismissed without inquiry or investigation, because he asked a civil question at a public meeting in the town of Dartmouth. Edward Kelly, in the Inland Revenue service in the city of Halifax, was dismissed without inquiry, simply because of the statement that he had been guilty of partisan conduct. I could give my hon. friend many other instances in my own county.

An hon. MEMBER. Hundreds of them.

Mr. BORDEN. While I do not say that there were hundreds in the county of Halifax, but taking the country all over, there were many hundreds of them, no doubt. I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to remember this, that if one political party dismisses officials in that way, they make it exceedingly difficult for another political party coming into power to take any other line of action. The best remedy that could be given in such cases would be to provide in terms within what limits any public official may engage in political affairs. That being done, there could not be much further question except as regards the evidence.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I understand the hon. gentleman, the government will be

governed by the terms of the resolution and the statute to which he has referred. But will he apply it to office holders indiscriminately, regardless of what side they take, or limit its application to the opponents of the government in office?

Mr. BORDEN. That is the way in which it was applied by the late administration.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am asking as to the application of the rule now.

Mr. BORDEN. No doubt my hon. friend would desire a different application from that which he carried out himself when he was a member of the government. We shall take all those matters into consideration. I am very glad to learn from my hon. friend that the example which the late government set us is one we ought not to follow. I judge that that is the conclusion he desires. With regard to that, I would make the same remark that I did regarding general dismissals a moment ago. I would like some rule adopted which would make the matter so plain that no official could possibly fail to understand it, and then I would like to have that rule applied to officials whether they took part on one side or the other. If we get that rule in the form of a statute, as I hope we shall some day, no doubt, it would be given the general application which my hon. friend desires, but which he and his friends failed to give it while they were in power.

I do not know that there is any other part of the observations of my hon. friend from Halifax to which I need call attention. I can only say that the desire of members of this government is not for wholesale dismissals; but certain rules have been laid down, both by statute and resolution of this House, and I do not see that there is any reason why those rules should not be applied. We desire, however, to apply them in a reasonable and moderate way, and not dismiss any office holder unless there be convicting evidence that he violated the rules laid down by the statute and the resolution of this House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The observations of my hon. friend show conclusively that whilst he is sound in doctrine he is singularly wanting in practice. He repudiates very properly the doctrine which long prevailed in the United States, and was the bane of the American civil government, namely, that to the victors belong the spoils. In this country, on both sides, for many years we have been of the opinion that positions in the Civil Service should be permanent, that everybody who took service under the government should be certain of his position so long as he did not offend against the law of the land or the proprieties of the position he occupies. I laid down the rule when in office in 1896, which has been referred to by my hon. friend, that no man in the service should be allowed to take any offensive part in an election. I did not mean that he should not have the rights of citizenship, that he should not be free to express his opinions and cast his votes, but I meant that he should not take any offensive part in any election. Every one will agree that a public officer should not take part in an election. That was the doctrine laid down in 1896, and which the late government endeavoured to live up to, namely, that no man should take an offensive part in an election. That is a doctrine which should be applied to all parties, but, if I am correctly informed, there has been a constant violation of this rule in hundreds of cases since my hon. friends opposite took office a few weeks ago.

An hon. MEMBER. What rule?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The rule that no man should be dismissed unless he be given an opportunity to defend himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do I understand hon. gentlemen opposite to contest this rule? Do I understand them to deny that a man should be heard before being deprived of his office? Have we come to this, with hon. gentlemen opposite sitting upon the treasury benches, that a man can be deprived of his office without being given the opportunity to plead in his own behalf?

Mr. LANCASTER. The right hon. gentleman made dismissals himself in hundreds of cases without any such investigation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall come to that presently. But is the rule I have mentioned to be accepted or not? I lay down the rule that a man who has taken an offensive part in politics is a proper subject for dismissal; but I should like hon. gentlemen opposite to say whether this man should be dismissed without being given the opportunity of being heard. I say that he should not, and I do not understand that such a rule is contradicted by hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1896 we laid down the rule that every man should have an opportunity of defending himself.

Mr. MONK. But you did not observe it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. We said in 1896 that no man should be dismissed unless he was

first given the opportunity of being heard. But I said also that we would accept the written statement of a member of parliament, giving the facts, and asking for the dismissal. That is the rule we laid down, and we have lived up to it. I am told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we did not live up to that rule. I do not admit the charge. I think we did, but even if we were deficient I would expect that the hon. gentlemen who are on the treasury benches at present would at least act according to their own doctrine. Are they going to throw over their own doctrine and institute dismissals right and left without giving any man the opportunity of defending himself or without any member of parliament taking the responsibility of placing on record a charge against the man whose dismissal he seeks? I would insist on the leader of the government that he should enforce the rule that no man should be deprived of office without being given the opportunity of defending himself or at least unless the member of parliament who asks for his dismissal has the courage to put on record the reasons why he demands it.

Mr. BORDEN. Does my right hon. friend know of any case in which a man was dismissed without being given this opportunity?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understood that many men have been so dismissed. I understand they have been dismissed without being given the opportunity of defending themselves or without any charge in writing being made against them by a member of parliament.

Sir, this rule is one we should insist upon --that a member of parliament should set forth his charge in writing. For then the papers can be brought down. There is such a thing as public opinion in this country; and, while I do not believe that a member of parliament on either side would lay a charge against a public official that he knew to be unfounded, yet when the papers are brought down that charge, if it has been made in writing, can be discussed, and the whole matter brought before the tribunal of public opinion. But I understand that this rule has not been followed, but that men have been dismissed by this government without having had the opportunity of defending themselves or even having the charge against them put in writing. I must say that I sympathize, as we all must sympathize, to a certain extent, with the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden). For I know, as a fact, and it is a matter of public notoriety, that since he has taken office—and even before, from the very day after the 21st of September last—the city of Ottawa has been invaded by office seekers, famished office seekers. Why, they, are like the locusts of Egypt, they cover the land! We find them in the corridors of this House. Indeed, the other day, we had the wail of lamentation from the Prime Minister that he could not go to his office or come out of it but there was a delegation lying in wait for him. He could not even take his lunch without them. He should have said: 'Gentlemen, you must be reasonable. A man must eat, and I am very hungry.' Of course, their natural answer would have been: 'But you are not half so hungry as we are.' And such an answer would have helped to explain, no doubt, why so many dismissals have taken place.

But I am serious in this matter. I repeat that if a man while in office is still a political partisan, then as I said in 1896, every opportunity should be given to him to go into politics. But let him have a fair trial first. Though my hon. friend disclaims any intention of adopting the spoils system, yet he has made dismissals which are notorious, and for which there was no possible justification, and which I believe are opposed to the welfare of Canada. We negotiated with the Americans a treaty for the settlement of all questions arising in connection with the boundary waters—a most important matter. That treaty which it took years to negotiate, was ratified only last session. It provided that all such questions should be settled by a tribunal of three men appointed by the American authorities, and three men appointed by the British authorities. These appointments on our side are imperial appointments.

Mr. HAGGART. What does the right hon. gentleman mean—'appointed by the British authority'? Do they receive from the imperial authorities the right to occupy the office?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am going to explain the matter as I understand it, and I know what it is, to some extent. After the statute had been passed, and after the Americans had appointed their commissioners we recommended to the imperial authorities three gentlemen well qualified for the position. They were, Sir George Gibbons, who had been chairman of the Canadian section while the treaty was in negotiation; Mr. L. A. Geoffrion, K.C., of Montreal, a man of unquestionable honour and great ability; and Mr. Barnhill, K.C., of St. John. Now, I understand that these recommendations were replaced by my hon. friend with recommendations of three other gentlemen instead: Mr. Magrath, formerly a member of this House; Mr. T. Chase Casgrain K.C., and Mr. Powell, K.C., of St. John. Against these gentlemen I have not a word to say; they are all men of honour and ability. But they are of no higher hon-

our, and no greater ability than the men whom they supersede. The commission we recommended was in every way equal to the commission that has been recommended since, and in one instance, at all events, superior, because Sir George Gibbons was more conspicuously fit for the chairmanship of that position than any one else because he had an experience which nobody else has had. But, if we assume merely that the qualifications of these gentlemen are the same, the fact that our recommendations have been set aside and others made gives a partisan character to that commission which it should not have. That is a matter of the highest importance; and I do not think my hon. friend can defend in a manner satisfactory to the people the making of these recommendations to the imperial authorities. Such conduct is not calculated to improve our standing either with our American neighbours, or with the imperial authorities.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce). There are just three points about which I wish to make a few remarks. One is the assumption, as I take it to be, on the part of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that the people of the United States were devotees of the spoils system and that this was a blemish on their Civil Service administration which we in Canada ought not to have.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But which they have rectified since.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). If my right hon. friend had given that side of the case as well, I should not have had any quarrel with him. I have only a word to say on that point. Any advocate of thorough and progressive Civil Service reform who looks into the matter will find that in the United States within the last fifteen years an immense stride has been taken in the right direction. The President of the United States has power by proclamation to extend the Civil Service system to any branch of the service, and extensions have been so widely and fearlessly made by Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Roosevelt, and now by Mr. Taft, that at this moment the greatest part of the Civil Service of the United States is under strict supervision and strict Civil Service rules. I only wish that our Civil Service were in all its parts as far forward in that respect as is the Civil Service of the United States.

I concur entirely with the rule laid down by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I believe now, as I believed in 1896, that parliament ought not to take away from a civil servant the right to hold and express a political opinion. The only thing we quarrel with is a civil servant making an offensive display of his political opinion and engaging in partisan warfare. If the civil servant simply votes, or in the quiet of his own circle, gives a fair expression of his opinion on political matters, that is all right, and I should be sorry to see any citizen curtailed of that right. But when the civil servant goes beyond that and takes an active part in the contest between parties, he contravenes that salutory rule and, as has been said, should be given an opportunity to devote himself to politics rather than to the public service. The whole point is as to when this activity becomes offensive ; and I agree with my right hon. friend that a civil servant becomes an offensive partisan when he becomes an active worker or an active talker in the strife between the parties.

The whole point seems to me to be what evidence is sufficient to convict a man of having taken that offensive part. One kind of evidence may be necessary in one case and another kind of evidence in another case; the point is not so much how the evidence is to be obtained as the quality and sufficiency of the evidence itself. Sometimes you may require an examination in order to find out. There are other cases, as that cited by my hon. friend by my side, when it does not require that, but when a minister of the Crown or a member of parliament knows of his own knowledge of the case and takes the responsibility for it. I think that goes far enough and there is no necessity to go beyond that and hold an expensive or tedious or litigous investigation. I think the common sense of the House and of the country would support an opinion of that kind. I stand by my opinions to-day as I stood by them in 1896, and I believe that those are the principles upon which this government is standing and proposes to stand in any action it may take.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) cited another case in which he says this government has offended, that is in dispensing with the services of three gentlemen in a position to which they were recommended by the outgoing government. I think that is carrying it rather to an extreme. It does not seem to me that my right hon. friend is right in that either from the standpoint of policy or any other standpoint. From the standpoint of good administration of government, I do not think he is correct in that. Here were three gentlemen who were to be appointed by the Home government. They were to be recommended by the government of this country. That government being a Liberal government recommended three Liberals and my right hon. friend talks about partisanship. Is any one of these three gentlemen a Conservative? Not by long odds, they were all well known Liberals. No man found any fault with them, but the element of partisanship, certainly the flavour of partisan

ship, attached to those three gentlemen. They were recommended, but my right hon. friend does not say they were appointed, and that appointment revoked. Take the circumstance of the case. Those three men were to fill a very important office; it was, you might say, a confidential office to a large extent. To my mind it would be absolutely incompatible that three strong opponents of the government in power should be the three men who are to have confidential relations with another government coming into power on an absolutely different line of political procedure. I do not find it necessary to argue that question, the mere presentation of it seems to me to carry with it its own sufficient evidence. When the names of these three commissioners were announced by the outgoing government hon. members on this side of the House felt that the opinions which had been expressed by some of the three gentlemen appointed put them out of sympathy with the attitude of the members and supporters of the present government upon the important matters with which the commissioners would have to deal. It would seem to me to be inconsistent and absurd that a government coming into power as this did, should be required to have as its confidential commission, engaged in that important business, dealing with this government and to a certain extent with other governments, men who were not in thorough sympathy and accord with the government by whom to some extent they would be directed, and with whom they would have to consult in a confidential way. That, I think, removes it altogether from the atmosphere of partisanship or recrimination in any way. If these gentlemen had looked at the thing properly they would have placed their resignations in the hands of the present government the very moment they knew that the power had passed over to those who were their political opponents and with whom their relations would perhaps not be the most pleasant and the most profitable.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the declaration of policy laid down by the Premier and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), and I do not think that any one on this side of the House can find fault with that policy as laid down. The difficulty to my mind is that from the information I received the government are not adhering to the declaration of policy on which they pinned their faith. The Premier says that he stands by the resolution introduced by Mr. Lake on July 17, 1905, in which it was declared by the House that the true policy was to be:

Whilst it is desirable that every official in the employ of the government of Canada should enjoy perfect freedom of political opinion and the untrammelled exercise of his franchise in accord therewith, no official should be engaged or be permitted to engage in partisan work of any description in the election of representatives to a provincial or Dominion legislature.

The Prime Minister says that is a correct announcement of the policy which this government is going to follow and he also says that he does not feel like retracting to any extent the statements made by him in 1896, that he practically stands by the rule which he laid down on that occasion. For the information of the House I would like to read a short statement of policy laid down by my hon. friend the Premier, as recorded in 'Hansard' of 1896, at page 388. It is as follows:

It is not the money of the Liberal party or of the Conservative party which is paid these gentlemen for their services; it is the money of the country, and the fact that these gentlemen worked openly, honourably and fairly, ought not to weigh against them if, at the same time, they do not neglect their duty as public officers. It seems to me that those gentlemen who are in the Civil Service of this country ought to have the same right as other electors, not only to vote but to work durng elections, subject to certain limitations which I shall endeavour to submit to the House. In the first place, I entirely agree that if any such official is guilty of any corrupt or dishonourable conduct in an election contest while working for one party or the other, such conduct ought to have only one result. In the second place, if, for the purpose of supporting one party or the other, he neglects his duty in any way as a public servant, and employs the time for which the country has paid him in furthering the interests of either party, it seems to me that such conduct is reprehensible and ought to be punished.

That was the policy laid down by my hon. friend in 1896 and to-day he says that he adheres pretty nearly in its entirety to that policy. The difficulty I find is that when pressed by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) to say whether he will apply the policy to Conservatives as well as to Liberals, as he claimed it should be applied in 1896, his answer is: You did not do it and therefore——

Mr. LANCASTER. Would the hon. gentleman read the next few lines of the quotation?

Mr. CARVELL. Certainly (reading):

I would be willing to go a little further than some of the hon. gentlemen opposite and have a further limitation, namely, that if an officer is in confidential relations with a minister or with a superior officer, he ought not to take such part in an election as would interfere with the discipline of the office which he holds.

I do not think anybody can quarrel with that proposition. For instance if a private secretary were to go out and take a hand in an election against his minister he should

not complain very much if his services were dispensed with. My hon. friend says he will come down next to the declaration of policy as laid down in 1905, but the hon. gentlemen opposite changed their declaration of policy so far as they were concerned, because on May 26, 1908, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) introduced a resolution on which a vote was taken, and for which he himself and his leader voted. It is true that it was with regard to the Civil Service as a whole, and it is also true that the law as it now stands does not embrace every official which my hon. friend wished it to cover at that time. But here was his policy as laid down in 1908, three years after the announcement of the policy which the Premier says is to be the settled policy of the government now:

The Civil Service system of Canada should be based on merit and character alone, and all the appointments thereto should be made from candidates whose competency has been established through open competitive examinations conducted under a non-partisan civil service commission.

My hon. friend must have been reading that very admirable speech of his recently, because I find he reiterates the principle which he laid down at that time, which he will find on page 9141 of 'Hansard' of 1908. In this case my hon. friend was, I think, giving an answer to a question by Mr. Paterson as to what would be permissible under the United States system. I thought the other day when I read it that he had incorporated it as his opinion, and I observe that he does so to-day, and gives it is as a proper declaration of policy. It allows every man to vote, to express his own opinion, to express it privately.

The civil servants have a perfect right to the vote and to the franchise, as I think every civil servant should have, as he is a citizen of the country and he has a right to his vote; he may have his private opinion and is allowed to express it to his friend or his family or in any other private way, but the moment he goes outside that, it is political partisanship and may become a charge and subject for discipline.

I think we have now arrived at what is to be the policy of the present government regarding dismissals. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce asked a very fair and pertinent question, the one question upon which depends the whole matter of whether or not the government are playing fair, whether they are standing by their principles or not; that question is how much evidence is required in order to dismiss a man from his office. The Prime Minister states that he himself saw a case in Halifax where an official had just come from a polling booth in which he assaulted an agent of his. I am willing to admit that if the Prime Minister saw that and took the necessary steps to assure himself of the truth of this charge, it would be a sufficient ground on which to dismiss a public servant. Again if my hon. friend will appoint a reasonable and fair commission, admittedly of his own party friends, and I find no fault with that because many of them will be fair, and if after investigation is held it is found that the official has been an active politician, that he has transgressed the rules laid down by my right hon. friend in 1896, laid down by Sir Henri Joly de Lotbiniere in 1896, concurred in by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1896, and reiterated in the declaration of the resolution of 1905, he can find no fault whatever if his services are dispensed with. The difficulty I find is that men have been dismissed from public office in this country within the last six weeks without a particle of investigation, upon evidence which must be false if it was given at all, and without adhering to the principles which my hon. friends lay down now as the rule they should follow.

Mr. HAGGART. Can you give one?

Mr. CARVELL. I will give a few illustrations.

Mr. HAGGART. Appointments made by order in council dismissed without any reason? I do not believe that you can give one.

Mr. CARVELL. I will give my hon. friend appointments by order in council dismissed without notice, without any right of defence and I believe, in one instance at least, without any reason whatever, a case in which I do not believe it is possible to find a reason. The first case to which I wish to refer is not exactly on the line raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart). Within 25 hours of the accession to power of this government, a notice was sent out by direction of the sergeant-at-arms of this House to something like 25 officials telling them that unless they were instructed otherwise they need not report for duty. I do not assume for a moment that the sergeant-at-arms would take on himself to order a man not to report for duty unless some persons higher in authority or whom he considered in authority had directed him to do so. I shall read one of these documents which is dated Ottawa, October 7, 1911. Mark you the 7th of October, and the government were not sworn in until the 8th of October:

Dear Sir,—I am desired by the sergeant-at-arms to inform you that unless you are notified to attend here it will not be necessary for you to report for duty next session.

Yours truly,
H. W. BOWIE,
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.

I do not think that even the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) will consider there was much investigation at that early date, and I am sure from a long personal knowledge of the gentleman who occupies the honourable position of sergeant-at-arms that he would not issue orders of that kind without instructions.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). What kind of officials were these?

Mr. CARVELL. House of Commons messengers.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the hon. gentleman aware that exactly the same thing was done with all employees along the Welland Canal in 1896?

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend will have an opportunity to give his end of it, and may give all the instances he wants. I am simply trying to see if my hon. friends are carrying out the principles they enunciated to-day. It is not an answer to cite what was done in 1896. I might ask my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) if he is aware that less than 100 years ago men were hanged in this country for petty larceny. That does not make it right to-day. There have been many changes in the civilization and laws of this country in the last 100 years and even, I am glad to say, since 1896. I wish to give credit to the Minister of Customs by saying that so far as I know he has not transgressed the rule laid down this evening or the rule which has been the settled policy of this country since 1896. To my personal knowledge every Customs official in the constituency I represent has had a charge against him by some person of offensive partisanship. I presume that has been done by my opponent because I know that more than a week before parliament met my opponent and two other hungry office-seekers hied themselves to Ottawa and remained here for over a week.

They left Woodstock on a certain Saturday and did not return for a week, or until the next Monday or Tuesday, and I think while they were away they saw my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). My hon. friend does not mean to say his opponent was an office seeker.

Mr. CARVELL. Well, I am not sure; perhaps I should say two hungry office-seekers. As I said before, charges of the same kind were laid against every official in the Customs Department in the county of Carleton save one. There is one official about whose office there is such an awful fight that they did not dare to lay a charge, and I understand he is to be allowed to remain in his position. I want to say in justice to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Reid) that he did not act with certain other ministers of the Crown in that, but he gave these people a chance. He notified them in a gentlemanly manner that a charge had been laid against them and asked what they had to say about it. I have no fault to find with my hon. friend in that regard. All I am asking to-day is for him to give them a chance, to give them a hearing; and if they are guilty, if they come within the rule laid down here this afternoon, their services can be dispensed with. If they are not guilty, I take it for granted that my hon. friend will be fair enough to say that he will allow them to remain in their positions. If he adopts that procedure, I am satisfied there will not be very many dismissals from the Customs Department in the county of Carleton.

Now I come to another department, and that is the Post Office Department, where the minister has not acted as generously as did the Minister of Customs, I am sorry to say, but where the spoils system is in full swing. In that department men have been dismissed with only about forty-eight hours' notice. I find that ladies have been dismissed who have occupied their positions for years. Of course, they have not got votes. They never did anything and never tried to do anything, but they are dismissed on two days' notice. Let me give my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) some information. In the first place, with regard to the postmaster at Woodstock, he is a gentleman who has occupied that position for some thirteen or fourteen years. He obtained a leave of absence after the writs of election were issued, went west, and did not return until about a week before polling day. He is a gentleman, so far as I know, who never lifted a finger or took an active part of any kind in the elections. That man was waited upon by his successor about three or four days prior to the first of December, who told him that he had received the appointment of postmaster in the town of Woodstock, and wanted him to be ready to hand over the office to him on the 1st of December. The postmaster wrote to the Post Office inspector to know what it meant, and I have here a letter which I received from the former yesterday:

Woodstock, Dec. 4, 1911.

My dear Sir,—I did not receive any notice from Ottawa. Mr. Winslow was the first one to tell me. I then wrote Dr. Coulter——

that would be the inspector at St. John, and not the Deputy Postmaster General.

—asking him if he had any word. In his reply he said Mr. Winslow had sent him his oath of office and that he would be up or send

some one to make the change in a few days. That is all I know about it.

Yours truly,
C. L. SMITH.

Mr. MACDONALD. Was there no notice from Ottawa?

Mr. CARVELL. No notice whatever. The only intimation that Mr. Smith ever received was, as I told you, about four days before the change, when Mr. Winslow walked into his office and said to him: I am your successor and I am going to take charge here on the 1st December. Oh, but my hon. friends will say: This man was a partisan.

Mr. EDWARDS. Take the case of the Souris postmaster.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not know anything about the Souris postmaster at all.

Mr. EDWARDS. You do not want to know.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend knows anything in that regard he will have an opportunity later on to speak. I want the Postmaster General to follow me in what I am now saying. He will doubtless remark: 'Oh, but I have the word of a gentleman in whom I have confidence that the postmaster at Woodstock was an offensive partisan. Therefore, I acted upon his word and dismissed the official in question. He may possibly come within the policy laid down by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I have evidence which satisfies me anyway because I have the word of a gentleman who was good enough to be our candidate at the last election.

Mr. MACDONALD. Why should he not have sent a notice?

Mr. CARVELL. He did not send a notice anyway, that is sure.

I will now take up the next case, and here is where I want my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier), to follow me. On the 27th November the following document was despatched from the post office inspector's office at St. John. And here I might state for the benefit of the Postmaster General that so numerous must have been the dismissals in the province of New Brunswick that the sending out of a circular had to be resorted to. These circulars were struck off on a typewriter and just filled in with the name of the post office when it was obtained, and that is all there is to it:

P. O. Inspector's Office, St. John, N.B.,
November 27, 1911.

Postmaster at Bath, N.B.

I beg to enclose herewith duplicate blank transfer receipts which you will be good enough to have filled in with all the blanks you have on hand, and prepare them so that they will be ready for the officer from this department who will be at your office on or about the 1st December to transfer the office.

(Signed): N. R. COLTER,
P. O. inspector.

Now, it happens that the post office at Bath, N. B., was in charge of a postmistress, a Miss Bohen, who was appointed to the office some five or six years ago—I have forgotten the exact date, but it must be that long. She is a lady who certainly did not vote and never opened her mouth one way or the other towards influencing the election in the county of Carleton or anywhere else in the Dominion. This lady was ruthlessly removed from her office on two days' notice, but no charge was preferred against her and no opportunity was afforded her to defend herself. And doubtless this action was taken on the evidence of the same gentleman who preferred the charge against the postmaster at Woodstock. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he thinks this is right conduct in the case of Bath post office, or what justification could be urged for the dismissal of a lady who did not vote and who certainly took no part in the election campaign? I want to know if my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), is satisfied that people should be ruthlessly driven from office without being given a chance to defend themselves?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not heard of a single instance from the hon. gentleman yet of an appointment by order in council.

Mr. CARVELL. Then my hon. friend's hearing is defective, and his powers of digesting evidence are very defective also.

Mr. HAGGART. Postmasters are not appointed by order in council.

Mr. CARVELL. Well, I can only tell my hon. friend that the officer at Woodstock was certainly appointed by order in council.

Mr. HAGGART. He may have been.

Mr. CARVELL. He must be.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know that.

Mr. CARVELL. It is a town of nearly four thousand people, and can you imagine a man appointed to an office of that importance without an order in council? Of course, I may be wrong, but I do not think so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What difference does it make?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, what difference does it make? This is the case of the postmistress at Bath, and I think the revenue of the post office there must be in the vicinity of $1,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The appointment would not be made by order in council.

Mr. CARVELL. Would not?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. CARVELL. What in the world is the difference then? I believe both these were appointments by order in council, but I may be wrong.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to ask if the hon. member adheres to the principle of accepting the recommendation of the defeated candidate?

Mr. CARVELL. I realize that when it comes to appointments the defeated candidate in my county has the say and not I.

Mr. RHODES. What do you think?

Mr. CARVELL. I realize that when these appointments are made they are made on the recommendation of the defeated candidate. I do not so much object to that. But, Sir, I do object to the Postmaster General taking the recommendation of a defeated candidate and absolutely discharging from office a postmistress who has not violated the rules of the department in the faintest iota. Then again, if my hon. friend the Postmaster General takes the word of a member of this House, the latter is here on the floor of this House to defend his action to state whether or not he knows of his own knowledge that the charges are true; but the defeated candidate is not here and in this case he is not speaking from his own knowledge.

Mr. EMMERSON. The charge should be put in writing.

Mr. CARVELL. I go further than that and say that the official concerned should be given an investigation and given a chance to clear himself. In connection with the post office at Bath, what do I find? I find a petition signed by 164 of the patrons of that office addressed to the hon. the Postmaster General as follows:

To the hon. the Postmaster General.

We, the undersigned voters of the parish of Kent, county of Carleton, province of New Brunswick, and patrons of the Bath post office in said county, enter a protest against the removal, without just cause or reason, of Miss Mary A. Bohen, late postmistress, who has given us entire satisfaction in every particular, and the removal of the office from the business section of the village.

We humbly ask for her reinstatement.

I will send this over to my hon. friend the Postmaster General and I sincerely hope that he will give it due consideration.

Mr. PELLETIER. Will the hon. member kindly mail it to me.

Mr. CARVELL. I may say that I have to-day received a letter from the lady, as follows:

Mr. F. B. Carvell, M.P.

Dear Sir,—I wish to inform you that I was dismissed from office as postmistress, Bath, P.Q., on December 1, after two or three days' notice. I had the impression no non-partisans would be removed from office, and as I come under that class, I did not bring any influence to bear to try to retain it.

I do not imagine that influence would have amounted to very much when the Postmaster General is willing to act on the meagre evidence or on the character of the evidence on which he made his recommendation for dismissal. There are two or three important post offices in my county in which the officials have been treated in exactly the same way. I refer to the post offices at Florenceville and Benton. Only two days' notice was given in the same way. Yet our hon. friends opposite lay down a policy which sounds all right, but in applying that policy they do the grossest injustice. But bad as is the conduct of affairs in this respect in the Post Office Department, if you want to find the spoils system reduced to an absurdity, carried almost to the point of petty larceny, go to the Public Works Department. I have just one illustration of this to give to the House and to the minister, if he were here; and I hope he will take the trouble to read this in 'Hansard' to-morrow. Fortunately for me, and I think for my people as well, I have very little patronage. Perhaps there is no other constituency in Canada in which there is so little as in the county of Carleton, and perhaps there is no other constituency in which there is so large a percentage of office-holders driven out as though they had no right to be British subjects. There are, I think, to-day only two officials of the Public Works Department in existence in that county. One of them has not been decapitated so far, but is expecting to be every day, because we are hearing of it on the streets, not because he has taken any part in an election, but because at some time in the last three or four years, he is alleged to have made statements derogatory to the character of the defeated candidate. The other official was the clerk of works on the public building at Hartland. The money having been voted for this work and the contract let by public tender, I asked the people of Hartland to give me the name of a gentleman who would have not only the ability but the honesty to see that this work was properly carried on. The result was that a petition was drawn up and signed by Liberals and Conservatives alike to the number of 30 or 40 of the leading people of the village, asking that Mr. Macfarlane be appointed to the office. That petition is on file in the Public Works Department. The man was appointed and began his duties in March or April last. The building progressed during the summer time and is now practically completed. I am informed that it will not take more than two months longer to complete it and hand it over to the gov-

ernment. This gentleman certainly took no part in the election campaign; he never attended a meeting, never looked sideways at either a Liberal or a Conservative, but remained in the post office and attended to his duties to the entire satisfaction of every resident of that community, whether Liberal or Conservative. But a hungry Conservative wanted a job, and within four or five weeks after the election Mr. Macfarlane received notice to hand over on the next day all the papers and everything under his control to the man who was appointed in his place, and who was actually one of the men who had signed the petition six months previously asking that Mr. Macfarlane be appointed. That is an illustration of the way in which things are conducted in the Public Works Department. If this is not petty larceny in public patronage, I would like to know where to find it. I have no desire to go over the ground covered by previous speakers, except so far as to call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the flimsy argument he advanced as to the reason why the gentlemen who were nominated for the Waterways Commission were removed from their positions. He says forsooth, that it was because a new government with new ideas, was coming into power, and he is almost surprised that the three gentlemen had not felt called upon to resign their positions voluntarily. My hon. friend is not so narrow as that. If he would go to England or the United States or to any other country and apply that doctrine, he would find that on a change of government the whole diplomatic service would have to be changed.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The diplomatic service is not a party service.

Mr. CARVELL. These commissioners constitute a court, but so hungry were hon. gentlemen opposite for the spoils of office that they were willing to remove men in that position. I think sufficient evidence has been given to show that these hon. gentlemen are not living up to the fine professions which they made in 1896, and which they make to-day. All we ask is that they should carry out the doctrine they laid down themselves and that men should not be driven from office without being given a chance to be heard in their own defence. If they be given that opportunity, and are found guilty, no one will have anything to say on this side. On the other hand if they remove a man without investigation as they have done in the particular case to which I refer, they are false to their own doctrine, and are guilty of deceiving the people.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). There seems to be a misunderstanding with regard to the appointments and dismissals of officials of this government. One would think that the prerogative of appointing and dismissing belonged to the opposition, but we must not forget in the first instance that the prerogative for the appointments to the Civil Service is vested in the Crown, subject to the statutory limitations which parliament imposes. Parliament can impose any conditions it likes. Parliament can enact whether civil servants can engage in political warfare or not. The removal of these civil servants is not in the power of the government but is vested in His Royal Highness the Governor General, and His Royal Highness will not remove any such official without good cause.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to convey the idea that His Royal Highness had anything to do with the removal of Miss Bohen from the office of postmistress?

Mr. HAGGART. I am speaking of parties appointed under an Act of the Parliament of Canada. I am speaking of appointments under order in council by His Royal Highness, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that His Royal Highness will go into every item of evidence as to the reasons for the removal of any such civil servant before consenting to it. I know that to be the case. If the evidence be not sufficient, His Royal Highness will send back to the minister for further reasons. Remember I am speaking of the inside and outside service to which appointments are made by Act of Parliament, and the conditions of which are defined by statute. I was astounded to hear the right hon. the leader of the opposition say that appointments not made by the Governor General, by virtue of his prerogative, but by the Imperial authorities, had been cancelled without reason. I doubt very much if the appointments ever were made that he speaks of. He is simply putting up a bogey before this House for the purpose of making an attack upon the government. I would ask the right hon. gentleman to point to a single party appointed by order in council who has been removed by this government. The right hon. gentleman must know that when appointments are made by His Royal Highness, under the prerogative of the Crown, such appointments would not be revoked without sufficient reason and evidence being furnished to His Royal Highness; and if any hon. gentleman considers he has occasion to find fault in any such case, let him move for the papers and have them brought before this House and see by them whether there was not sufficient evidence to justify the action taken.

The hon. gentleman has spoken about the removal of postmasters from one end

of the country to the other, but he must know that such appointments do not come under the Civil Service Act, but are made by the minister and are revocable by him at pleasure. I would refer the hon. gentleman to cases in which the power of dismissing was exercised in a most cruel degree by the late government in the department of railways. Lockmasters on our canals, and others who had been employed on these canals for years, were removed ruthlessly without reason by the late Minister of Railways, simply at the request of members supporting the government. I must say to the credit of some of those members that they were honourable enough not to exercise the power given them, but others did not fail to take advantage of their opportunities, and even should this government exercise the power of dismissal in the cases which do not come under the Civil Service Act, they would be only following the bad example set by their predecessors.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). When the hon. member for Carleton, N. B., (Mr. Carvell) was speaking, I asked him what he would say about the high-handed acts of the government which he supported so strenuously in their dismissals of men on the Welland canal, which runs through the constituency I have the honour to represent. The hon. gentleman was gracious enough, instead of answering my question, to say that I could address my words to the House. I intend to avail myself of his kind permission. In 1896, when the government led by the present leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took office, without a word on record from anybody concerned, on which to base such an action, a letter was written by the Minister of Railways and Canals to the superintendent of the Welland canal at St. Catharines instructing him to dismiss at once all lock tenders, lockmasters and others on that canal. That is, he was to tell them they need not report for duty after that season, unless they were re-appointed. No charge was made against these men, and no reason could be given for their dismissal except that they had been appointed by a Conservative government. They were excellent men and had done their work well; no one suggested the contrary. Simply the hon. member who represented Lincoln down to 1900 came to Ottawa and saw to it that the letter was written and the dismissals took place. Let me quote what the Hon. A. G. Blair, Minister of Railways said about it. This will be found in 'Hansard' of 1897, vol. 1, page 2122:

> At the close of navigation in the fall of 1896, all employees were notified through the superintendent by letter from myself as minister, that their services were not further required, and that they would be notified before the opening of navigation next spring if they were to be taken on again.

There were 130 of these dismissals at once. The canal could not be managed without some experienced lockmasters, so forty or fifty Conservatives were kept on for another season to teach the new appointees, and then they went too. We hear hon. gentlemen opposite to-day voicing beautiful precepts, setting up high standards of honour and laying down fine rules of discipline to be applied to the Civil Service. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said that public officials should not be dismissed so long as they merely expressed their own opinions and voted. But no one pretended that those lock tenders and lockmasters had been active partisans. The only thing against them, as I said, was that they were appointed by a Conservative government. These hon. gentlemen are worried about the inhumanity of the spoils system. What a great difference it makes in these gentlemen that they are there, rather than that they are here. What wonderful ideals of morality have taken possession of their minds since they were beaten by the people on the 21st of September. Some of these men who were then dismissed are living to-day in poverty. And as fast as I can, I intend to give back to them, if I have any influence with the government, the same positions they had in 1896. And if any have died since then, so far as I can accomplish it, their sons, if they are needy, or some other men whose only fault is voting for the Conservative party, shall be appointed in these places, instead of the men who were ungracious, even inhuman enough, to have their neighbours dismissed and take their positions, to the numbers of one hundred and eighty in the Niagara district alone.

The leader of the opposition says that officials should not be dismissed if they only expressed their opinion. Did he ever hear of the case of the postmaster of Beamsville, Ontario? This postmaster voted, and did nothing else. But after the results in that village—in which resided Mr. Gibson the Liberal candidate—were known, he remarked: 'I guess Gibson's in the soup.' This was not said during the election, but after the election was over. And the man was dismissed for saying it. Gibson was not 'in the soup' to the extent that the postmaster thought, but he got there four years afterwards. And was there an investigation in this case? After the man was dismissed, they thought it necessary to hunt up a reason for dismissing him, and they succeeded in bringing forward the evidence I have indicated and so secured the wonderful verdict that Mr. Fairbrother was a partisan. Is it any wonder that Lin-

coln put Mr. Gibson 'in the soup' since 1900? Is it any wonder that on each successive occasion after that, when the late government appealed for the verdict of Lincoln, the majority against them in that riding was larger and larger? I hope the hon. gentlemen who have worked themselves up into such a state of indignation about the management of the Post Office Department will read the discussion in 'Hansard' about the Beamsville post office, and will cogitate over that case a little. If they do so, I think it will be many years before they will find fault with the administration of the post office as it is now being administered in the interest of the people.

There are one or two other matters I will refer to now that I am on my feet. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) who moved the resolution, wants a declaration of the government's policy. He did not worry about that for fifteen years, while his friends were in power, but now he wants a strict declaration and interpretation of the government's policy in this matter. This government is young, this government is beginning and from all signs it will be able on this question of patronage or any other to give my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) plenty of demonstrations of the fitness of their policy and the approval accorded to that policy by the people.

He does not propose to discuss matters in his own constituency, I suppose because there are no complaints there to amount to anything. He spoke in general terms. He referred to the case of Mr. Ham and said that question five on to-day's Order Paper gives the reason assigned, that because Mr. Ham expected to be dismissed he quit. What was he afraid of? What reason had he to suppose he would have been dismissed if he had not done something for which he should be dismissed? I could point out that several men on the Welland canal have left the service since September 21, because of having been violent and active partisans, and because they expected to be dismissed. They have taken positions in factories or other places because they expected that this government would restore what was taken away in 1896, not by petty larceny, but by grand larceny, when 180 heads went into the basket by one letter from the Minister of Railways, depriving the men and their families of a livelihood without a minute's notice. The hon. member speaks of the dismissal of a minor official as petty larceny, but here was a grand larceny approved of by the leader of the opposition, when he became Prime Minister in 1896. Why did Mr. Ham not wait until he was put out of office? He went out of his own accord.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). He was dismissed by Mr. Crosby, the candidate of the Prime Minister in the recent election, who once held a seat in this House. The young man thought Mr. Crosby was clothed with power to make the dismissal. That was all there was to it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think Mr. Crosby was quite within his rights if he found there was reason for dismissing a man to dismiss him. Who should have been asked if the man was an offensive partisan if not Mr. Crosby?

The hon. member says that he wants an investigation first and wants fair play, and he does not want members of parliament to say whether fair play is given or not. Take my own case, who is responsible to the people of Lincoln for the public service on the canal in my county? Who, under the constitution, has to account for the way that work is being done but myself? Who is to say whether that work is done properly and whether the servants who are doing that work are doing it in the public interest? The member for the constituency must be responsible for the proper administration of the patronage of his county. He is responsible to the people, the people are supposed to know him, and will see to it that he fulfils his duty. The argument of my hon. friend that something was done 15 years ago or 100 years ago is about the logic applied by hon. gentlemen on this occasion. They do not care, and do not want the country to care what they do. They want everything wrong which they have done in the last 15 years to stand, wrong as it is, and they expect us to be so derelict in our duty as not to clean up this public service and put in good men where bad men were put in by the Laurier government since 1896.

Now, let there be no mistake; this is not a matter of spoils at all, but it is a matter of restitution to the people, of the service which has been wrongly interfered with by the Liberal government since 1896. Who started the spoils system? Who had the postmasters dismissed? We remember the case that was discussed in this House eight or ten years ago—I do not remember at this moment the man's name or the place in question but it was in Nova Scotia —where, on a stormy night in an election campaign, the Conservative candidate, his speakers and driver, were entertained by a man in order to save them from the necessity of driving ten or twenty miles through the storm to get home. The present chief justice of Ontario, Sir Wm. Mulock, then Postmaster General, characterized that as offensive partisanship on the part of this man who happened to be a postmaster notwithstanding the fact that this officer was simply playing the part of the good Samaritan, and, being at the meeting, invited these gentlemen to go to his home, an invitation which they accepted. The dis-

missal of that man was justified by the government then in power. In the places of these men were put men who, they say, were as good as the officials who were dismissed. In 1896 they practically made a clean sweep. We are not after the spoils, we are not looking for vengeance in the matter, but we are asking—and we believe we will obtain what we ask—for a reconstruction of the public service by putting out of office the men who have been put in by the Liberal government simply and solely because they were Liberals and at the expense of Conservatives and their families against most of whom there was not a jot or tittle of objection. We say that there should be a reconstruction of the service upon a proper basis, and if it does happen that honest, able and intellectual persons who happen to belong to the Conservative party are put into office I am sure that there is no proper minded Liberal or any other person who can find fault with such appointment.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, as my department has been to a large extent the subject matter of the discussion which has taken place this afternoon, I wish just to say a few words, and to declare before this House the general line of policy I have adopted, and which I am going to continue in the future so that every member of this House will know exactly where I stand, and it will prevent probably many people from asking questions, except that in some cases what I may say will not be deemed to have answered them beforehand. I am doing this for the general advantage of every one concerned. But, before saying the very few words that I have to say, I would ask my friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) not to think for one moment that I meant not to be courteous to him in not answering further the letter which he wrote to me. I will give my reasons now which I think he will fully understand. He wrote me on the 28th November and I answered that very day by the general formal letter which is always sent in cases like that. It is practically an acknowledgment of the receipt of the letter. Then I said I would consider the matter, but when I came to consider the matter I found that the postmaster in question had been dismissed thirty days before, so that the consideration which I had said I would give could not be given then. I did not mean to be discourteous at all but the facts were as I have stated them, and it was then only a question of considering whether the postmaster had been rightly dismissed or not. Well, what are the facts? The gentleman who was postmaster in 1896 was dismissed without investigation. He is living to-day, and he has asked me to give him back his post-

mastership. I have done it, and I shall do it in every case of this nature. If there is one thing in regard to which I shall not hesitate it shall be that, the facts having been ascertained, if one of our political friends, whose head has been cut off by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, comes to me for relief he shall get it. I would be unworthy of the position which I occupy to-day if I did not do that.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman restore the head if it should transpire that there was not a single resident in the vicinity where this postmaster lived?

Mr. PELLETIER. I am coming to that. But let us satisfy ourselves that I am right so far. This is a most interesting case and I am surprised that my hon. friends have taken it as a sample. This file is a very interesting one to read. What do we find in it? It goes back to the days of 1896 and what do we find in 1896? A gentleman by the name of Russell writes to Sir Wm. Mulock, then Postmaster-General, and what does he say? Now, let my hon. friends, who have such grand and lofty ideas to-day about what should be done by this government, listen:

Dear Mr. Mulock,—I enclose clipping from the 'Evening Mail' containing a list of the officers of a newly formed Tory association.

This was a short time after the election of 1896, and we see that these bad Tories were already forming an association for which I congratulate them heartily.

The councillor Henley——

Mark that name; that is the man I have appointed—

The councillor Henley, named as one of the vice-presidents, is your postmaster and Mr. Paterson's preventive officer, at Spry Bay. The people of the district cannot understand it. He tells them that he cannot be removed and they conclude that he cannot be or would have been long ago. They have dragged the life out of me——

The boys down there.

—about the matter and I have written you and Mr. Paterson till I am ashamed to say any more. Could you not appoint your commissioner and let us get some of these cases closed out? I do not see that this case needs the intervention of a commissioner at all.

Yours truly,

B. RUSSELL.

Now, this gentleman whom I have not the pleasure of knowing, was B. Russell. He says that people had been dragging the life out of him. But evidently Sir William Mulock was not of opinion that the case was as clear as Mr. Russell put it. What do we find? In March, 1897, three or four months afterwards, a telegram

from this same gentleman, Mr. B. Russell, who says:

My nominee for Spry Bay post office is Gaspard J. Leslie.

Now, on the same day I find in Mr. Mulock's own handwriting:

Appoint Mr. Russell's nominee.

Where is the investigation in that case? Do my hon. friends seriously pretend that after our friends have been treated that way we shall protect the persons they have put in office and let our own people suffer? Let it be clearly understood that in such cases our friends, if they are still alive, will get back their jobs.

Mr. CARVELL. Suppose they are dead, what then?

Mr. PELLETIER. Then we will pray for them.

Mr. CARVELL. Will the Postmaster General tell us what he will do in case a postmaster is not dead?

Mr. PELLETIER. That is another case; sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. Where the postmaster is proved to have taken an active part in politics he will be dismissed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whether on the one side or the other?

Mr. PELLETIER. I am not going to consider a case of such remote possibility as a postmaster fighting his own government.

Mr. CARVELL. You have a good many things to learn.

Mr. PELLETIER. I do not pretend to be a practical politician, but let us take the cases as they will occur.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend says: When an official has taken an active part in politics he will dismiss him. Suppose he finds that before the elections of the 21st of September, the official took an active part on the Conservative side, will he dismiss him?

Mr. PELLETIER. If cases occur of that description, which I do not expect, and which we cannot reasonably expect, we will consider them.

Now as to evidence, I say that it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule. I will in all cases accept the word of a member of parliament who comes to me and says that he knows enough to demand that man's dismissal. I do expect, however, that the member of parliament will be fair and just enough, and if he has been elected by his constituents he is considered by them to be fair and honest.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will you take an hon. member's word and retain the office-holder in his position?

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) should not confront me with such a cruel dilemma. I do not expect—and I will answer his question at the same time as that of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley)—any of my friends on the opposite side to make any such recommendation, so it is no use discussing that matter at all. If a member of parliament has been deceived—no man can avoid making mistakes, I make mistakes myself, and everybody makes mistakes—if it is found that a mistake or wrong has been committed I will not allow that wrong to remain without rectification.

Mr. CARVELL. Will my hon. friend be good enough to look into the case of the postmistress at Bath at once?

Mr. PELLETIER. I am coming to that. I know of a case—I do not remember the name but I think our good friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce may be able to give it—under the late government, where a member of parliament made a recommendation for the dismissal of an official and a mistake was made. The brother of that officer had taken an active part in the election, and it was discovered that a mistake had been committed, but the late government would not rectify that mistake. I shall not do that. If I make a mistake I shall be broad and manly enough to see that the error is rectified. I have made dismissals, but not with pleasure. I have not dismissed one single postmaster in my own riding, but I have had to dismiss quite a few postmasters in other places and I shall dismiss more; but, in so doing I shall endeavour to keep in view the principles of justice laid down in the resolution unanimously adopted by parliament.

We have been told by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that postmasters should not fall under this rule. Why, Sir, this is a brand new doctrine. Why should not postmasters fall under this rule? Do not postmasters know, have they not been told, for the last fifteen years that they come under this rule? Have they not been dismissed by hundreds and hundreds for violating this rule? So they come under it to such an extent that they are not appointed by order in council. Very few postmasters, as my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) knows, were appointed by order in council. If I mistake not, it is only in cities of 20,000 population or over, that appointments are made in such a way. Now, the postmasters referred to by the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) are not appointed by order in council.

They are simply dismissed on the strength of a few words in pencil on a corner of the letter of the member of the House who asks for such dismissal. That is all. Now, why should a postmaster who holds his position as long as the Post Office Department is willing to leave it to him, not fall under this rule? I consider that he does.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There are hundreds of persons holding post offices in this country who have been almost forced to accept the position; they did not want to take it.

Mr. PELLETIER. Then I would not suppose that they would be very sorry to lose it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). But there may be no other person in the county whose residence is so well located as this person's, and in the interest of the public service he should be retained there.

Mr. PELLETIER. Some of our friends on the other side have said: Have we come to this that these dismissals should be carried on in this way? It seems that now we are in power and our friends on the opposition side are going to abandon all the principles they have laid down, all the policy which they have put before the country as far as the Civil Service is concerned. They want us to be great saints when we are in power so that their friends shall be protected. It is a pretty clever move on their part, but it is rather thin.

Now, I am holding investigations. My hon. friend will be pleased to hear that I have one commissioner acting in Quebec, and another in Montreal. I believe in the principle that a man should be heard in his own defence. It is a British principle, and it is a good one all over the world.

Mr. CARVELL. Why didn't you carry it out?

Mr. PELLETIER. I did carry it out in all the cases in which I did not consider that I had positive evidence before me.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman state who are the commissioners at Montreal and Quebec?

Mr. PELLETIER. At Quebec it is Mr. Lawrence Stafford. I am not sure who the commissioner is at Montreal, but I will tell my hon. friend to-morrow. Some of the members of this House have asked me for dismissals, and I will say to their credit that when I have told them: 'If you have not enough facts to demand this, it is in your own interest that an investigation should take place,' they have assented. In those cases we have written letters to the postmaster saying: 'The department is informed that you have taken an active part in politics; do you admit or deny this?' This will save the trouble of an investigation in many cases. I have received letters stating that it is true, and in such cases I have saved the country the cost of an investigation, for which I suppose nobody will blame me unless possibly the investigator. Others write long letters on the great principle that a man should not lose his job. These I just dismiss, because I know they cannot deny the charge. If a postmaster writes saying: 'No, Sir, I have not taken any part in politics,' that case is investigated. Now, I appeal to my hon. friends opposite whether this method of dealing with this matter is not fair and right. They did much worse than that during the 15 years they were in office. I know of my own knowledge that people who never meddled in politics at all were dismissed to make room for people who had been waiting a long time to get their jobs, and I know that some of our friends were obliged to leave this country and go to the United States to earn their living because they were dismissed by the late government. With regard to the Bath post office, I expect the papers in a few minutes. I have been able to get some papers with reference to Spry Bay; but I had no notice of this, and my hon. friend the ex-Postmaster General knows that with 13,582 post offices in the country, it is not very easy to remember each case individually.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was pretty hard to get him to dismiss anybody.

Mr. PELLETIER. But there are records in the department to show that he did so, and that he put his initials on letters in which people asked him for the dismissal without giving a reason.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like my hon. friend to mention that case. I know of only one case in which a gentleman was dismissed because I was weak enough to accept the word of the member, and when I was assailed in the House for dismissing the postmaster at Souris, Manitoba, Mr. Sifton, who had asked for the dismissal, would not come into the House.

Mr. PELLETIER. You have been his colleague for fifteen years.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, he was not my colleague; he was a private member of the House. He is your leader now. That is the only case in which a dismissal was made while I was in the department.

Mr. PELLETIER. That is probably the case I was referring to, because the papers were put before me the other day. Now, let us come to Woodstock, where we are told the postmaster was dismissed without cause or reason. We have some friends on this side of the House who come from New

Brunswick and they know something about that case. I am informed, and credibly informed, that this is one of the worse cases that could be put before the House, that the postmaster there is a violent partisan.

Mr. CARVELL. We would like some proof of that.

Mr. PELLETIER. If my hon. friend will wire down to Woodstock, he will get it. I have all the information I require to justify me in acting as I did. There are members on this side of the House who know something about it; I have consulted them, and they have told me that there is not the least possible doubt about this case. With regard to the Bath case, as the papers have not arrived, I am not in a position to discuss it, but I feel sure that I have not applied to that case any other principle than the one I have stated, which the hon. member for Carleton found to be so good that he greeted my statement with applause.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. Postmaster General finds himself in error about the Bath case, will he reopen the matter and allow an investigation?

Mr. PELLETIER. Most decidedly. As a minister of the Crown it is my duty, and I will not be a party to injustice. But I will try to give prompt satisfaction to the people who expect us to do something, and not let the papers lie on our desks, or in the pigeon holes of the department for too long a time. I wanted to let our friends on both sides of the House know that there is no doubt about the stand which I have taken, and which I will continue to take.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am sure that my hon. friend the Premier did not realize, when addressing the House earlier in the afternoon, that he was giving to the House and the country a splendid opportunity of learning the principles on which his administration was going to act, and did not know that his Postmaster General had made a very large addition to the resolution, which every one in this House agreed to in 1905, and which the Premier adopted as the policy of his government in dealing with the outside service.

My hon. friend from Lincoln was the first to announce this additional feature of the Conservative policy. In the early days of the session he was not very enthusiastic about the personnel of this government, and not specially pleased that his abilities were not recognized in its formation. Evidently, however, he has got new light; he has had a vision. He has been informed that he can have removed all the employees on the Welland canal he wants to have removed. Since then he has discovered some admiration for the present government. If he will now only bring on some of those resolutions that have been standing in his name for the last four weeks, every member of the House will be interested.

He has told the Postmaster General that there was a postmaster at Beamsville who was dismissed and the result was that 'Gibson was in the soup,' and that the county of Lincoln was in the same predicament ever since 1896, on account of the wholesale dismissals made at that time. Well, if history should repeat itself as it often does, my hon. friend from Lincoln had better be careful because should the policy of this administration be carried into effect both he and the Postmaster General will speedily find themselves in the soup. Then we are told that it is not the spoils system, but a simple matter of restitution of rights which is being put into force. Here we have the old Conservative doctrine that they have an inherent divine right to rule, and that no one not belonging to that party has any right to hold any office in the administration of the country, and consequently that because in some time past Conservatives went out of office in some places and vacancies were created which were filled by Liberals, these offices must be filled again by Conservatives. My hon. friend the Postmaster General is too shrewd not to know that Mr. Henley, postmaster of Spry Bay, was the vice-president of the Conservative Association. If Mr. Henley was vice-president of the Conservative Association he ought to have been dismissed. My hon. friend cannot, with his theory of restitution, set aside the doctrine which the First Minister put forward as the basis on which this government would act and which he preached so loudly in his addresses to the people. No one who sat in the last parliament can fail to recollect the different occasions on which he preached about the evils of patronage. Look at the resolution moved by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) two years ago denouncing the evils of patronage. But my hon. friend is there and we are here. He is there and he can implement these splendid ideas which he so frequently inculcated when on this side. The Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) says that we want the men on the treasury benches to be great saints. We do not expect them to be great saints. We expect them to turn out as great sinners as did their Conservative predecessors when they had to give up office, as these hon. gentlemen will have to do at an early day. I thought we were going to have a clear understanding of what the policy of this government was going to be regarding this large question. I thought that the First Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce were going to make an attempt to give us something tangible in

the shape of Civil Service reform, and the elimination of the spoils system which they so vigorously condemned in days gone by. Until we heard the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and the hon. the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), there was a well defined policy with regard to the inside Civil Service, laid down by statute, and also a well defined policy with regard to the outside service laid down by the resolution of 1905, and I would urge on the government not to depart from that policy in either case. I have no objection to an offensive partisan being dismissed, but we should have evidence to bear out the charge that he is an offensive partisan. I am not here to say that a statement made by a member of this House under his hand in writing to the minister giving specific facts would not be sufficient evidence. I think that every member of this House is entitled to be considered as worthy of credence and there is this further protection that we can discuss the question in the House with the member who makes the statement. But when we come to deal with the written statement of a defeated candidate——

Mr. RHODES. Does the hon. gentleman object to a minister taking the recommendations of a defeated candidate?

Mr. MACDONALD. Most certainly, and I have just given the reason why. We are now dealing with the question of the minister being satisfied by the evidence that a certain fact is true and the minister must justify his judgment to parliament. If he takes the statement of a member of parliament, that statement can be discussed in this House in the presence of the member who made it.

But if he takes the statement of a defeated candidate, he takes the statement of one who cannot discuss the question here, who cannot even give the details to the minister, or put them on record in the department as well as one can who holds a place in this House.

Mr. RHODES. With the permission of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou), I would like to ask him a question. I think I should do it in justice to the hon. gentleman himself, in view of the fact that he lays down the principle here that a minister should not accept the recommendation of a defeated candidate.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman need not ask the question. I am discussing here the responsibility of a minister of the Crown in carrying out a resolution of this House, and I am discussing——

An hon. MEMBER. Showing the white feather.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend who talks about my 'showing the white feather' does not know me. I was going on to say, Mr. Speaker—and—I am addressing the minister——

Mr. CURRIE. I desire ——

Mr. MACDONALD. I decline to yield the floor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) has the floor and has expressed the wish not to be interrupted.

Mr. CURRIE. But, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MACDONALD. I decline to yield the floor to my hon. friend (Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

Mr. CURRIE. I only wish to ask the hon. gentleman a question. I want to know——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, I endeavoured to catch your eye to address the House on this question previous to two other hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I have only six minutes to speak now before the House adjourns under the rule. And as the penchant of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) for interruptions is so well known, I do not propose to get into a discussion with him just now. I was endeavouring to call the attention of the government to the proper principles on which to carry out this policy. The statement of a defeated candidate should not be accepted alone—there should be something in addition. But I wish to point out a singular thing which the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) has done in regard to dismissals. The Minister of Railways and Canals has never been in my county. He visited Halifax to attend the banquet to the Prime Minister. While there, a delegation of gentlemen who were looking for scalps waited upon him. They succeeded in inducing him to remove a gentleman, a very capable man, who was the inspector of construction on the roundhouse now being built in Stellarton, in Pictou county, Mr. Faulkner. I queried the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) and the information I received was that Mr. Faulkner was employed as inspector and his services were dispensed with on November 4, 1911. The reason for his dismissal is thus given:

For offensive partisanship. It is not in the public interest to give the name of the person who recommended his retirement.

I contend that a minister of the Crown who removes a public employee is bound to give to the House and the country—that is a part of his responsibility as minister—the information on which he acted. If he has done so at the request of an individual, he should say so, and if he has acted on a statement of memorial he should be prepared to present it to the House. Sometimes you can invoke great reasons of state as a justification for not divulging information, but that does not apply to a case of this kind. And let me tell this House whom the minister appointed. This was Mr. John Fraser. And who is he? I am indebted to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) for giving to the House information that was within my own knowledge. Mr. Fraser had been postmaster of Stellarton for something like twenty-one years. He had nothing whatever to do with the construction of buildings nor did he know anything about it. He knew no more about the work on the structure in which $35,000 of public money was to be expended than a child would know. He was seventy years of age, and the only claim he had to consideration was that he was secretary of the Conservative party in the last election.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. Let me give my hon. friend who says 'hear, hear' some of his other qualities. The Postmaster General told us that this Mr. Fraser was appointed postmaster at Stellarton on the 1st April, 1892, and he ceased to hold the office on the 1st of May, 1903, because,

Serious irregularities had occurred in connection with the postmaster's accounts which led to his removal from office.

Now, Sir, the occupants of the treasury benches should exhibit some care in dealing with cases that are brought to their attention by candidates who are not in this House. My hon. friend who wanted some information in regard to the subject will see that I have drawn the attention of the House to a case sufficiently serious to warrant the ministry in taking the position that, in regard to constituencies not represented in this House by members supporting the government, they ought to have evidence which should be clear, cogent and positive, both in regard to the action which they take and the appointments which they make. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) will remember, and so will other hon. gentlemen who were in the last parliament, the wail of indignation that went up over the appointment of a Mr. Wagner, because of some irregularities in his case. Yet the Minister of Railways and Canals comes to the province of Nova Scotia, listens to a patronage committee from a county not represented in this House by one of his supporters, wipes out an official against whom nothing can be said and puts in a man, who, according to the reports of the Postmaster General had been guilty of serious irregularities in his accounts which justified his removal. I am sorry the Minister of Railways is not here. This is the first opportunity I have had to call the attention of the House to this matter and to learn from him whether he will not remove at once this man, who in another department of this government was guilty of serious irregularities. This government put in charge of an expenditure of $30,000 a man who had proved false to his trust in another department of the government. The Postmaster General speaks of restitution. But if Mr. Fraser was put in as inspector of this construction it was not because he had been turned out by a Grit government for partisanship or anything of that kind, but he was turned out for the reasons which the Postmaster General himself has been good enough to give to the House. I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT—CABLE RATES.

Mr. LEMIEUX. With the leave of the House I would like to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) if there is any truth in the statement in the newspapers about the reduction in the cable rates between England and Canada?

Mr. PELLETIER. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) who has been a member of government so long, not to press that question for the moment. He will understand the reasons.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 7, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received notification of a vacancy having occurred in the electoral district of South Renfrew by the resignation of Thomas A. Low, Esquire. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

CHRISTMAS ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BORDEN. I move that when the House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until the tenth day of January, 1912.

Mr. MACDONALD. As I am going to leave the House in a very short time to catch a train, I desire to ask on behalf of a certain number of members who have spoken to me on this subject, and also in my own interest, if the hon. leader of the government would agree to fix the date for the resumption of business on the 17th instead of the 10th of January. I know, of course that there are some gentlemen who propose to stay in the city during the recess, who do not want that, but there are other gentlemen who have been more or less engaged with public affairs continuously during the past year, and an adjournment to the 10th of January would be a very short one after all, having regard to those conditions. There may be a difference of opinion on the subject, but I speak for the members of Nova Scotia, and for a good number of other gentlemen from the east, who would like to have an adjournment to the 17th, if that date could be fixed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if there are any hon. gentlemen who oppose the extension of the Christmas vacation the change could not be made now without the unanimous consent of the House, the leader of the government having given notice of an adjournment until the tenth. I understand the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), is very strongly opposed to postponing to a later date the time for resuming business.

Mr. BORDEN. I suppose an amendment could be moved to the resolution.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I should like to make an appeal to the leader of the government on behalf of western members. I think when in opposition the Premier showed very considerable sympathy with what is an undoubted grievance of the hon. gentleman in question. They come a very great distance and have to make a journey home for the Christmas holidays, and to extend this recess for a longer period may detain us here longer in the spring. It is all very well for those who can make this journey. Personally, I am not going west at all, but the fact is that members from the west labour under very great disabilities as compared with those in eastern Canada who have very easy access to their homes. If the government represent that they want time to prepare legislation for the session, I should be disposed to regard such a claim as extremely reasonable, having regard to the very short time they have been in office; but I think that when the recess has been arranged according to the consensus of opinion between the leader of the House and the leader of the opposition, we should be tardy in making an alteration on behalf of one particular section of the members.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). If I am in order, before this motion is put to the House, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question. I do not know whether this is the proper time to do so or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had better wait until this motion is disposed of. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. EMMERSON. Personally, I prefer the adjournment to the 10th rather than the 17th of January, and I concur in what has been stated by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that the extension of the recess means projecting the session one week longer in the spring.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What do I understand the motion to be?

Mr. SPEAKER. That the House adjourn until January 17th.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to be permitted to say a word in favour of the proposition of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). The first part of January is required by hon. gentlemen who live a long distance from Ottawa, and are not able to get home during the session for business purposes, and it would be a great convenience indeed if they were allowed to have a longer holiday than the resolution permits. I am not sure than an extension of the Christmas recess will add another week to the length of the session in the spring, because a great deal depends upon the method with which the business of the House is conducted and the attitude of the opposition, and it might not mean a lengthening of the session to give us a longer holiday at Christmas. I think that the proposition of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is worth considering.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand the motion on the Order Paper to be for an adjournment from the 7th December to the 10th of January. Is there any amendment to that?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is proposed to amend the resolution by extending the adjournment to the 17th of January. Personally, I would agree with the hon. gentlemen who wish for an extended adjournment if I saw any reason for it at all. But every western member is under a great disadvan-

tage in coming down here and having a long vacation as is proposed by this motion. For my own part I am very much opposed to a longer adjournment during the Christmas holidays, and putting western members to the expense which they will incur if an adjournment is made beyond the 10th of January as proposed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. BORDEN. There is certainly no desire on my part, or on the part of the government, to put any hon. member to any unnecessary inconvenience. The 10th of January and the 17th of January were both discussed in connection with this adjournment, and I understand the leader of the opposition has no very strong opinion one way or the other, but is perfectly willing to accept either date. If it would be likely to keep us here a week longer in the spring, I am sure that no one would regard any change with more displeasure than myself. At the same time, there is a great deal in what the hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has suggested with regard to the time which would be available to members of the government for the purpose of preparing their work. I am bound to say that we look forward to the Christmas vacation not as a holiday, but as a time when we may be able to do some work. I would be very willing, therefore, if the members of the House have no strong objection, to have an adjournment, until January 17th, but I would not agree to do so if hon. gentlemen persist very much in their objection. I would like, however, just to add that I think the preparation which might be made, if the vacation is extended to the 17th January, would enable us to have a more rapid despatch of business than would be possible if we should meet again on the 10th.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That would depend on the opposition would it not?

Mr. BORDEN. I am speaking of our side of the case. It would enable us to get ready for a speedy despatch of business, and I am thoroughly confident that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will be inspired with the same desire to get through as fast as the public interest will reasonably permit, as we all of us have been very actively engaged in political affairs for more than a year past. Therefore, if there is no strong objection I would be perfectly willing to change the date from the 10th to the 17th, and in doing so I feel pretty thoroughly assured that it would really not cause any delay in the business of the session.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I feel just as strongly against an extension of the holidays as any other gentleman here can possibly feel in favour of it. I think it is only fair that an arrangement having been come to between the two leaders that arrangement should be carried out. It is certainly taking the House somewhat by surprise to spring a proposition for an amendmeent at this time. I will oppose the proposition to extend the holidays unless on the responsibility of the government for government reasons or until a further discussion can be had with the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman takes that position, we will persevere with the motion as it is, for the 10th.

Mr. MACDONALD. Might I ask the hon. leader of the government to let the matter stand till the leader of the opposition comes in? I spoke to him in regard to the request that I have made to the House, and he expressed himself as satisfied with it; otherwise I would not have made it.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the motion is before the House now, I do not see how we could well let it stand and go on with other business.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That, as the time for receiving petitions for private Bills and the time for presenting private Bills without an additional charge will be curtailed by the Christmas adjournment, it is resolved, that petitions for private Bills be received by the House if presented on or before the 1st day of February, 1912; and that the time for presenting private Bills without the payment of the additional charges provided for under paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection 3 of Rule 89 be extended until February 14, 1912, and March 13, 1912, respectively.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS—REFUND OF FEES.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the accountant of this House be authorized to refund (less the cost of printing and translation) all fees and charges paid in this House on the undermentioned Bills which were undisposed of when parliament was dissolved in July last:

Bill (No. 109) An Act respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company;

Bill (No. 158) (letter U of the Senate), intituled: 'An Act to incorporate Revillon Frères Trading Company';

Bill (No. 198) (letter Y 1 of the Senate), intituled: 'An Act to incorporate the Quebec and Great Northwestern Railway Company';

Bill (No. 202) (letter G 2 of the Senate), intituled: 'An Act to incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company';

Bill (No. 205) (letter D 2 of the Senate), intituled: 'An Act respecting the Canada Cement Company, Limited'; and

Bill (No. 214) (letter Y 2 of the Senate), intituled: 'An Act respecting the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.'

He said: The reason for this motion is that on account of the sudden dissolution of parliament in July last these Bills were not passed. I believe it is customary that a motion of this kind should be based on a recommendation of a committee, but as there is no committee to which these Bills have been referred or can be referred, it has been represented to me by the Examiner and Registrar of Private Bills that the motion is a proper one to be made in this way, and I postponed the motion in order that I might make inquiry of him on that point.

Motion agreed to.

REDUCTION OF CABLE RATES.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay upon the table of the House a communication from the High Commissioner for Canada, Lord Strathcona, setting forth a communication made to him by the Postmaster General of the United Kingdom with regard to a reduction in cable rates. I believe the substance of this has already been communicated to the press, but I lay it on the table for the information of hon. members. I understand that my colleague the Postmaster General also has a communication to make which he has received from the Postmaster General of the United Kingdom.

Mr. PELLETIER Mr. Speaker, this is a very important communication which I am sure will be gladly received by every one. It is a telegram from Mr. Samuel, the Postmaster General of Great Britain, which reads as follows:

London, 6th Dec., 1911.

Hon. Louis P. Pelletier,
Ottawa.

Cordially reciprocate the friendly wish contained in your letter of 24th November. Have announced in House of Commons that reduced rate for plain language deferred telegrams to and from Canada will come into operation on 1st of January, also that by arrangement with Western Union Company deferred press telegrams at half rates and day and week-end cable letters at greatly reduced rate will be accepted at once by this company for places in Canada served by its system. Letter follows. Am sending this by cable letter on first day of service.

HERBERT SAMUEL,
Postmaster General.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I wish to congratulate my hon. friend on the success which he has achieved with the Postmaster General of England. I may say that negotiations have been proceeding for the last two years. I am glad, however, that my hon. friend gets the credit of having succeeded at last; but he will bear in mind that this is only the first instalment, and only a minimum of what should be obtained in regard to cable communications between the two countries. My hon. friend is aware of the movement which is on foot for closer communication on a telegraphic basis not only with the mother country, but between the various colonies of the empire. Already a step has been taken in that direction by the Dominion government in the establishment of the Pacific cable. But we should have between England and Canada a government-owned cable. The matter has already been discussed at several Imperial Conferences, but I think the time has come when, to curb the monopoly of the cable ring, a government-owned cable should be established between Great Britain and Canada. Once more I congratulate my hon. friend on the success he has achieved.

MESSAGE FROM HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. BORDEN delivered a message from His Royal Highness:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with great pleasure the address that you have adopted in reply to my speech at the opening of the session of parliament, and thank you for it. Sincerely,

ARTHUR.

Government House,
Dec. 5, 1911.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY FROM MONCTON TO LEVIS.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. What work yet remains to be done on the National Transcontinental railway between Moncton and Levis?

2. When is it expected that that portion of the line will be completed and ready for operation?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The following information has been received from the National Transcontinental Railway Commission:

1. 53·5 miles of track yet to be laid. 83·4 miles of ballasting yet to be done. 20·4 miles of grading yet to be completed. 1 per cent of the bridge superstructures from Moncton to New Brunswick and Quebec boundary, and 20 per cent from boundary to Lévis, yet remains to be done. 90 per cent of the work on station buildings yet remains to be done.

2. The portion of the line in the province of New Brunswick by September, 1912, and

the portion in the province of Quebec from the New Brunswick boundary to Lévis by September 30, 1913.

RAILWAY FROM NEW GLASGOW TO THORBURN.

*Mr. MACDONALD.

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Railways been called to a Bill proposed in the last session of last parliament to provide for the taking over of the railway between New Glasgow and Thorburn on the terms proposed in a draft agreement with the Acadia Coal Company?
2. If so, does the minister propose to introduce a Bill of a similar nature at this session?
3. Has the minister discontinued any passenger service that was being given to the people of Thorburn by agreement with the company over said railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. There was no Bill introduced during the last session of parliament to provide for taking over the railway between New Glasgow and Thorburn on the terms proposed in a draft agreement with the Acadia Coal Company. On May 17, 1911, a resolution, was proposed by Hon. Mr. Graham, in connection with the leasing by the government of the Vale railway, property of the Acadia Coal Company, but was not adopted.
2. No.
3. Yes.

MR. P. S. ARCHIBALD.

*Mr. MACDONALD.

Is Mr. P. S. Archibald in the employ of the Department of Railways in any capacity? If so, in what capacity?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes; in an engineering capacity reporting on proposed branch lines.

VEITCH FARM, VANCOUVER.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Is the government aware as to whether Mr. Grisdale of the Department of Agriculture recommended the purchase of the Veitch farm in North Saanich, Vancouver Island, for the establishment of an experimental farm?
2. If so, is it the intention of the government to carry out such recommendation?

Mr. BURRELL:

1 and 2. The government is of the opinion that in the public interest information of this kind should not be given.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What percentage has been kept of the salary due the census enumerators?
2. When is the balance of such salaries to be paid by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. 10 per cent in organized districts and from 10 per cent to 40 per cent in unorganized districts.
2. Parliament having now voted the necessary Supply payment of the balances will be made as rapidly as practicable.

WILLIAM ROY.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Was an inquiry made by the Intercolonial authorities after the 1st October, 1904, on the report made by H. Boulay, of Sayabec, county of Rimouski, against William Roy, a section man on the Intercolonial railway at Amgui?
2. If so, when was it made and what was the result?
3. If not, why was it refused and by whose order?
4. Is the said William Roy still in the employ of the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No inquiry was made at the time, in 1904, but an inquiry was made in October, 1911.
2. An inquiry was held October 16, 1911, and the evidence taken is now being considered.
3. It is understood that the minister, in 1904, desired the postponement of the inquiry.
4. Yes.

C. N.R., CLARKBORO, SASK.

Mr. MEIGHEN:

Has the Department of Railways any information, and if so, what, as to whether the Canadian Northern Railway Company has, as requested by law, secured title to their right of way and station grounds through the townsite of Clarkboro in Saskatchewan?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The department has no information.

NEWSPAPER MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. PELLETIER. If I have the unanimous consent of the House, I would like as a matter of courtesy to my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) to give him an answer to a question he put the other day. My hon. friend is not in his seat but he will have the benefit of the answer in 'Hansard.' Re question of daily newspapers from Toronto and Montreal not being delivered at Sydney, Glace Bay and other mining points in the neighbourhood, the Postmaster General is informed that there is no reason, so far as the mail connections are concerned why such delivery should not take place. The Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, who was wired in regard to the matter, informs the department that in all cases all the daily papers are forwarded, except in the case of failure to make con-

nection at Truro, owing to accident or other unaccountable circumstances. There is, therefore, no basis for the assumption that the Railway Mail Service is not adequate so far as the daily delivery of those newspapers is concerned, and the daily papers are being received at those points regularly except owing to accident, &c., as above mentioned, when it is not possibile to make the connection.

POSTAL CONVENTION BETWEEN CANADA AND FRANCE

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General to a statement published this afternoon regarding a postal convention between Canada and France. Will he be kind enough to have the papers on the table when we meet after the adjournment.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am happy to be able to inform my hon. friend that the agreement has now been signed by both contracting parties.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The newspapers are publishing the rates and we ought to have the record before the House.

Mr. PELLETIER. The papers will be brought down.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) has been kind enough to give a satisfactory answer to the question I put about the payment of the census enumerators. He says that the money is now available and will be paid. Will he be kind enough to see that payments are made before Christmas? We are deluged with letters from all parts of the country asking to have the payments made speedily and it would be a nice Christmas box to send each enumerator what is due him.

Mr. BURRELL. My hon. friend is not the only one who is deluged with correspondence on this matter. We shall do what we can to expedite the payment.

THE COPYRIGHT BILL.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). On the 29th of November last I put the following question:

Is it the intention of the government to introduce the Copyright Bill, Bill (No. 184) of the last session of the last parliament, which had its first reading on 26th April, 1911, or to introduce an analogous Bill during the present session?

To this the hon. the Minister of Agriculture replied:

Mr. BURRELL. At the time of the introduction of the Canadian Copyright Bill there was before the British parliament a Bill to give effect to the resolutions of the Imperial Copyright Conference of 1910. One of the main objects of the Canadian Bill was to make the Canadian law on the subject uniform with the law to be enacted by the British Bill. Since the introduction of the British Bill substantial amendments have been made and it is still before the British parliament. It is not the intention of this government to introduce a Bill this session.

Let me draw the attention of the hon. minister to a paragraph which I find in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of Wednesday, December 6:

Copyright Bill through.

Canadian Associated press cable.

London, Dec. 5.—In the House of Lords today the Copyright Bill passed the third reading.

I would like to ask my hon. friend if he can give us some information about the Canadian Bill?

Mr. BURRELL. I am afraid I cannot give any definite promise along the line mentioned by my hon. friend. While it is true that the delay in the passage of the British Bill referred to had some effect on our action, I would not say that it was the entire cause of the delay on our part. I have noticed the item to which he refers, and when we get the Bill mentioned in it, we shall give the matter further consideration.

THE FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) to the following despatch which has appeared in the daily papers:

Halifax, N.S., Dec. 5.—That there is a good prospect for the complete reorganization of the fisheries branch of the Marine Department at Ottawa is the opinion of ex-Ald. Wilson, who has just returned from Ottawa, where he had an interview with Hon. J. D. Hazen, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on the subject. Mr. Wilson told a Canadian press correspondent to-night that he found the minister favourably inclined to the proposition and disposed to put it into effect.

The reorganization would include the appointment of a deputy minister of fisheries, who would have special charge of the prosecution and development of the fishing industry, which at present is worth to Nova Scotia alone between $7,000,000 and $8,000,000 annually.

What the government is urged to do is to appoint a deputy minister of fisheries, a man who would know the business thoroughly. In each province there would be a superintendent —also a practical man—to look after the carrying out of local details.

Might I ask if it is the intention of the government to carry out this reorganization, and if the change will mean that we are to have three deputies in my hon. friend's department instead of two as at present?

Mr. HAZEN. I may say that a few days ago I had a visit from Mr. Wilson of Halifax, the gentleman referred to in the interview, who is largely interested in the protection and development of the fisheries of Nova Scotia. Mr. Wilson gave me ideas and suggestions with regard to changes that might be made with advantage to the fishing interests of this country.

I talked the matter over with Mr. Wilson, and thanked him very much for the suggestions he had made and told him they would receive careful consideration on my part. I am not prepared to answer the hon. gentleman's questions more definitely than I have done in these few remarks. I might add, however, that from my short experience in the department, I am led to believe that the outside protection service might possibly be reorganized with benefit to the fisheries. I am giving consideration to the matter, and am consulting the officials of the department with regard to it, and getting such information as I can from different sources. While I do not say that it can be done in the course of a week or so, yet, I hope at some time to make a reorganization that will give better protection to our fisheries resources than we have at present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What protection?

Mr. HAZEN. The protection afforded by a better enforcement of the laws than we have at the present time. We have good laws in regard to close seasons, the times when nets may be put out and things of that sort. But I am led to believe, not only by those in the department, but by those outside as well, that there are a good many cases in which these laws are not very well observed this being due, to some extent, to the defective system of appointing fishery officers. A report has reached me to the effect that the fisheries protective service on the Pacific coast is not as effective as it should be; consequently, our friends across the international line come over inside the three mile limit and take fish in Canadian waters where they have no right to carry on fishing operations. These are all matters worthy of consideration. And should I reach the conclusion that by some system of reorganization our fisheries can be better conserved and our fishing industry improved, I am sure I shall have the support of the House in carrying out that reform.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would suggest to the hon. minister (Mr. Hazen) the desirability of having a thorough examination into the question of the pollution of streams by sawdust.

Mr. HAZEN. The question the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) raises, is an extremely important one from the standpoint of the preservation of fish life in our rivers and streams. We have excellent laws on the subject now; the only question is the enforcement of those laws. I presume that as to the province from which we both come, rumours have reached the ears of my hon. friend, as they have reached mine, that there is too much laxity on the part of the fishery officers in seeing to the carrying out of the law.

NAVAL SERVICE—RUMOURED VISIT TO ENGLAND OF THE MINISTER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. May I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) whether it is true, as reported in the press, that he is going to England during the recess with regard to the Naval Service?.

Mr. HAZEN. I may say to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the only information I have on the subject I have received from the newspapers.

TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is it the intention of the government to introduce early after the recess the measure to establish the Tariff Commission?

Mr. BORDEN. It is the intention to introduce the legislation referred to as soon as practicable after parliament reassembles.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) to the fact that on the 29th of November last I moved for a return of papers relating to the Salisbury and Harvey railway and the lending of rails to the company for the purpose of putting the road in order. That return has not yet been laid upon the table. I suppose I can hardly look for it before the House rises, but may I express the hope that the hon. minister will bring it down as soon as possible after the resumption of business by the House?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

THE BANKING ACT.

Mr. MACDONALD. As there seems to be, judging by public rumour, some uncertainty on the matter, I desire to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) whether he intends to introduce the Banking Act soon after the vacation.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I have the matter under consideration. But the importance of it is well known to the hon. gentleman and to every member of the House. I am sorry not to be able to give the hon. gentleman a definite answer.

BILL MINER.

Mr. BUREAU. I am sorry that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) has left his seat, but I suppose my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) will tell him what I ask. I would like to know if his attention has been called to the statement in the public press to the effect that Bill Miner, the famous escaped convict from New Westminster penitentiary was in the vicinity of Ottawa, and if so, if he has taken any steps or intends taking any steps to have him recaptured?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where did the hon. gentleman find that?

Mr. BUREAU. In the newspapers of the 4th of December.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) seems much more diligent now than he was formerly.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act 1908.—Mr. Bickerdike—read the second time.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. With the consent of the House, I move that the Bill be given its third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. The House will first have to send it to a committee—either the Committee of the Whole or some other.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Then if there is no objection, I move that the House go into Committee of the Whole on the Bill. The Bill has been on the Order Paper for two sessions.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

1. Section 19 of the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908, chapter 40 of the statutes of 1908, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:—

3. No child of a religious faith other than the Protestant or Roman Catholic shall be committed to the care of either a Protestant or Roman Catholic children's aid society or be placed in any Protestant or Roman Catholic family as its foster home unless there is within the municipality no children's aid society or no suitable family of the same religious faith as that professed by the child or by its family, and, if there is no children's aid society or suitable family of such faith to which the care of such child can properly be given, the disposition of such child shall be in the discretion of the court.

Mr. DOHERTY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) will give us some explanation of the precise purpose of the Bill.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will probably remember that in 1908 an Act, chapter 40, was passed, entitled the Juvenile Delinquents Act, in which there is provision made only for the children of Roman Catholic and Protestant parents. It has been felt that there are many other children whose parents are neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic who should not be denied the same advantages as are afforded to children of those faiths. For instance, in the larger cities of this country there are a great many Jews, a very respectable body of people, especially is this so in the city of Montreal; and it has been felt that the Jews and other religious denominations are entitled to the same privileges and to the same protection for their children as are Protestants and Roman Catholics. This want has been felt for some time and courts are just now about being established, as soon as the government makes arrangement for a judge. In these circumstances, it has been felt that an amendment is necessary to complete the Bill. Of course the Jews are in a minority, but in any case, and in any country that flies the Union Jack, minorities should be treated not only justly but generously.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must say that I have met several gentlemen in Montreal belonging to the Hebrew race who have asked me to support the Bill presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike), and I do so, Mr. Speaker, very cheerfully. I think the Jews are entitled to the same rights as Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not think there can be any question, or any difference of opinion, as to the propriety of this amendment, that where there is in existence an aid society such as referred to, under control of people belonging to the religious denomination to which the child belongs, it would be a proper thing to send him there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend knows that in Montreal the Jews have a number of good societies.

Mr. DOHERTY. I know they have very excellent societies, and do a good work in caring for their own children and their education. For my part, I think the Bill is a good one, and I congratulate the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) on the idea which inspires him in proposing this Bill. I cannot see any possible objection to it.

Mr. AMES. It seems to me that while the intention inspiring this Bill is undoubtedly a good one, it may not be altogether drawn in such a way as to meet the object in view. What is meant by 'religious faith'? How many religious faiths are there? That there are Catholics, and Protestants, and Jews we admit, but are there not other

religious faiths? We know that there are Armenians, there are Swedenborgians, there are Buddhists, and there are a number of other religious faiths. Now are we to understand that not only children belonging to the Catholic, Protestant or Jewish faith, but of any other, may be placed in charge of a committee of three persons belonging to the same faith as the child? Supposing for example, that a Chinese child gets into trouble, must three Chinese be appointed of the Confucian faith to act as a juvenile court with respect to that child? Supposing that the child of some of our Hindu residents gets into trouble, must there be three Hindu guardians appointed with respect to him? While the object seems to be good enough, the wording here leaves it open to very wide and serious claims on the part of a large number of classes.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. It is open and wide, and is purposely made so. There is no reason even why the Hindus should not be able to bring up their children in the same way that Protestants and Catholics do, if there are enough of them who are willing to establish a committee of their own persuasion for the purpose. When people of whatever faith establish such a committee, then the court is empowered to send a child to such a committee to be provided for. I cannot see any objection why people of every faith should not be taken in. I am sure the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) does not object to that.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what is the power of this juvenile court with respect to children?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think the preamble of chapter 40 explains that; perhaps the hon. gentleman has not got it by him:

> Whereas it is inexpedient that youthful offenders should be classed or dealt with as ordinary criminals, the welfare of the community demanding that they should on the contrary be guarded against association with crime and criminals, and should be subjected to such wise care, treatment and control as will tend to check their evil tendencies and to strengthen their better instincts.

Then it goes on to say how it should be done. A committee is to be appointed for the purpose. If the Jews, for instance, do not choose to appoint a committee of their own faith to look after such children, then the court would have to deal with them. But, if in any community the Jews do provide a committee to look after delinquent children, then such children should be sent to that committee.

Mr. AMES. What are the duties of the juvenile court, then we will see whether these various classes of foreigners and strangers are suitable persons to be given the guardianship of the child.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Section 6 of the original Act reads:

> When any child is arrested, with or without warrant, such child shall, instead of being taken before a justice, be taken before the juvenile court; and, if a child is taken before a justice, upon a summons or under a warrant or for any other reason, it shall be the duty of the justice to transfer the case to the juvenile court, and of the officer having the child in charge to take the child before that court.

My hon. friend is aware that they are about establishing a juvenile court in Montreal.

Mr. AMES. The minister himself can probably give me the explanation I want. What is the Juvenile Court Committee that is referred to in this amendment?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The Juvenile Court Committee is composed of three people selected from the religious persuasion to which the child belongs, whether Protestant or Catholic. That is all provided for now. My amendment goes further, and makes provision for children of any other religion than Protestant or Catholic, in case the people of that faith choose to form a committee to look after the children.

Mr. AMES. What are the duties of this committee? That is what I have been asking.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The duties of the committee are to look after the welfare of these children, and instead of sending them to the penitentiary or to jail, to take care of them for their own benefit while they are growing up. I thought at the moment that my hon. friend himself was connected with such an association. As to the duties of the committee, section 24 states exactly what they are:

> It shall be the duty of the Juvenile Court Committee to meet as often as may be necessary and consult with the probation officers with regard to the cases of juvenile delinquents coming before the court, to offer, through the probation officers and otherwise, advice to the court as to the best mode of dealing with such cases, and, generally, to facilitate by every means in its power the reformation of juvenile delinquents.

Mr. DOHERTY. Might I suggest to the hon. member that perhaps it might be well to provide that the committee shall be composed of suitable persons residing within the municipality, and to say that it shall be within the discretion of the magistrate or the court appointing them to say who are suitable persons.

I would be afraid that it might be interpreted as it stands there, that the only question of suitability was as to whether they were of the same religion. I am not

at all now referring to our Jewish friends, because we all know that there are plenty of them suitable persons, but when you make it applicable to children of every religious faith it is quite conceivable that you might have in a city a small group of persons belonging to some denomination and it might happen that, although among them there would be suitable persons on the score of religious faith, they might not perhaps be desirable persons. I think we should make it quite clear that the three persons of that faith should be competent or suitable in the judgment of the magistrate presiding.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is provided in the Bill now.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think the Minister of Justice is perfectly correct, but that is provided for in the original Act.

Mr. DOHERTY. What section?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Subsection 2 of section 23 provides for just what the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. AMES. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and I have very much the same end in view. When you narrow it down to a denominational basis you might find it impossible to secure suitable and desirable persons among the very small number that might be entrusted with the care of a child. I would suggest that the words 'suitable' and 'desirable' be put in and that would allow the court to use a discretionary power.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have no objection to the words 'and desirable' being put in.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not find in the original Act what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdiks) suggests, and I do not think that what I propose departs in any way from what the hon. gentleman desires. I make this suggestion because I think it should be made quite clear that suitability means something else than merely belonging to some religious denomination.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think that the word 'desirable' suggested by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) would meet the objection of my hon. friend.

Mr. DOHERTY. I move that the section be amended by adding to it the words 'and in the judgment of the court desirable persons to be named such committee,' so that it would read:

If there are such suitable persons resident within the municipality willing to act and in the judgment of the court desirable persons to be named such committee.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would be very glad to accept the minister's suggestion.

Section, as amended, agreed to, and Bill reported.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TURRIFF moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) is not at present in the House. Is my hon. friend anxious to go on with this to-day?

Mr. TURRIFF. No, I am not particularly anxious to go on to-day, but I would like to get the Bill to the committee as early as possible. I have no objection to it standing, if necessary.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I do not suppose they would do anything with it before the holidays.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. STEVENS moved the second reading of Bill (No. 9) to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. DOHERTY. If the hon. gentleman is not especially desirous of proceeding with this Bill to-day, I would be glad if he would allow it to stand until we have had time to consider the measure more carefully. It is a matter of some importance, being an amendment to the Criminal Law of the country, and I do not think the hon. member will lose anything by letting the Bill stand for to-day.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to go contrary to the wish of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Bill stands.

DISMISSALS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Carvell, for a copy of all papers, correspondence and orders in council in connection with and relating to the dismissal from the office of public officials from each of the departments of government since the first day of October last past, including both the inside and outside service.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I tried yesterday on two or three occasions to catch your eye so as to be permitted to say a few words on this resolution, but I did not succeed. I wish to continue the debate for a very short time this afternoon, in order to draw the attention of one or two ministers to certain cases of hardship in the county which I have the honour to represent. Members

on this side of the House are somewhat disappointed at the attitude taken by the Prime Minister and by some other ministers who participated in yesterday's debate. There was an expectation by members on this side that a step forward would be taken by the Prime Minister in regard to this important question of Civil Service reform, and the House had good reason to expect something of that kind from the hon. gentleman. If there is any subject, Sir, that he has been identified with ever since his first coming to this House, some fifteen years ago, it is the subject of Civil Service reform. The first speech that he made here on his first entry into the House was in regard to this question, and that speech was a very broad and statesmanlike one. On that occasion he laid down the principle that the widest liberty, in a fair way, should be allowed to men engaged in the Civil Service. Among other things he stated that he would permit a civil servant not only to vote against the government of which he was then a servant, but he would also allow him to express his opinion on any public question that happened to be under discussion, provided he did it in a gentlemanly and fair way, and did not neglect his duties as a civil servant. Those were some of the things he gave utterance to in his first speech during the debate of 1896, but he did not stop there. It may not be out of place that I should put on record a statement, taken from the 'Hansard,' that he made on that occasion:

> If the question of an official's politics is to be considered when a new government makes up its mind whether or not it will dismiss him from office, or, if a government ventures to deal with these questions from the standpoint only of an official's political opinions, or if an official has given expression even on the public platform to his views on any public question—if these things are to control in determining whether or not a man is to remain in the service, we shall have approached very closely to the American spoils system, which I for one hope will never be introduced into Canada.

The hon. gentleman goes on to quote from Leckie on 'Democracy and Liberty,' and he led the House to believe that he agreed with the views expressed by that great philosopher on those questions. Then, later on, at the elections of 1908, my hon. friend issued a manifesto which is known as the Halifax platform. In that manifesto, he again lays down the doctrine of necessity of Civil Service reform in this country. On the occasion on which he placed that platform before the public at Halifax, he is reported as having used the following language:

> A government holds the power of patronage for the benefit of the public, and it is entitled to fill the public service solely in the public interest. The duties of those officials are for the public benefit and are fixed by the laws of the country. Their salaries are paid out of the people's money. To use the power of filling such positions as a reward for party service and without regard to the character and capacity of the individual selected is a gross breach of a solemn public trust. A private trustee so dishonouring his office would be subject to punishment by the criminal law, but the one punishment which can be meted out for such abuse of a public trust is dismissal by the electorate.

I submit, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is not living up to the principles that he laid down in his Halifax platform, and in his first speech in this House, and he has before him the punishment which he said would be administered to the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House if they persisted in this wicked course—that is the dismissal of the electorate. Again, in the election that was held on the 21st of September, the Prime Minister once more brought before the people of Canada this important question of Civil Service reform and it was one of the prominent planks in his platform. In the discussion here yesterday, it did not seem to me, however, that he was disposed to make any advance on the old practice that has been in force in this country for a good many years. He stated yesterday that he was guided by two things: by a clause in the Civil Service Act and by a resolution of this House. He quoted the clause of the Civil Service Act which reads as follows:

> No officer, clerk or employee in the Civil Service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election, if under the laws governing the said election he has the right to vote; but no such officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work in connection with said election.

This is section 43 of the Act of 1908, and it applies, of course, to the inside service. Then my hon. friend said that he would be guided in making dismissals from the outside service by the resolution of this House, passed on July 17, 1905, which reads as follows:

> That whilst it is desirable that every official in the employ of the government of Canada, should enjoy perfect freedom of political opinion, and the untrammelled exercise of his franchise in accord therewith, no official should be engaged, or permitted to engage, in partisan work of any description in the election of a representative to the provincial or Dominion legislature.

Now, Sir, I submit that the policy laid down yesterday, by the Postmaster General, and even by the Prime Minister himself, does not live up to that resolution. The former leads us to believe that he would reinstate every man that was formerly dismissed for political partisanship.

This resolution says that no man who is guilty of political partisanship is fit to occupy public office. I submit, therefore, that the hon. gentleman is not living up to the resolution which he said was to guide him in regard to this matter. Now, the point I wish to make is that we have the right to expect something further from the Prime Minister than simply the old system that was in force in this country for so many years. If not, what is the meaning of this Civil Service reform that we have been placing before the people of this country? The votes of the people are asked for an improvement of the Civil Service, a reform of the Civil Service, and when the people give their votes and the hon. gentleman is returned to power with a large majority, he stands up in the House and says: 'So far as the rule is concerned it seems to me that it is a matter which has been already settled.' Yet my hon. friend when appealing to the country said that he stood for a reform of the Civil Service. And when the people gave him power to carry out that reform, he stands up in his place in the House and says it is already settled. He is not prepared to go any further than the late government went in 1896.

Hon. members who spoke on the other side of the House went back to 1896. If we are to go back over the various changes of government that have taken place we can get a great deal of material for recrimination, but it will not accomplish very much for the reform of the Civil Service. I could refer our hon. friends back to 1879, the year in which the party they represent came into power, and the slaughter of officials on the Intercolonial railway that took place on that occasion. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) spoke of 130 men employed on the locks of the canals having been notified that if they were not notified to come back to their work in the following spring they need not return. In 1879 no less than 344 officials of the Intercolonial railway were summarily dismissed, and the axe was kept swinging over the same class of officials during the whole 18 years in which the party opposite were in power.

Mr. HAGGART. Were they replaced by others?

Mr. SINCLAIR. If it would interest the House, I can give the figures. The number of dismissals was: in 1879 344, in 1880 23, in 1881 35, in 1882 41, in 1883 173, in 1884 64, in 1885 63, in 1886 109, in 1887 164, in 1888 90, in 1889 78, in 1890 67, in 1891 69, in 1892 266, in 1893 50, in 1894 62, in 1895 41, in 1896 71.

Mr. RHODES. The hon. member does not mean to say that these men were dismissed for political purposes, does he?

Mr. SINCLAIR.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is my information. You will notice that in the years 1879, 1883 1887 and 1892 the larger number of dismissals took place, and these happen to be the years after the four elections which were carried by the party opposite. The meaning of that is that they used the Intercolonial railway for the purpose of fulfilling the promises they had made during the elections.

Now, I want to refer specially to some cases of hardship that have occurred in the county which I have the honour to represent. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the case of Robert Sutherland, the caretaker of the public building at Canso. Some days ago I heard of the summary dismissal of Mr. Sutherland from that position, and as it was a matter of some urgency, and I thought that perhaps the minister might reconsider the notice that was given to him to walk out of the building, I wrote to him the following letter:

November, 29, 1911.

Hon. F. D. Monk,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Monk,—I have just had a message from Canso stating that Mr. R. Sutherland, caretaker of the public building at that place, has been dismissed. I regret that your department has found it necessary to take this extreme step at this season of the year without giving any notice, so as to enable Mr. Sutherland to find another house for his family. This caretaker has been a faithful public servant and has done his work well for several years, and I submit that he should not be dismissed from the service without an investigation. I have never heard of any charge against him, and I question if any valid charge can be made. Be kind enough to let me know if you will re-consider this matter and give Mr. Sutherland an opportunity of being heard in his own defence. I remain,

Yours truly,

I have not received any answer to that letter, although it was written a little more than a week ago, except a remark made by my hon. friend in the House that he would examine the papers that he had in connection with the case. In the meantime Mr. Sutherland has been asked to walk out of the building, without any notice whatever, not even the usual month's notice to enable him to get another house for his family. I do not think any just complaint can be made against him. Mr. Sutherland was appointed to the position some years ago when the public building was erected, and has been a faithful public servant. He has not been an active partisan. I have no doubt that he voted for the Liberal party, which I think is the worst that can be said about him politically. He was ordered without notice to move from the building and his hungry successor, I believe, was standing at the door waiting to get in. I think this is a case of very

great hardship. I think Mr. Sutherland should not only have had a reasonable notice, but also have had a part of his salary advanced. I would like to ask the minister still to consider the case, and if he finds that there is no complaint against this man, will he give him a fair trial, and if he finds that he has not been guilty of offensive partisanship, will he reinstate him? I should be glad to have the minister's answer.

Mr. MONK. I will answer when my hon. friend has finished.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Another case I wish to refer to is the case of David S. Hendsbee, who was employed as weigher in the reduction works at Canso, under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Mr. Hendsbee was appointed in July, 1905. I have here the letter appointing him, which I will place on record:

Ottawa, July 31, 1905.

Sir,—As Mr. A. B. Cox, who has been appointed manager of the Reduction Works at Canso, has been directed by wire to immediately call upon you to report to him at the Works to act in the capacity of weigher, for which you will be paid at the rate of seven hundred dollars per annum, I beg to inform you that you are to act under his instructions.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
EDWARD E. PRINCE.

Mr. D. S. Hendsbee,
Fish Reduction Works,
Canso, N. S.

This gentleman received a letter from the manager dated the 3rd of December, informing him that his services were dispensed with on the 30th of November, three days before the date of the letter.

I submit that that was a pretty cold kind of deal to give a man who was employed by the year, and was depending upon that employment for the support of himself and family. I submit that at least it would have been only fair to have given him three months notice. According to the letter I have read, under which he is appointed, you will see that his appointment was a yearly one at a salary of $700 a year. Yet he was dismissed without any notice or without any intimation that he would receive the three months' salary which would have been paid him had he been in the employ of any private citizen. I trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will consider this case, and if it be necessary that Mr. Hendsbee should be dismissed, he at least should be paid three months salary. The same is true of the case of Edward Kelly, an engineer in the reduction works who, I understand, got his notice of dismissal on the same day, the 30th of November. Kelly's appointment was also a yearly one. He was in charge of very valuable machinery which he looked after during the winter months and for attending to this machinery he got a yearly salary. Mr. Kelly was also given notice of dismissal without any intimation that he would get three months' pay. Another case is that of Mr. John M. Rogers, the postmaster at a place called East Roman Valley in the county of Guysborough. This is one of the cases referred to by the Postmaster General yesterday in which he said he had made restitution. The former postmaster, named Walsh, was dismissed some years ago for political partisanship; and in order to show that the late government was not so severe in matters of this kind—at all events in the county I represent, as at present, I might mention that during the eight years I have held a seat in this House, this is the only case of a dismissal of any kind in my constituency, and it was a very extreme case of political partisanship. Mr. Walsh was dismissed, and the evidence against him is no doubt in the possession of the Postmaster General. Mr. J. M. Rogers was appointed in his place, and it now becomes necessary to dismiss Mr. Rogers, who is not a partisan, in order to reinstate Mr. Walsh. There is no pretence that Mr. Rogers has done anything at all to warrant the charge that he is an offensive partisan, but it becomes necessary, under the construction my hon. friend gives the resolution, to dismiss a man who is not a partisan in order to make room for another man who was proved to have been a partisan, and who was dismissed on that account by the late government. I notice that Rogers received from the department a printed notice. I suppose that so many such notices are being sent out, that printed forms are required. That printed notice reads as follows:

I am directed to inform you that Mr. Patrick Walsh has been appointed to succeed you in the postmastership of East Roman Valley, and that it is proposed to transfer the office to his charge as soon as the necessary preliminaries can be arranged.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
W. E. MACLELLAN,
Post Office Inspector.

Mr. John M. Rogers, P.M.,
East Roman Valley, N.S.

This is signed by W. E. McLellan post office inspector Halifax, and is addressed to the postmaster.

I asked in the House a few days ago certain questions with regard to this dismissal. The first was:

Has the Postmaster General received any communication asking for the dismissal of John W. Rogers, postmaster at East Roman Valley, Guysborough county?

To that question I got no answer. There was no intimation given that any such communication was received. I also asked

what names were signed to any such communications. Neither did I get any answer to that question, and I submit that it ought to be answered. If men are to be dismissed on letters from persons a thousand miles away, those persons should have the courage to sign their names to those letters, and should not be afraid that those letters should be produced in the House. I quite agree that if an hon. member of this House chooses to make a statement on his honour that a certain official has been guilty of political partisanship, that ought to be taken as sufficient proof, but we have that hon. member here and he can be asked any day to substantiate his statement. That is not the case, however, with respect to a defeated candidate who may be thousands of miles distant from this city. In such cases, it should be only fair that the Postmaster General should secure the signatures of those making such charges and produce such letters when they are asked for in the House. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, who informed us yesterday that he wished to be just and fair, ought to consider the position I take with regard to these matters. There are a number of other cases in my county, but I shall not weary the House by going over them. Those I have given are samples of what is happening in Nova Scotia at present, and I submit that the case of Mr. Rogers is not in line with the resolution which the Hon. the First Minister says is one he would be guided by in matters of this kind.

What is the reason we have this clamour for the dismissal of officials all over Canada to-day? I submit the reason is that our hon. friends opposite made so many promises during the recent election that they have now to make some show of implementing those promises. I do not suppose there ever was an election in this country in which so many extravagant promises were made. My hon. friend the First Minister himself (Mr. Borden) led the way by going out to the three prairie provinces, where he knew reciprocity was popular and where he knew it was necessary to give some kind of financial or economic argument in order to capture the votes of the people there—we had my hon. friend going out there and making various promises. He promised the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. That, however, was one of the planks in the platform of the late government, and the late government had taken important steps in the direction of carrying out that policy. But the First Minister went one better. He said: We shall not only construct the Hudson Bay railway, but we will operate it as a government work. He also promised an expenditure of more millions in the supply of chilled meat refrigerators. I am not very familiar with the necessity for those refrigerators, but they were one of the things which the hon. gentleman promised the prairie provinces. Coming down to the Great Lakes, he promised an expenditure of more millions for the purpose of building elevators at Port Arthur and other points to be operated by the government.

Mr. FOWLER I rise to a point of order. I understand we are discussing the question of dismissals. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) seems to have wandered very far afield. He has been discussing the Hudson Bay railway, the elevators in the west, and the chilled meat industry. Of course, he is probably an expert on chilliness by this time, for I am sure it is cold on his side of the House. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to keep the hon. gentleman to the subject under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) was in order. As I understand it, he was giving it as a reason for there being many dismissals, that many promises had been made.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I forgot to mention another very important promise made in the west—the handing over to the provinces of the natural resources of that country. In northern Ontario, as I have pointed out the Prime Minister promised large expenditures at the head of the Great Lakes. I am not aware that he made any great promises in eastern Ontario. There is a general belief among members on this side of the House that the best way to catch votes in eastern Ontario is to tell some fake story about the Pope. It was not necessary, probably, to make promises of any large expenditures in eastern Ontario. Coming to the maritime provinces which lie adjacent to the United States, and the people of which, of course, were very anxious to have the outlet of the United States market for their surplus products, it was necessary to make promises. In his manifesto the Prime Minister announced that the Conservative party had adopted the policy of giving free medical attendance and free medicine to the fisherman of that coast, a policy which has earned for the present government the title of 'The Lydia Pinkham Administration'. Passing to Prince Edward Island, it was thought that, being largely an agricultural province, and not depending so much on the fishing industry, it was necesary to do something extra; and so my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) in order to get the votes promised the people of Prince Edward Island a tunnel at a cost of $10,000,000 to $20,000,000, to connect the island and the mainland. And while the hon. gentleman was scattering these millions upon millions of the people's money from ocean to ocean —and remember, hon. gentlemen opposite used to say that we were 'bribing the peo-

ple with their own money '—all over the country his lieutenants were making special and more detailed promises. In my constituency, there was not a lighthouse that was not promised; and I am told that many of them were promised to three and four different people. I am told that the position occupied by Mr. Hendsbee is now claimed by no less than thirteen applicants. These promises were made broadcast throughout Nova Scotia, that if the Conservatives obtained power these jobs should be peddled out to their supporters. These are the reasons why we are face to face with this serious state of matters to-day, and why my hon. friend the Prime Minister is not able, with the men he has behind him, to give us the Civil Service reform that he has been promising the people for fifteen years. I would appeal to my hon. friends who occupy the treasury benches and to their supporters. One friend made the remark to me that it was not much use to appeal to a government composed mainly of millionaires on a matter of this kind. But I would appeal to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). He has not a hard heart, and he laid down some good principles in 1896 when discussing these questions. I do not think he has forgotten what he said about the poor man. If so, let me remind him. He said:

> Ministers are simply after all the executive of this country. They do not own this country. They do not own the fortunes of poor labouring men. Poor labouring men have some rights to fair and decent treatment whatever government is in power.

That was good doctrine when it was spoken in 1896, and it is good doctrine to-day. The hon. gentleman declared further that when a charge was made against a public employee, it should be made in the open and not in a ' star chamber ' way, an investigation should be granted in every case, and in every case there ought to be a fair trial. I suggest to my hon. friend—and I know he will be willing to do it if he can, that is if the pressure behind him is not too great—that he try to live up to the doctrine now—that he laid down in 1896. I would appeal to the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) if he were in his place. The hon. gentleman has had two great opportunities since the 21st of September. The first was the formation of his cabinet. If he had shaken himself free from the anti-British party in Quebec, that was a splendid opportunity for him——

Mr. PELLETIER. There is no anti-British party in the province of Quebec.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Why, in the debate on the address a few days ago, I read from the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman's leader (Mr. Bourassa) in North Bay in which Mr. Bourassa referred to 'your' king, and 'your' flag, and 'your' constitution. Why, Sir, he would not even acknowledge King George V. to be his king; he would not acknowledge the flag that floats over this building; he would not acknowledge the constitution under which we live. And am I to be told now that there is no anti-British party in the province of Quebec?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There was during the election. Perhaps there is not now.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Perhaps not. Perhaps they are all converted. I say the Prime Minister had his first opportunity in forming his cabinet, and he has his second opportunity now. He has been telling the people that he stands for progressive legislation and practice in Civil Service reform. He has been telling them that for fifteen years. Will he carry out his ideas now? The Minister of Trade and Commerce, when discussing the subject in 1896, characterized the spoils system as the 'meanest principle that can be adopted by any government in any civilized country.' Now, will the Prime Minister rescue his party from committing itself to the principle thus so strongly denounced by his colleague?

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). I rise not in a grumbling spirit or to complain of the dismissals which have taken place in the county of Wright. Of course over there it is a matter of a wholesale slaughter. I do not blame the ministers so much. I understand that sometimes pressure is brought upon them to such an extent that they cannot withstand it. I speak with some knowledge of the subject of patronage, for during some years I have been closely concerned in it. I feel really sorry that the government of the day found it necessary to dismiss so many people in the county I have the honour to represent. I hope that the sympathetic nature of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) may be reached, and that the guillotine may be stopped. In the Post Office Department I must say that I have absolutely no complaint to make to the Postmaster General. I know of no case of a postmaster being dismissed in the county of Wright. I do not blame the ministers altogether for making dismissals but I think some reforms are absolutely necessary. I would, for instance, humbly suggest that positions which partake of the nature of manual labour, especially in these buildings, should be placed under a commission, which would be totally independent of politics. If this were done, then the hon. members who are representatives of counties in or near the city of Ottawa would have more time to attend to their public

duties. I would say to the Minister of Public Works that he would have my hearty support if he could discover a means whereby the present iniquitous system of political patronage could be done away with.

Mr BRADBURY. It is a little late in the day to start to preach that doctrine. You should have done that long ago.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think it is good Christian doctrine, and it is never too late to repent. It is a doctrine that I have advocated on more than one occasion, and I see no reason why I should change my views because I sit on this side of the House. I was going to say that I think the elevator men, the carpenters, labourers, men working in shipyards, men working around these buildings generally, and who do not come under the term of civil servants, should be placed under a commission. While on this subject, I may say that I think most of the men who work for the government are underpaid. I would strongly advocate the raising of the minimum wage paid to the permanent messengers of this House and the elevator men; I think they should all be placed upon the permanent staff. Let me add that when a man is to be dismissed from the service, if he occupies what is called a permanent position he ought to be given a fair notice. I have under my hand a letter which was sent to me by a gentleman who has occupied a position under the government for the last eleven years; he was instructed to hand over at once all the material belonging to the government to the assistant foreman of the particular work in which he was engaged. Absolutely no reason was assigned for his dismissal. The man I refer to is Mr. Chenest, of Hull, a man around 69 years of age, who had filled the position during eleven years, and commanded the respect of the community I know of no reason why Mr. Chenest should be dismissed. However, he was dismissed just on the eve of winter, without any notice at all. I do not question that it is not within the perfect right of the Minister of Public Works, or of any other minister, to make dismissals, if he has been so advised by the person who has the handling of patronage in the county. I understand it is invariably the case that the minister is obliged to accept the recommendation of the gentleman who has the handling of the patronage in the county.

Mr. MONK. Not at all.

Mr. DEVLIN. I understand that is being done.

Mr. MONK. I am not obliged to accept any such dictation. My hon friend should know that.

Mr. DEVLIN. I understand that is usually done, that the ministers of the Crown are doing it at the present moment. Though the Minister of Public Works has stated that he is not obliged to do it, I think I can point out perhaps forty or fifty cases within the last two weeks where that has been done. I know he is too goodhearted a man to go over to the city of Hull and dismiss the men employed by the government there and put other men in their places. I am positive that the hon. the minister has done it. I know the letter I refer to was sent upon the instructions of the Minister of Public Works. I know that the Minister of Public Works would have absolutely no interest in dismissing the man I refer to. I say this without wishing to attach any blame to the action of the Minister of Public Works; I mean rather to say that he was actuated by circumstances. I will not detain the House by going over the cases of all those who have been dismissed, and their hardships; but I do hope that as soon as possible labourers, and men occupying positions of that nature, will be put under a commission. Such an action would have my hearty co-operation

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). I am sure that every hon. member of this House will agree with me when I say that one of the most onerous and disagreeable duties which has to be performed by a member of this House is the dismissal of officials from office, no matter how justly they may deserve it, and the distribution of patronage generally. For my part, I would be quite willing if some means could be devised whereby the members of this House would be relieved of that disagreeable duty, so far as it possibly can be done. I think that we should strive to reach, as far as possible, that system which now prevails in the Civil Service of Great Britain. It would be a blessing to the members upon the government side of the House to be relieved of that duty, and would throw the onus of the injustice of any dismissal upon the opposition. I know that when a position is vacant, and you have 15 or 16 applicants for the same, who are probably all competent to fill it, you are only doing justice to your own party when you place in that position the man who has done the most for you politically, provided he is able to fill the place satisfactorily. Practically the effect of what you do is to retire your most active friend, to place beyond usefulness to your party, the man who would do the most for you in helping you to carry an election; and at the same time you are disappointing 16 or 17 of your other supporters. So I say that, looking at it from a merely selfish standpoint, it would be not only in

the interest of the member himself, but of the community generally, if we could devise some system whereby we could relieve ourselves from this onerous responsibility and place it in the hands of a competent independent body.

But, in discussing this matter, I assume that we must take the facts as they stand before us to-day, and we have before the House two rules that are to guide us on the present occasion. We have the rule laid down in 1896 by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and we have the law upon the statute-books of this country governing the inside Civil Service. In judging the present administration unless the opposition are of the opinion that this administration are to be governed by a higher tone of political morality than the late government and we have every reason to suppose that will be so—they cannot ask from us any higher standard of political morality than that which characterized their own administration during the last fifteen years. That is if they judge the present administration from their own standard of morality; but, I hope that the present administration will be actuated by a higher standard and will be able to treat officials with greater fairness and even with greater generosity than they were treated by the late administration. Speaking for myself personally and not on behalf of the government, if a man was competent and properley appointed by the late government and has discharged his duties honestly and efficiently, if he has taken no part in elections I will not have the heart to dismiss him but if I find a man eating the bread of both political parties and at the same time taking an active part in elections I will take the first opportunity I can to see that he is dismissed from the office which he holds. I will not expect any official I appoint to take any active part in any election to help myself and should I become aware that he votes against me in the next election I shall consider that he has a perfect right to do so. I think that is a fair stand and I think it will be the stand taken by individual members on this side of the House. While it would be quite proper in most cases for the ministry to take the word of a private member as to facts within his knowledge, I am sure that no private member would ask a minister to dismiss an official on facts not within his own knowledge and not supported by corroborative evidence. In this connection we have the expressed precedents of the right hon. leader of the opposition, the ex-Prime Minister himself, the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), and his predecessor, Sir Wm. Mulock; so that, judging the government upon this matter, the opposition will not surely expect of us a higher plane of political morality than that which characterized their own administration. According to a supplementary return brought down in 1897, only nine months after the late administration assumed office in 1896, I find that there were 250 officials dismissed. This return was brought down in answer to a motion in the Senate asking for the names of all officials who had been dismissed by the administration without investigation, and it shows that this large number were dismissed without investigation. The return is dated 7th April, 1897. Now, that was only a supplementary return. I am informed, but I have not yet verified the facts myself, that the original return showed that 250 or 300 officials had been dismissed according to that return without any investigation whatever. I took the trouble to go over the dismissals that are given in the supplementary return in the Department of Customs, and while we heard one hon. member on the other side of the House yesterday stating that he would give credit to the present hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) because he had not dismissed any officials unjustly and without investigation, this supplementary return showed that after the late administration had been in office nine months, 80 officials had been dismissed from the Department of Customs without investigation. We have these facts staring us in the face and yet the opposition blame us for the paltry number of officials that have been dismissed. As far as I have been able to ascertain we have not had any proof that any man has been unjustly dismissed without some opportunity of being heard. I remember reading some years ago a discussion which took place in 1898, or about that time, upon this question in which a charge was made by the present hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) that a great many officials had been dismissed in Manitoba without any investigation whatever. On looking up the debate upon that question I found that Mr. Boyd, the then member for Macdonald, laid upon the table a schedule showing that the number of officials dismissed in Manitoba between 1896 and 1898 was something like 150.

Then we come down to the question of dismissing postmasters, and I think it was the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) who laid down the principle yesterday that no postmaster should be dismissed even if he did take an active part in politics. I fail to see the difference between an official holding an office in the Post Office Department and an officer holding an office in any other department. It was said that the country postmaster is receiving a very small salary,

so small that it is sometimes difficult to get any one to take the position. If that is the case there is no harm in dismissing him, because he apparently does not attach much importance to the position. I think the principle should be applied in all departments that every official who takes an active part in an election should be liable to summary dismissal. We had a debate in this House in 1909 upon the question of the dismissal of the postmaster of Souris, Man. The leader of the opposition, the ex-Postmaster General, Sir Wm. Mulock and his successor (Mr. Lemieux) placed themselves on record as subscribing to the view that the government is perfectly justified in dismissing any official upon being informed, either verbally or by letter, that that official has taken an active part in politics. Judging this government by the standard laid down by the opposition when in power, they can have no fault to find with any minister of the Crown if he dismisses summarily an official upon the simple recommendation of the sitting member. I will quote the precedent for that. These remarks were made by Sir Wm. Mulock in 1897 and were approved in 1909 by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, the ex-Postmaster General, who spoke as follows as reported in 'Hansard' of May 17 1909:

After the last general elections the hon. gentleman who represents the county of Brandon (Mr. Sifton) made a formal charge against the postmaster of Souris and reported, on his own responsibility as the member representing that constituency, that the postmaster at Souris had taken a very active part in the last campaign against him. Under such circumstances, in view of the fact that the complaint or the charge was made by the member himself, on his own personal responsibility I had no other course to follow but to accept his word and to take action against that postmaster. The policy upon this matter was laid down by my predecessor Sir William Mulock, and by the right hon. the leader of the House, in 1896. During that session a debate occurred in this House in relation to the dismissal of a postmaster in the county of Lincoln, Ontario. The policy was then laid down by Sir William that if a charge was made against an official of the government (in that case it was the postmaster) on the personal responsibility of the member representing the county, he as Postmaster General, and the other ministers would have taken action. Sir William's statement is to be found in 'Hansard' of 1897, at page 1853. It is as follows:

When a member in the position of my hon. friend from Lincoln makes a statement of the kind, there is the best guarantee that his statement is absolutely within the facts. He is bound to make good that statement before his electors and before the country. As a public man, he cannot afford to make a statement to me of something within his own knowledge if that statement is not literally true; and, with evidence of that kind, a minister would be derelict in his duty if he did not accept it as a full statement of the facts. At all events, in the future as in the past, I accept the words of my colleagues on matters within their own knowledge, and I consider that those statements are incapable of disproof, and that further inquiry under the circumstances would be an idle sham.

In view of that statement how is it possible for any hon. gentleman in this House to find fault with the dismissal of an official upon the recommendation of the sitting member? But not satisfied with that the Postmaster General went on. He says:

This is the statement I have to make regarding the postmaster at Souris. When the statement is made to me by an hon. gentleman occupying a very prominent position in this House, and who formerly was a member of the Cabinet, such as the hon. member for Brandon, that a certain officer had taken a leading part in the contest against him, my duty is to accept his word and take action against that officer.

An hon. MEMBER. Who made that statement?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The ex-Postmaster General. He goes on to say:

I can only repeat what was said by the right hon. leader of the House on a former occasion, when he declared that a government official who openly takes part in an election against the government takes his own official life in his hands. In the present instance the fact that the present member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) took upon himself personally the responsibility of the charge against the official, left me no other course to follow than to accept his word. I have just said that the policy laid down as far back as 1896 and 1897, is this, that when an officer takes part in an election against the government he takes his official life in his hands, and if an hon. member makes a charge of offensive partisanship against him, the statement of that hon. member is accepted by the government. That is my policy—an officer of the government who takes part in the elections does so at his own risk. To-day he has his friends in power, but another time he may have another party in office.

Now, in the face of all these facts, I would like to ask any hon. member on the other side can he stultify the policy of his leader and the two ex-Postmasters General, and say that a minister on this side who dismisses an official upon the verbal or written recommendation of the member is doing anything that he should not do, or is doing anything that they did not do or would not do, when they were in power.

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer). May I put a very friendly question to my hon. friend? Does he not think there is something in such an appeal as was made by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) to the very high professions of the present Prime Minister, professions extending over

fifteen years? I do not ask the question from a partisan point of view, but in full sympathy with the opening remarks of my hon. friend that it would be a great thing for the country and for all civil servants if we could reach a permanent basis in regard to this matter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. My hon. friend asks me to presume a higher tone of political morality than his friends exercised during the fifteen years they were in office.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I do not care about that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I say, yes, we expect that, and we will get that ultimately.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I hope so.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As far as I have been able to gather, there has been no dismissal made without cause. If I see an office holder in my own riding driving electors to the poll at election time, or standing around the polling booths, I require no other evidence than my own that he should be dismissed. It would be an indignity for me if I went to the minister and asked for that man's dismissal to be told 'I must give him ten days within which to prepare a defence.' I can quite see that where the member who makes the complaint has no personal knowledge, there might be some mistake; but if sufficient evidence is produced to the minister he should act upon that evidence. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) who complains that a certain postmaster at Spry Bay was dismissed without notice, forgets that when the present Prime Minister complained against the late administration that they had dismissed an officer at Musquodoboit, I think it was, without giving any notice, and without holding any investigation—a former member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) stood up and declared: 'Yes, I dismissed that man without giving him any notice and without granting any investigation. Why? Because I produced four affidavits myself to the minister proving that he was guilty of offensive partisanship.' This man was given no notice and no chance to defend himself, but the member in question coming from the very city now represented by the present junior member for Halifax himself, admitted that that was the principle followed by the late government. And so, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I can see there has been no case yet made out by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, especially having in view the fact that they themselves have laid down the very rules upon which the present administration has acted

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert). Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the hon. member for Wright upon the manner in which he has presented his views on this question. That manner was in marked contrast to the attitude taken by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who had preceded him in the debate. The latter gentleman seemed to think it was necessary to make an attempt to stir up racial and religious strife even in such a small matter as the debate under consideration. He referred in most improper terms to the great province of Ontario and its attitude during the late election. He also insulted the province of Quebec by insinuating that there were in that great province men who were opposed to British connection. He brought forward a number of instances of dismissals which he seemed to think were deserving of a very great deal of consideration. I would like to tell this House a few of the instances of dismissals which were made in my own county from 1896 down to 1911. There was one particular instance in the county of Albert. A gentleman who was collector of customs at the port of Hillsborough in that county attended a joint meeting in 1896 where the candidates of the two rival parties were present to speak to the electors. As is customary in cases of this kind, a pitcher of water was necessary on the platform for the convenience of the speakers during the course of the debate. Nobody had sufficient thought to fill this pitcher so the collector of customs took it out of the hall, filled it with water and returned and placed it upon the table. It seems that during the course of his speech the Conservative candidate took a drink from this water, and that, Sir, was the only evidence upon which the collector of customs was dismissed from office. They held an investigation in that case, they sent an investigator or inquisitor down to Hillsborough and the act which I have mentioned constituted the testimony upon which the collector of customs was dismissed. That was one instance. I am sorry the Postmaster General is not here just now. I would have given him a sample so that he might know just how much he would require from the member when asking for the dismissal of a postmaster. Now, I come to a dismissal in the county of Kings, and will read a communication written by the then member Mr. Domville who has since been translated to a seat in the Red chamber. This is the letter:

Ottawa, Nov. 20, 1896.

Sir,—The Nauwigewauk postmaster now is Dodge. He has always been a most active partisan and worker in elections, and I want him dismissed and T. P. Trueman appointed in his place.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) JAMES DOMVILLE.

That is all. Upon that demand the postmaster was dismissed and Mr. T. P. Trueman was appointed in his place.

Now, I would not have spoken upon the question at all, if it had not been for some remarks made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I was not in the House at the time he made those remarks, but he attributed to me the statement that to the victors belong the spoils, and I think insinuated that I proposed to carry out that idea, so far as I was able to carry it out, to the law.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will My hon. friend pardon me.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, I will be very glad to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I made the remark that I have seen a report, or what professed to be a report, of a banquet to my hon. friend in which he was reported to have said that he was a thorough party man and believed absolutely in the principle that to the victors belong the spoils. It was from that I quoted.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, my hon. friend knows that while newspapers are in the main trustworthy yet very often they publish reports of speeches which are entirely untrustworthy. By suppressing a certain portion of a speaker's remarks and giving prominence to another an altogether different conclusion is reached and a different construction given. That was the case in this instance.

In this instance, at a banquet held in the county of Albert in honour of the victory that had been achieved not only locally, but in all Canada, I made a few remarks with regard to patronage. After a party has been out of power for fifteen years, you can understand that the question of patronage is a somewhat burning question. Therefore, I conceived it my duty to lay down to my friends present, some 300 men, the rules by which I proposed to be guided in the matter of patronage, and which I proposed to press upon the government. In the first place, I said that every Canadian, whether an office-holder or not, had an absolute right to cast his vote as his conscience dictated, and that no office-holder should be removed from office because he had voted for one candidate or another. I said I recognized that as a proper principle and would act upon it, and I would recommend no man for dismissal simply because he had voted for the Liberal party, though I thought him in a very benighted condition of mind to vote in that way. But I said that if any man, being an office-holder chose to go out during a campaign and become an active worker for the Liberal party, other things being equal, that man should be dismissed. I said that in appointments to office I would consider first that the person to be recommended by me should be competent to fill the position for which he was recommended—that that was what the country had a right to expect. I said that the conditions of competence, efficiency, suitability for the position, being fulfilled, the question then became a party question, and that so far as I was concerned the man who had been an active party worker, provided he fulfilled the other conditions, should receive my support, because I said that in that sense to the victors belong the spoils. I submit that that is a proper position to take and a proper principle to lay down, and it is one that I am prepared to defend here or at any time. Before taking my seat I want to refer to the instance given by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) of the removal of a postmistress, I think at Bath, in Carleton county. To have heard the hon. gentleman one would have thought that never in the whole history of this country had a woman been dismissed from office. Let me say that one of the first dismissals in the county of Kings in 1896 was that of Miss Mary Folkins, postmistress of Collina. She made a most earnest protest against being dismissed, and was able to show that she had taken no part in politics; but she was summarily dismissed without any investigation being allowed. So that if the hon. Postmaster General wants a precedent for the Bath case he will find it in the case of Collina.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad that my hon. friend has taken this early opportunity to correct the mis-statement of a St. John newspaper. The paper was the Conservative newspaper of St. John, and I had every reason to suppose that my hon. friend had been correctly reported. The report certainly gave the impression that my hon. friend was after blood, and was determined to carry out to the fullest extent the principle that to the victors belong the spoils. My hon. friend has made a statement which ought to be fairly satisfactory. I understand him to say that his rule is that where an office-holder has acted as a partisan, he would insist upon his dismissal. I do not understand that very many of those who have spoken on this side of the House have complained of that course being adopted; but, as I understand, the position taken is that in every case in which the person is charged, he should be notified of the charge and have an opportunity of presenting his side of the case; in other words, that there should be a full investigation, unless in a case where a member of this House has a personal knowledge that the person has been guilty of partisanship. In that case I do not think we can complain very much if the minister acts upon the statement of a member of parliament, but it seems to me that that statement ought to be in writing, so that if it were called for it could be brought before the House, and the member could be held

responsible for the charge he makes. I happen to know what has taken place in this regard in reference to some dismissals in the province of New Brunswick since I became a member of the government. I have had requests made for dismissals by different members supporting the government. The statement has been made to me that the persons affected have taken an active part in the election campaign upon the Conservative side. I have in mind more especially the ground taken by the late Postmaster General most positively—and in that he was simply acting on what had been the course of the government since 1896—that he would make no dismissal except after investigation or unless the member making the complaint should in writing pledge his word that he had personal knowledge that the official complained of had been guilty of partisanship. I know of one case which stood over for some time under the consideration of the minister. Finally he acted, but only upon the positive statement of the member that he had personal knowledge that the official complained of had been guilty of partisanship. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) made the statement that the minister ought to act upon the request of a member. I think that is going very much further than he contended was the rule during the regime of the late government.

It was not the policy of the late government to act upon the recommendation of a member of the House except when that member made the charge in writing. My hon. friend from Kings and Albert gave the name of a gentleman who was postmaster at Nauwigewauk, and who was dismissed. The files show that the member for that county, now Senator Domville, pledged his word that this man had been guilty of political partisanship. It may be that Senator Domville was mistaken, but at all events he did pledge his personal word to that effect.

I know nothing about the case of Miss Folkins, but I think my hon. friend will agree that if there was no investigation, the member for the county did not give the assurance that he had personal knowledge that she had been guilty of partisanship a great injustice was done; and I am sure he will not quote that as a precedent on which the Postmaster General should act in the case of the young lady at Bath, who was dismissed without any evidence that she had been guilty of partisanship. If the Postmaster General is able to give the information required, I shall be glad to receive the evidence.

Mr. PELLETIER. I told my hon. friend that I had not the papers before me and my time has been so much taken up that I have not had the time to look into the matter. However I intend looking into it. I would not like to be understood as having admitted that there was no case for dismissal. There must have been a case, I am sure, since the dismissal took place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I trust my hon. friend does not understand me to say that he had no evidence. What I was pointing out was that the House has not been furnished so far with any evidence of partisanship. I am sure he would not take the case of the lady to which the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) alluded, who was dismissed some fifteen years ago—and who, he says was unjustly dismissed—as a justification for dealing out harsh treatment to the postmistress at Bath.

I want to refer for a moment to a matter which was brought before the House by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I refer to the recall of the commissioners who were appointed under the Boundary Waters Treaty. I do not think that the government can justify its conduct with reference to those commissioners. They had been appointed some considerable time before the elections and they were appointed under the treaty which provides that the right of recommendation shall rest with the Dominion government. The British government simply makes the appointment, as a formal matter, because the treaty is one between His Majesty the King and the government of the United States. The negotiation of the treaty was, however, left entirely with the representatives of Canada and the United States. Those who went to Washington representing this country communicated from time to time with the British Ambassador but the whole treaty was negotiated between the representatives of this government and the representatives of the government of the United States, and the treaty provides in express words that three commissioners shall be appointed to act on behalf of Canada by the British government upon the recommendation of the Governor General in Council. That shows that the appointment, so far as the British government was concerned, was merely a formal matter. It shows that these appointments really rested with this government, and that all the British government had to do, under the treaty, was to carry out the recommendations made by the government of Canada.

No doubt the present government, immediately on coming into office, made inquiry and ascertained that His Majesty the King had not actually become a party to the appointments and availed themselves of that point—which was a mere formality—to rescind what the previous government had done and had done a considerable time before the elections came on. As a matter of fact the British government had

approved of these appointments, and the British Ambassador had been notified that His Majesty's government had approved of them, and that a formal order signed by His Majesty the King would be given in due course. On receipt of that notification the British Ambassador at Washington advised the Canadian government that the British government had approved of the appointment of the Canadian commissioners and these commissioners were requested to proceed to Washington to organize the commission.

Mr. MONK. Who gave that information?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The British Ambassador conveyed that information to the Canadian government and my department, acting on the request of the British Ambassador, notified the three gentlemen that they had been appointed and requested them to proceed to Washington to organize the commission, pursuant to the request of the British Ambassador.

Those facts show that to all intents and purposes these appointments had been made before the late government left office. Is it not idle to say then that those gentlemen were not appointed?

Mr. MONK. That is the information we got.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will make inquiry, he will find that I have given absolutely what took place. The British Ambassador informed the late government that the British government had approved of the appointments that a formal order signed by the King would follow in due course, and requested that the commissioners should proceed to Washington as early as possible for the purpose of organizing the commission. I am sure that the papers, when they are before the House, will confirm everything I have said, and satisfy my hon. friend that the department over which he presides had been communicated with in the regular way by the British Ambassador informing the minister of that department of the approval of the British government of the appointment of these three commissioners and requesting that they should proceed to Washington for the purpose of conferring with the commissioners appointed by the United States government.

If these facts be proved—and my hon. friend can verify them by referring to the letters on file in his department—they show that these gentlemen were in every sense of the word appointed commissioners to act for Canada. What have our friends opposite done? They have, in the face of the order in council appointing these gentlemen, in the face—

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. MONK There is no order in council appointing them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there was.

Mr. MONK. An order in council suggesting their names.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I beg pardon; a minute of council appointing them so far as this government could do it under the treaty.

Mr. MONK. It was a suggestion

Mr. PUGSLEY. And recommending to the British government, as we had a right to recommend under the treaty—for the British government was simply to carry out the recommendation of the Governor General in Council—that these gentlemen be appointed. The British government, under the treaty, could not appoint any others than those recommended by the Governor in Council. My hon. friend will find a Minute of Council passed a considerable time before the general election; and he will find in his department, as I have said, the information conveyed to the government by the British Ambassador that the British government had approved of the appointment of these gentlemen, and that the formal order in council would follow in due course, requesting them to undertake the work of the commission and to proceed to Washington to meet the commissioners appointed by the United States for the purpose of organizing. Now, what does the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) say? He says that because these gentlemen were Liberals, and because of the nature of the duties these commissioners will be called upon to discharge, they ought to have retired from office, and allowed Conservatives to be put in their places. What does that mean? It means that if, next year, or the year after, there should be a change of government, these gentlemen who have now been appointed should send in their resignation, or if they fail to do so, should be dismissed from office. That does not appeal to me as a correct doctrine in appointments of this character. It is certainly not according to British tradition. These gentlemen were appointed to what is to be, to all intents and purposes, a court. The commissioners are not to act either for the United States or for Canada, but are to consider as a judicial tribunal all questions of an international character; first, questions arising in connection with the boundary waters; second, questions arising along the common frontier which may be referred to the commission by either government; and, third, questions of any description which the two governments may agree to refer to the commission. They are to be something like the Hague Tribunal but in a smaller way. They are, as I say, to all intents and purposes a judicial body.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) deny that they had a representative character also?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think they have a representative character; I think they have a judicial character. Why, the treaty contemplates, and so provides, that there might be a division of opinion between the commissioners appointed on either side; one or two United States Commissioners might side with the commissioners from Canada or vice versa, and so have a decision by a majority vote. It was expected, as I say, not that they would voice the opinions of the government that they represented, but that they would act in a judicial capacity, forming a tribunal of a most important character to determine questions of an international nature arising from time to time. I cannot help feeling that a great mistake has been made by our friends opposite. They have, in fact, asked the British government to revoke what that government had done, according to the information conveyed to this government through the British Ambassador. They have asked the British government to rescind that and to act upon the recommendation which they themselves have made, under which these gentlemen who had been, to all intents and purposes, appointed were dismissed from office and friends of the party in power appointed in their places.

Motion (Mr. Carvell) agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. It is nearly six o'clock, and there does not appear to be any business for which it is worth while to call the House together this evening. I move, therefore, the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 10, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Alberta Electric Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Alberta Interurban Railway Company.'—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Boyce.

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Architectural Institute of Canada.—Sir Edmund Osler.

Bill (No. 36) respecting Barcelona Traction Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Staples.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Canadian Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company and the Carillon and Grenville Company.—Mr. Achim.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Cap de la Magdeleine Railway Company.—Mr. Paquet.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Baker.

Bill (No. 45) respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Achim.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Dominion Trust Company, and to change its name to 'British Empire Trust Company.'—Mr. Cromwell.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Ames.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Boyce.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 53) respecting certain patents of Edmund F. Piper.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Quinze River and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Brabazon.

Bill (No. 55) respecting certain patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Union Bank of Canada.—Mr. Barker.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ending March 31, 1911.—Hon. W. T. White.

Report of the Minister of Justice, Penitentiaries in Canada, for the year ending March 31, 1911.—Hon. C. J. Doherty.

Report of the Department of Naval Service for the year ending March 31, 1911.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Report of the Department of Customs for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911. Part II.—Hon. Geo. E. Foster.

Report of the Northwest Mounted Police, 1911.—Rt. Hon. R. L. Borden.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 58) respecting the Department of External Affairs. He said: The Department of External Affairs is constituted by chapter 13 of the Acts of 1909, which provides that there shall be a department of the government of Canada to be called the Department of External Affairs over which the Secretary of State for the time being shall preside. The Act which I am introducing repeals that Act and re-enacts it in another form. The only material change made in the Bill is that it places the Department of External Affairs under the Prime Minister instead of under the Secretary of State.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ESTIMATES FOR 1912-13.

Hon. W. T. WHITE presented a message from His Royal Highness the Governor General transmitting estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending the 31st March, 1913.

On motion of Mr. White, the message of His Royal Highness, together with the estimates accompanying it, were referred to the Committee of Supply.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. What is the eastern boundary of the extension of the province of Manitoba, regarding which an announcement has been recently made by the Hon. R. P. Roblin?

2. What is the western boundary of the proposed extension of the province of Ontario, regarding which an announcement has recently been made by Sir James Whitney?

Mr. BORDEN. This seems somewhat objectionable in point of form, but I may say for the information of the hon. gentleman that it is expected the Bill will be brought down at no distant date, which will give him the information asked for.

BRITISH COLUMBIA'S PROVINCIAL BOUNDARY.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any agreement been arrived at with the government of British Columbia as to the claim of that province for increased subsidy?

2. If so, what are the terms of the agreement?

Mr. BORDEN. The claim of the province of British Columbia is that there are special conditions in that province of a permanent nature to which consideration should be given. That claim of the province has been submitted to the government, and is under consideration at present. I might add that the province asks, as I understand it, that a competent and impartial commission should be appointed to inquire into its claim and report thereon.

LOTBINIERE POSTMASTERS.

Mr. FORTIER:

1. How many postmasters in the county of Lotbinière have been dismissed by the present government?

2. What is the name and residence of each?

3. What reasons or complaints were alleged for their dismissal?

4. What is the name and residence of each of the persons replacing them and who recommended them?

5. Is there assurance that the complaints or reasons formulated against these dismissed postmasters are founded in good faith?

6. If there be cause for it, will an inquiry be granted to whichever ones of those dismissed, who should wish to obtain it?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Three.

2. (a) Mr. Orius Mailhot, postmaster at Ste. Philomène de Fortierville, replaced by Mrs. H. Tousignant,

(b) Mr. Edmond Bernard, postmaster at Ste. Emelie de Lotbinière, replaced by Mr. Siegfroid Beaudet.

(c) Mr. Clovis Brochu, postmaster at Ste. Agathe de Lotbinière, replaced by Miss Marie A. Gregoire.

3. (a) In December, 1910, the postmaster at Ste. Philomène de Fortierville (Mr. Tousignant) died and his widow was an applicant for the office. Instead of appointing her, however, the late government appointed Mr. Orius Mailhot, who was then and has continued to be an active political partisan. He has been dismissed and Mrs. Tousignant has been appointed.

(b) The two post offices of Leclercville and Ste. Emelie de Lotbinière were amalgamated and one post office took the place of the two with Siegfroid Beaudet as postmaster.

(c) Mr. Clovis Brochu, postmaster at Ste. Agathe de Lotbinière, was dismissed for political partisanship and Miss M. A. Gregoire appointed in his place.

4. (a) Mrs. H. Tousignant, Ste. Philomène de Fortierville.

(b) Mr. Siegfroid Beaudet, Ste. Emelie de Lotbinière.

(c) Miss M. A. Gregoire, Ste. Agathe de Lotbinière.

5. Yes.

6. There will be no cause for inquiry because the facts are to the personal knowledge of the Postmaster General.

ST. AGATHE DES MONTS POST OFFICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Postmaster General received lately a petition concerning the post office at St. Agathe des Monts, county of Terrebonne, Quebec?

2. If so, what was the object of said petition, and what are the names of the petitioners?

3. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to dimsiss the postmistress, Mrs. Bedard?

4. If so, what are the reasons alleged for her dismissal?

5. Has there been any inspection made of late of the St. Agathe des Monts post office, and what are the conclusions of the report made by the inspector?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. Praying that Mrs. Frederick Bedard, postmistress at Ste. Agathe des Monts, should not be removed from office. This petition bears many signatures. The list will be given on a motion for production of the papers.

3. Under consideration.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. The post office inspector at Montreal was instructed to inquire into the management of this office. He reports certain facts, but there is no special conclusion.

MR. S. B. PARISEAU.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is the Minister of Railways and Canals aware that S. B. Pariseau, one of the employees of the Quebec Canals Branch is said to be doing expropriation work as arbitrator for a private concern known as the Cedar Rapids Company?

2. Is any employee of the government allowed to receive a salary from both His Majesty and a private concern?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The minister is not aware that L. S. Pariseau, an employee of the Lachine canal, is said to be doing expropriation work as arbitrator for a private concern known as the Cedar Rapids Company.

2. The minister is not aware of any law prohibiting an employee from doing outside work; but the rule of the Department of Railways and Canals is that employees shall not perform outside services without special authority to do so.

POST OFFICE ANNUITIES BRANCH.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

In view of the proposed transfer of the Annuities Branch to the Post Office Department and the dismissal of the annuities agents will not the Minister of Trade and Commerce recommend that three months' salary be paid to such agents as a compensation?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I may say that an order in council has been passed making the usual grants in consideration of the dispensation of services.

DISMISSALS AT CANSO REDUCTION WORKS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many officials have been dismissed from the Government Reduction Works at Canso, N.S.?

2. What is the name and employment of each official so dismissed?

3. What reasons were alleged for their dismissal?

4. Who recommended said dismissals?

5. Will an investigation be granted in cases where officials express a wish for same?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Two.

2. Edward A. Kelly, engineer; D. S. Hendsbee, weigher.

3. Economy in the operation of the works. It was not considered that such officers should be employed for a longer period each year than the works are operated.

4. The departmental officer responsible for the control of these works.

5. In this instance no investigation will be held, as the action taken was for purposes of economy.

SOREL MARINE YARDS.

Mr. BARRETTE:

Does the government intend to institute an inquiry into the administration of the marine yards at Sorel?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, the commissioners appointed under the Inquiries Act to investigate and report upon the Civil Service will make a full inquiry into the administration of the government shipyard at Sorel.

MR. J. A. LACOMBE—DISMISSAL.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has J. A. Lacombe, postmaster of St. Sebastien, county of Beauce, been dismissed? If so, for what reason?

2. Was an inquiry held before the dismissal?

3. Has the government or one of its ministers received a petition asking that Mr. J. A. Lacombe be retained in his office and that the post office at St. Sebastien should not be changed from the place it now is? If so, how many signatures were there?

4. If Mr. Lacombe has been dismissed, who has been appointed in his place?

5. Who requested the dismissal of Mr. Lacombe, and who recommended the appointment of his successor?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Mr. J. A. Lacombe has been removed from the postmastership of St. Sebastien de Beauce, Mr. Louis Paradis, who was removed from that office in December, 1896, having been reinstated in his position.
2. The facts do not require an inquiry.
3. Yes, 156 signatures.
4. See answer to No. 1.
5. Dr. George Cloutier.

NORBERT HENRY—MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. BELAND:

1. On what date will the contract entered into by the Post Office Department with Norbert Henry for the carriage of the mails between Scott Junction and the station in the county of Beauce, expire?
2. Has the Post Office Department decided to cancel this contract before the date of its expiration? If so, for what reason?
3. Has an investigation been held?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2 and 3. This contract might have run until the 31st March 1915, but it contained a clause by virtue of which it could be terminated on giving three months' notice. This notice has been given.

POSTMASTER BOUCHER, DORCHESTER.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has the government or one of its ministers received a petition signed by the parishioners of St. Benjamin, county of Dorchester, P.Q., asking that the postmaster, Mr. O. F. Boucher, be not dismissed? If so, how many signed said petition?
2. Has the government or one of its ministers received a petition asking for the dismissal of Mr. Boucher? If so, how many signed the petition?
3. Is the Postmaster General disposed to respect the expressed desire of the great majority of the parishioners?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. A communication signed by the Postmaster and eleven other persons has been received by the Department asking that no change be made in the postmastership.
2. A communication was received from Mr. Albert Sevigny, M.P., testifying to the fact that Mr. O. F. Boucher had been guilty of offensive partisanship during the recent federal elections.
3. The Postmaster General is not aware of any such desire on the part of the great majority of the parishioners.

MOOSEJAW POST OFFICES.

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What are the names and locations of the new post offices which have been authorized in the Moosejaw electoral district, to which no postmasters have yet been appointed?
2. Have requests been made by the present government for recommendations to said postmasterships? If so, on what dates respectively and from whom?

Mr. PELLETIER:

Proposed Name of Office.	Proposed Site.				Name of Person Consulted, and Date.
	Sec.	Tp.	Rge.		
Bestville	14	17	21	West 3rd M.	S. K. Rathwell, Dec. 20, 1911.
Sunshine (name unavailable)	13	3	27	"	" " 20, 1911.
Floyd	1	2	15	"	" " 20, 1911.
Helland	27	1	27	"	" " 20, 1211.
Brandenburg	12	22	26	"	" " 20, 1911.
Dixie (name unavailable)	22	18	26	"	" " 20, 1911.
Lacordaire	7	1	29	"	" " 20, 1911.
Spring Lake	21	23	10	"	" " 20, 1911.
Buffalo Head	31	17	28	"	" " 20, 1911.
Pinto Valley	16	7	10	"	" " 20, 1911.
Niederstadt	16	11	9	"	" " 20, 1911.
Dingwall	13	26	27	"	" " 19, 1911.
Dumblane	16	24	25	"	" " 19, 1911.
Ritchie	2	26	21	"	" " 20, 1911.
Maeshowe	15	12	17	"	" " 18, 1911.
Newbury	12	19	27	"	" " 18, 1911.
Bengough	23	5	24	"	" " 7, 1911.
Connaught	3	16	29	"	" " 7, 1911.
Jonesboro	17	23	15	"	" " 26, 1911.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence relating to the negotiations that have been opened by the government for improved trade arrangements with the British West Indies and British Guiana—Mr. Murphy.

OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of all petitions or memoranda presented to the government, since the 21st of September last, respecting work done or to be done for the improvement and beautifying of Ottawa.

He said: Some few weeks ago the newspapers of this city gave an account of an interview between my right hon. friend the First Minister and a delegation, as I understand it, of a board styling itself the Architects' Association—

Mr. BORDEN. The Royal Architectural Institute.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know exactly what the purport of that memorial was, but, if the reports concerning it are correct, it contained some strictures as to the work done by the Ottawa Improvement Commission appointed some years ago by the government on the instructions of parliament for the improvement and beautifying of Ottawa. That which principally attracted in this memorial was the statement that the Ottawa Improvement Commission seemed to have proceeded with its work hitherto in a rather haphazard way and without any plan made in advance. I believe that everybody who has been a resident of Ottawa for some years will say that ever since the Ottawa Improvement Commission began its operations its work has been very well done indeed. That work may not have been perfect, but I think it will be agreed that it has added greatly to the beauty of Ottawa. And I believe also that it has received the commendation generally of those who have visited the city. But it is not accurate to say—and it is to this I wish particularly to call attention—that the commission proceeded without any plan prepared in advance. The commission, very shortly after it was appointed, secured the service of a landscape architect of considerable reputation and wide fame, Mr. Frederic G. Todd. That gentleman made a report to the commission, which report I now have before me. And part of it is as follows:

Temple Building, Aug. 29, 1903.
The Ottawa Improvement Commission,
Ottawa, Ont.

Gentlemen,—In accordance with your request, I have examined the city of Ottawa and its vicinity with a view to considering the adaptability of certain portions of it for park purposes and also with the idea of outlining a general comprehensive scheme for the improvement of the city, having due regard to the future health and happiness of its inhabitants, and to the fact that Ottawa is the capital of the Dominion of Canada, whose population, wealth and importance is rapidly increasing. I have given my best attention to this problem, and I beg to submit to you the following report:—

I am not aware whether that report has ever been brought to the attention of parliament, or whether it has ever been laid upon the table of the House. It is a comprehensive document. Mr. Todd seems to have gone fully into the subject, examining all Ottawa, and its vicinity, and to have made a report covering:

Large natural parks or reserves.
Suburban parks.
Boulevards and parkways.
Waterway parks—bathing.
City parks and squares.
Playgrounds.

These several heads are dealt with and illustrated on the report. And the commission have, to a large extent, already acted upon some of these recommendations. Recommendations were made with regard to:

Rockliffe park.
Rideau canal drive.
Clemow boulevard.
Paterson's creek park.
Strathcona park.
Somerset street square.

These recommendations have been carried out—though not in their entirety I believe—and with some degree of success. There are some recommendations which contemplate work in a very large way, and which, if carried out in their entirety, would add greatly to the beauty of Ottawa. The commission, however, has not gone into the larger features of the report, but the work done by the commission has been chiefly in Rockliffe Park, the Canal Driveway, Somerset Park, and other similar works all within two or three miles of this place in which we meet. The commission has still more work to do, and I hope that during the coming season it will be able to take up the old cemeteries which are at present an eyesore to the city and which, after the bodies are removed can be transformed into beauty spots for Ottawa. The commission is also engaged in the work of the driveway from Nepean Point to Rideau Hall. This will keep them busy till next season. But what I wish particularly to point out is that it would not be fair to the commission to say that they have been proceeding at haphazard. On the contrary, they have followed a general plan. I can only say to my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that he should bring down as early as possible the representations which have been made—made, I have no doubt in good faith—by those who interviewed him. I repeat

that in my humble judgment the commission has done good work. It is work which all parties in this House will agree has been well done, and work in which not only the citizens of Ottawa, but also the citizens of all Canada should be deeply interested. For we all have a pride in the capital of the Dominion which is endowed by nature perhaps more than any other part of the Dominion, which endowment properly used ought to make the capital of the Dominion one of the finest cities on the continent.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). There is no objection whatever to the passage of the motion which the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has proposed. So far as the comprehensive plan is concerned to which he has just alluded, it has never come to my attention before, nor do I think it has ever been laid upon the table of the House. I should have thought that, inasmuch as the commission is carrying on its work by means of moneys granted out of the public treasury of Canada it might have been better perhaps—unless there is some reason that does not occur to me at the moment—that that report should have been brought to the attention of parliament at an earlier date. It has never before been brought to my attention either in parliament, or by the chairman of the commission, so far as I recollect. This motion reads:

> For a copy of all petitions or memoranda presented to the government, since the 21st of September last, respecting work done or to be done for the improvement and beautifying of Ottawa.

Perhaps the right hon. gentleman would have no objection to enlarge the motion by eliminating the words 'since the 21st of September last', so that it might include the document to which he has called attention, and any other document that may be covered.

At the moment I am not aware of any petitions or memoranda presented to the government since the 21st September last respecting this matter, with the exception of the document to which the right hon. gentleman has alluded. That memorial is under date of 24th November, 1911. It is a rather lengthy document, and has been printed for the information of members of the government, to each of whom a copy has been sent. I have brought a printed copy here to-day, and shall hand it over to the right hon. gentleman at once in order that he may not be obliged to wait for the return for which he has moved. It is not necessary to dwell at the moment upon the representations made in this memorial. It will speak for itself. I have only had the opportunity of reading it in a very hurried manner some time ago, and do not recall everything in it with regard to the work of the Ottawa Improvement Commission. I may say, however, that it does not deal solely with the work of that commission, but deals also with other matters such as the location and character of public buildings to be erected.

So far as I was able to gather, and can recollect, the views which were presented on that occasion amounted substantially to this, that in the development and improvement of Ottawa, a comprehensive outlook into the future for a good many years, is eminently desirable; and that there should be some co-operation between the government, the Ottawa Improvement Commission and the authorities of the City of Ottawa itself, because all these are more or less concerned with the erection of public buildings, the laying out of streets, and with other improvements which may be required in Ottawa as a developing city, and as a place of residence in the future. It seems to me, that there is a good deal to be said in support of the reasonableness of that suggestion. The buildings to be erected by the government,—and I think there is a great need of some early step in that direction—the manner in which the streets should be laid out, and the facilities of transportation, all these and many other matters which will readily occur to every hon. gentleman in this House, are intimately connected with the future development of the city of Ottawa. I believe the criticism has been made, perhaps it may have been made in this memorial, that there has not been sufficient regard by the Ottawa Improvement Commission to a comprehensive scheme. I have heard that criticism in private. It is said, for example, that the south end of King Edward Avenue has not been connected with or co-ordinated with any other work of the Ottawa Improvement Commission. That is only one illustration of several criticisms that have been brought to my attention. I do not consider myself competent to pass judgment upon the work of the commission, or upon these criticisms. It is desirable, I think, that proper consideration should be given to a comprehensive scheme, and that too much attention should not be paid to detached work. My right hon. friend thinks that sufficient consideration has been given to that part of the subject. I am not prepared either to deny or to affirm that he is right. It is sufficient to say for the present that at the earliest possible opportunity the attention of the government should be given to the matters suggested in this memorial; the commission will be consulted with regard to them, and we shall endeavour to have the work so carried on that no reasonable criticism or complaint can be made with regard to it. I know we are all desirous, on both sides of the House, that, since a very considerable expenditure of public money takes place yearly on this work, that money should be applied in a reasonable and effective way, having regard

to the facilities of transportation, to the beatifying of the city, and to everything else that might tend to the proper development of the capital city of this Dominion.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS COMMISSION.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John City) moved:

For a copy of all orders or minutes of council relating to the appointment of commissioners under the treaty with the United States relating to boundary waters, and questions arising along the boundary between Canada and the United States, signed at Washington, January 11, 1909: together with a copy of all despatches, letters and telegrams between the Governor General, or the government of Canada, or any member thereof, and the British Ambassador at Washington, or the British government, or any member thereof, upon that subject; and also of all letters and telegrams between any member or department of the government and Sir George Gibbons, Mr. Aimé Geoffrion and Mr. Alexander Barnhill, or either of them, relating to their appointment as such commissioners.

He said: I take it for granted that there will be no objection on the part of the government to the adoption of this resolution. I think it will be conceded on all hands that it is desirable it should be passed, in view of the circumstances of the appointment, in the first place, of those three gentlemen whose appointment was made a considerable time prior to the last general election, their subsequent recall, after this government came into office, and the appointment of other gentlemen had been made. I think the House will agree that it is desirable that all the documents, correspondence and orders in council relating to these appointments should be laid before the House. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will remember that at an early date in the session reference was made to the removal of the appointees of the previous government, or rather the appointees of the British government, upon recommendation of the late Canadian government, and the appointment of other gentlemen in their stead. I made the statement that so far as the facts have come to my knowledge, the appointment of Sir George Gibbons, of Mr. Geoffrion and of Mr. Barnhill had been recommended by the Governor General in Council a considerable time previous to the general election. I also called attention to the fact that the recommendation had gone forward to His Majesty's government, and that there had been received by the Canadian government a communication from the British Ambassador stating that the appointment of those gentlemen would be approved of, that, indeed, it had been informally approved of, but that the formal order in council had not been passed, but assuring this government that the appointments would be approved of; and the British Ambassador requested that the gentlemen who had been appointed should be notified to proceed to Washington at as early a date as possible, to meet the commissioners appointed by the United States government for the purpose of organizing under the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the ambassador the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) speaks of?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The British Ambassador, the Right Hon. Mr. Bryce.

Mr. FOSTER. It was the ambassador at Washington?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. That is the information which I received as Minister of Public Works, in which department the matter more particularly belonged, although the formal communication had come through the Department of External Affairs. I caused notice to be given to Sir George Gibbons, Mr. Geoffrion and Mr. Barnhill to comply immediately with the request of the British Ambassador and urged that they should, at as early a date as possible, proceed to Washington with a view of taking up the work of organization with the commissioners appointed by the United States government. You will understand that the work of organization could not take place until the appointments were ratified by the British government.

Therefore, when the British ambassador made that request, as I was informed departmentally he had done, I took it for granted that, in substance at least, the appointments had been approved by the British government and, in accordance with the request of the British ambassador, I caused the necessary directions to be given to those gentlemen informing them of their appointment and requesting them to proceed to Washington. I believe they did so and took up the preliminary work of organization in conjunction with the appointees of the United States government.

Thus it was a matter of very great surprise to me to learn that after the present government came into office the British government was requested to undo what it had, in substance, already done upon the recommendation of the former government. It may be said that as a matter of form His Majesty had not signed the order in council but practically the appointment had been ratified. It must be borne in mind that, under the treaty, the British government can act only upon the recommendation of the Governor General in Council of Canada. Under the terms of the treaty the British government cannot make the appointment except of gentlemen who

are recommended by the Canadian government. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), as I understood, rather questioned the accuracy of my statement. It may be that I was misinformed by the officials of the department who communicated with me but I made the statement according to my recollection. My hon. friend has possibly had the opportunity of looking into the matter since and may be able to inform the House as to the correctness of my statement. When the papers are brought down it will be seen whether or not my statement was correct.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). There is no objection whatever to bringing down the papers and I therefore at once consent to this motion passing. The hon. gentleman speaks of the appointments having been made and recalled. As I understand the situation, a recommendation was made by the late government. After we assumed office we thoroughly understood that the matter was open for our consideration and our action, and we recommended accordingly. I was not aware, except from the statement of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that any communication had been made by the British ambassador at Washington of the purport which he has indicated. I do not question the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statement but I am bound to say that it had not come to my attention when action was taken by the present government. Nor do I quite understand how an intimation of that kind could come from the British ambassador at Washington. That is not the usual channel of communication. However, my hon. friend may be right in this instance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the customary channel of communication between the British government and the Canadian government is not through the British ambassador?

Mr. BORDEN. That is not in my experience, on the contrary it is through His Royal Highness the Governor General.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It comes through the British ambassador to His Royal Highness, the British ambassador communicates to the Governor General.

Mr. BORDEN. I am bound to say that if all communications of every kind from the Colonial Office come through the British ambassador at Washington, it is entirely new to me. I have understood that sometimes this may be the case in respect of matters which concern the relations of Canada and the United States.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which this did.

Mr. BORDEN. But I see no good reason why a recommendation made by the Canadian government through the ordinary channel should not receive an answer through the ordinary channel. Does my hon. friend say that the recommendation of the late government went through the British ambassador at Washington to the imperial government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The British ambassador was at once informed of the recommendations which had gone forward to His Majesty's government.

Mr. BORDEN. Quite so, and the British ambassador would be informed of the reply conveyed to the government through His Royal Highness the Governor General, but to the statement that, as a matter of practice, communications of that kind pass through the British ambassador at Washington, I am unable to agree. If this communication went through the ordinary channel, as I understand it did, it was forwarded to the imperial government by His Excellency the late Governor General, and therefore I see no reason why the reply of the imperial government should not have been conveyed to the government of Canada in the same way.

As to the propriety or impropriety of the action of the present administration, my hon. friend has said little to-day and when the papers are brought down he will have a full opportunity to discuss that subject. I do not intend to discuss it to-day. We took action such as we deemed in the best interests of this country and we are prepared to defend that action whenever my hon. friends opposite see fit to attack us with regard to it.

My hon. friend has made the further statement that the British government had purely a formal part in this matter. My hon. friend will remember that the appointment is to be made by His Majesty the King. It is true it is to be made upon the recommendation of the government of Canada. I believe that under the terms of the treaty His Majesty would be bound to appoint upon the recommendation of the Canadian government; but it is true also that His Majesty would not be bound, strictly speaking, to appoint those who were recommended, just as the Governor General of Canada might decline, for good reason, if he had good reason, to accept the recommendation of his advisers for the time being. Thus I cannot quite agree that the action of the British government was quite so formal as my hon. friend would have us understand.

However, there is no reason why the papers should not be brought down and then there will be every opportunity for a full discussion of the matter.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House it is desirable in furtherance of the transportation interests of this Dominion, that the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial railway as a government operated railway should be widened and extended by securing by lease or otherwise such of the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I do not feel called upon to take up very much of the time of the House in view of the frequent discussions of this subject particularly during the last parliament. In 1907 the subject of the acquisition of branch lines by the government of Canada, to be operated in connection with the Intercolonial railway, was, I think, first mooted in this parliament by myself. Subsequently, in 1908, I made a motion worded as follows, which motion was moved on the 3rd February, 1908:

Resolved, that in the opinion of this House it is desirable in furtherance of the transportation interests of this Dominion that the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial railway, as a government operated railway, should be widened and extended, by securing by lease or otherwise, such of the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial, as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway, and by providing for the extension of the government operation of said railway to industrial centres of western Canada, and to a point or points on the Great Lakes of Canada, either by the construction of an extension to the same to such points, or by securing such running rights over existing lines thereto as will enable the Intercolonial railway to extend its transportation facilities westwardly, with a view of stimulating and promoting internal and interprovincial traffic, and facilitating the import and export trade of the Dominion, through Canadian channels.

That motion was discussed at some length and I took the opportunity then to bring to the notice of the House the character of and the facts relating to certain branch lines then existing and connecting with the Intercolonial railway. I referred, I think, then to railways in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec. It will be observed that the motion which I have just read as having been introduced into this House during the session of 1908 deals solely with the acquisition of branch lines and the extension of the Intercolonial railway westward. Although those were the terms of the resolution then moved, I brought particularly to the notice of the House, the desirability of having connected the two branches or portions of the government railway system of Canada. It is known and recognized in the Department of Railways and Canals and by the government generally that by the term 'government railway system of Canada' you mean not merely the Intercolonial railway itself, but as well, the Prince Edward Island railway. Both of these railways are under government control and operation. There are no branch lines connected with the Prince Edward Island railway that are not operated by the government as a part of that railway, but there are many branch lines in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as well as in Quebec, which are operated by private companies, which railways connect with the Intercolonial railway and which ought in my judgment, to be operated as a part of the system of the government railways of Canada. In 1908 nothing occurred to give effect to the resolution then moved; it went, I think, to the graveyard with many other resolutions and time was not given for further consideration. In 1909 the same resolution was moved by myself but it did not refer to the extension of the Intercolonial railway westward. I did not observe that the suggestion was taken up with any enthusiasm at least by hon. members from the province of Ontario. My own judgment was that it was in the interest of the Dominion of Canada and in the interest of the Intercolonial railway itself that the railway should be extended westward from Montreal, but gentlemen sitting in this House who represented the sections of country that would be traversed by any such extension did not with any enthusiasm take hold of the question. In 1909 I moved a resolution confined to the acquisition of the branch lines, the widening of the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial railway by that course and not by extending it westward. The same fate befel the motion of 1909 as that which befel the one of 1908. I did not find the government of the day as enthusiastic in respect to the subject as I thought they should be. In 1910 further action was suspended on my part by reason of the fact that the government of that day introduced a Bill empowering them to acquire certain branch lines upon certain conditions.

I pointed out that the Bill did not go as far as in my judgment it should have gone, and would have to be amended; but, being willing to accept half a loaf rather than no bread, I supported it in the hope that decisive action would be taken even under the terms of that Bill. Other hon. members of this House, differing with me in regard to the scope of the Bill, claimed that it was within reasonable expectation that under it the government would be able to secure many of the branch lines if not all of those which had been referred to in the resolution. In 1911 the only action taken by the government was upon certain

reports which had been made by commissioners appointed by the Department of Railways and Canals. The government of the province of New Brunswick, in 1907, seemed to be strongly in favour of the acquisition of the branch lines. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will, I think, recall that the government of New Brunswick appointed commissioners to travel over the several branch lines existing in that province and to make a report to that government with respect to them. That report was subsequently laid upon the table of this House, together with the report of the commission which was appointed by the government of Canada. The commissioners appointed by the government of New Brunswick were T. M. Burns, then I think a member of the legislature of New Brunswick, and Mr. Gilmour Brown, an engineer of high standing. In 1908 the government of Canada appointed commissioners to report to the Department of Railways and Canals and to the government of Canada with respect to all the branch lines in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These reports were laid before parliament and were printed, and will be found in Sessional Paper No. 67a, 1909. They dealt very fully with the character of these railways, their value to some extent and their traffic possibilities. In 1911, during the last session of the last parliament, a resolution was brought in by the then Minister of Railways, the Hon. Mr. Graham, I think in the month of July, and was considered by a Committee of the Whole House and discussed at some length, and a Bill founded on the resolution was introduced, but it did not proceed further by reason of the dissolution of parliament. Now, during the elections of September last the subject of the acquisition of the branch lines was discussed in very many constituencies in eastern Canada, and it was promised, I think, on behalf of the right hon. the leader of the government, that should his government come into power they would proceed to acquire the branch lines and operate them in connection with the government system of railways. I know that a number of the candidates contesting the elections in the province of New Brunswick assured the electors that it mattered not which government was sustained, action would be taken with respect to the acquisition of those branch lines and making them a part of the government railway system, as the parliament of Canada had committed itself to that principle. There came under my notice a telegram which the right hon. the leader of the government addressed to my hon. friend from Kings-Albert (Mr. Fowler), as follows:

Mr. EMMERSON.

Summerside, P.E.I., Sept. 8, 1911.

To George W. Fowler.

Am convinced that interest of Intercolonial railway demands acquisition of branch line railways as feeders, and we purpose to acquire them on reasonable terms if returned to power.

This evidently was an important telegram. It was evidently in the judgment of the right hon. gentleman of sufficient importance to demand that he should send it at that particular time, although he was then on a campaign tour throughout the province of Prince Edward Island, and that he should send it to a gentleman who was a candidate in the interests of the Conservative party in the electoral district of Kings. That telegram strongly commits the right hon. gentleman and the government to the necessary action involved in the terms of the resolution which I now move. In view of the attitude of the right hon. the First Minister and past discussion in this House and in view of the acceptance of the proposition generally by the people of Canada, I am not going to attempt at any length to give the reasons why this resolution should pass. I would hope that those who are sitting on this side of the House in view of their past action, and that the government of the day which is committed by the action of its leader during the election—I would hope that both sides would adopt this resolution without opposition and that the government would promptly take action in order to carry it out.

I have never dealt with this matter in this House from a party standpoint. I have always felt that it was of paramount importance to the whole Dominion, regardless of political considerations, that our government system of railways, some 1,700 miles in length, including Prince Edward Island railway should be dealt with by this parliament in the same way that any board of directors of a private railway would deal with their system. There can be no difference between the environment of the Canadian Pacific railway or the Grand Trunk railway and that of the government system of railways. It is considered good business by our great trunk lines that they should on all occasions, as far as possible, acquire feeders, and they lose no opportunity to acquire branch lines to connect with their central systems. Such a course has been followed by the Canadian Pacific railway in the west as well as in the east. It led, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will realize, to the acquisition by the Canadian Pacific railway of the Tobique Valley railway, to the great advantage both of the Canadian Pacific railway and that railway as well as the people served by it.

It seems like a work of supererogation to attempt to prove the advantages that would accrue to the Intercolonial railway by the adoption of the policy involved in this motion. To-day the Intercolonial railway is suffering because it has not the control of the branch lines which connect with it. A large portion of the traffic which goes over what are known as the coal railways of Nova Scotia is diverted over other lines than the Intercolonial railway. As a matter of fact, many branch lines, which connect with the Intercolonial railway north of Moncton, have their traffic carried to St. John, whence it is carried by the Canadian Pacific railway to Montreal—and this despite the fact that the most direct and shortest route for that traffic would be over the whole system of the Intercolonial railway to Montreal. I make this assertion unreservedly, namely, that a very large proportion of the express traffic which comes from the counties of Kent and Northumberland in the province of New Brunswick, and which naturally go over the Intercolonial railway, is diverted by way of St. John around over the Canadian Pacific railway. I know that a very large percentage of the passenger traffic goes that way. This is due in a great measure to the want of an arrangement with respect to train connections. If these branch lines were under the control of the Intercolonial railway and proper train connections made, there is no reason why the Intercolonial railway should not take all the traffic that is gathered by the respective branch lines which connect with its trunk line. In my judgment the carrying out of the policy embodied in this resolution would not be merely to the advantage of the Intercolonial railway but of the people of all Canada.

In the past whenever the subject of the Intercolonial railway was mentioned at all in this House, hon. members were disposed to regard it as something exclusively in the interests of the maritime provinces. Whenever any proposition was made respecting the Intercolonial railway, it was seemingly recognized as one solely in the interests of the maritime provinces. I am not going to make any reflection upon either political party in that regard, but that is an opinion which has grown up because people have not reflected, because they have not realized the purposes which the Intercolonial railway has served in the history of Canada. I have said more than once on the floor of this House that in my opinion the Intercolonial railway has been of greater service to the trade of Ontario than it has been in reality to the trade of eastern Canada. Eastern Canada has its water communication, and while it has been advanced by the construction of the Intercolonial railway, yet the western provinces have been equally advantaged. The manufacturers and the merchants of Ontario and of the city of Montreal and other industrial centres in the province of Quebec have in the Intercolonial railway a highway which enables them to find a market for their wares along the shores of Nova Scotia and among the fishermen and lumbermen of New Brunswick.

The merchant princes of Toronto and Montreal have reaped very great advantage by reason of the construction of that railway, and by the absorption of other railways known as branch line feeders equal proportionate advantage will accrue to western Canada. Some ask why it is, the branch lines have not been more prosperous, and, as they have not been more prosperous, why the Dominion of Canada should assume the burden of operating them in connection with the Intercolonial railway. Let me say first that when the principle of aiding the construction of branch lines was adopted by the parliament of Canada in the way it was adopted, a step was taken which, in my judgment, was a move forward for the transportation interests of the Dominion. Yet one who at that time looked into the future must have seen that the day would inevitably come when these branch lines must be a part of the Intercolonial railway system, that it would be a matter of impossibility to successfully operate isolated railways constructed from time to time through remote sections of the several provinces; and must have realized that the branch lines could be managed more economically and more to the advantage of the people if they became part of the Intercolonial railway system. I am confident that the right hon. the leader of the government has been imbued with the idea that this is a desirable thing. I have no doubt he will find, as I have found in the past, that there will be opposition to the idea in certain sections of the Dominion. And yet I think that with his great powers he can convince and silence such opposition and show that the proposal is not merely in the interest of the communities traversed by these branch lines, not only in the interest of the Intercolonial railway and of the eastern section of Canada, but in the interest of the transportation in Canada as a whole and of every province of the Dominion. Consider the location of these several branch lines. Travelling from the west eastward you come to Ste. Flavie and the line down to Metapedia, Campbellton, Dalhousie, and so through New Brunswick to Nova Scotia. There is the line extending from near Ste. Flavie down to the south shore of the St. Lawrence and on through to Matane. Then there is one from Metapedia through Bonaventure county to Gaspé. And in the county of Gloucester, N.B., there is what is known as the Caraquet railway through the rich and

flourishing section down to Caraquet and on to Tracadie and also to Shippegan, and providing connection for all that section of country. There is no section of Canada with greater natural resources than the county of Gloucester, N.B., I say that unhesitatingly, having some knowledge of the resources of that county. It is a county that is growing in population and in the development of its resources. There are rich stone quarries there, while the fishing resources of that section of New Brunswick are incomparably ahead of any similar section of the maritime provinces. And the people who are now served by that railway would benefit immensely by the acquisition of this line. The people down the Gaspé coast would certainly reap immense advantages by reason of the acquisition of what is known as the Baie des Chaleurs road. And so with the people served by other branch lines. These people have the right to be considered by this parliament. The proposition has been made by the parliament of Canada to construct a railway north from Pas Mission to Hudson bay, and we see much in the newspapers with respect to that work. I am not going to discuss the feasibility of the prospects of that road. But, at best, it is a railway that will serve the traffic interests of Canada only during some four months of the year. I care not how optimistic he may be, no man would say that the Hudson Bay railway, when constructed, can be utilized as a transportation line in connection with the exports of Canada for a longer period than three or four months of each year. Many millions of dollars are involved in the construction of that railway. I say naught against its construction; but I do say, Sir, if the people of that section are to be recognized by the construction of that railway, it is certainly of equal importance that the people living remote from the Intercolonial railway in the provinces of New Brunswick, Quebec, and Nova Scotia, and not having proper railway facilities, should have their interests attended to and their claims recognized by parliament. Many of these places are old-settled sections of Canada, and their people are entitled to recognition in this matter. But these people alone are not to reap the benefit of such a policy. True, they will be placed, measurably at last, upon a footing with their fellows who now have the advantage of railway facilities. They will be able to bring in goods from the markets of Canada and other industrial centres, which will be to them a great advantage. But it will be of equal advantage to the manufacturing and mercantile interests of Canada that these people should be brought into contact with them and be enabled to furnish the market with that which the manufacturers and merchants handle in their business. The proposition in this resolution is for the leasing of these roads. It does not necessarily involve the purchase of these roads, although it may involve that, if in the judgment of the government of Canada that step should seem desirable. It simply involves the leasing of these lines and operating them as a part of the government railway system; and if the policy of leasing is adopted it does not mean adding one dollar to the public debt of Canada.

Personally I would favour, in the interest of the country, and in the interest of the Intercolonial itself, the purchase outright of certain branch lines of that railway. Sir, I have a startling statement to make. There are to be found lying along the line of the Intercolonial, rusting and decaying, sufficient rails to enable many of those branch lines to be relaid with a new track, rails that have become useless to the Intercolonial by reason of the heavier rolling stock that is now used. There are bridges that have had to be taken up because of this heavier rolling stock, that would give to almost every one of those branch lines a steel or iron bridge to replace the defective ones that might be found on those branch lines. The old material, the cars which are obsolete because of the improvement of the Intercolonial itself, the locomotives that are now too light for the purpose of the Intercolonial, with many other items of material, could be utilized on those branch lines, material which is now lying unused, although it is represented in the cost of the Intercolonial as material on hand. These railways could be improved, they could be bettered, each one of these branch lines could be furnished with railway facilities with advantage to the people, to the Intercolonial itself, and to the Dominion at large. Now, why should there be any hesitation or delay? This matter has been discussed for five or six years in this parliament. The right hon. leader of the government may say: Oh, you are supporting a party that did not act as promptly as it should. I admit, Sir, that I have made some complaint against the government, to which I gave a loyal support, that they did not act as speedily as I thought they should have acted. Now, we all realize that a new broom sweeps clean, and we hope that if there have been any undue delays on the part of a former government, the present government will turn over a new leaf, and will take that prompt action which was not taken by the former government. Let me say that, in view of the fact that the former government did act finally, in view of the legislation that they brought down during the last session of the last parliament, and in view of the legislation of 1910, this government is justified from every standpoint of public policy in carrying that legislation forward to completion, although it was not

in the first instance as operative as I would have liked. But the last legislation proposed, that of 1911, would certainly have been effective if carried forward to completion. Now, Sir, this subject is with me so old that it has become tiresome to myself as well as to the House. I always feel like apologizing to the House whenever I venture to make any remarks in connection with it. I believe that the government of Canada to-day have an opportunity of advancing the interests of eastern Canada by the acquisition of the branch lines of the Intercolonial, and by connecting the Intercolonial with the Prince Edward Island railway by means of a car ferry service. It is the only natural action to be taken. If you are to continue to operate a government railway, you must operate it from a business standpoint, you must operate it in the same way that a business corporation would operate it, and as business corporations are to-day operating other railways in Canada. On another occasion I hope to have an opportunity of referring more especially to the connection of the Prince Edward Island railway with the Intercolonial. That idea is a complement of the branch lines policy; they are inseparable. If the one is absurd, the other is absurd; if the one is reasonable, certainly the other is reasonable. Now, I appeal to the right hon. the leader of the government that this matter be not allowed to hang fire, but that prompt action be taken with regard to it. It is a matter that has been brought to the notice of this parliament time after time. I am sure that the right hon. gentleman, by reason of his familiarity with the conditions in eastern Canada. must see the desirability, nay the necessity, of taking action in the direction indicated by the motion. Why should there be any more delay? The sooner action is taken the better for the Intercolonial, and the better for the people of eastern Canada. I am not discussing this question from a party standpoint, I have no desire to introduce anything of that kind in the discussion of this question. In the past I have sought to eliminate all partisanship in connection with the discussion of this policy, to which I have been an adherent for so many years. I ask for the favourable consideration of this motion; more than that, I would ask the right hon. leader of the government to take speedy action in the direction of carrying out the promise involved in the telegram which he addressed to the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), from Summerside, in September last.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

ALFRED THOMPSON, Esquire, member elect for the Electoral Division of Yukon, introduced by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Borden and the Hon. Mr. Burrell.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) I have to say that it seems a strange thing to me that, while he occupied the position of Minister of Railways, he did not carry out those improvements which he asks us to carry out now. The government of which he was a member had an opportunity of extending the Intercolonial railway up to the Great Lakes at the time the Canada Atlantic railway was sold. They missed an opportunity then that will probably not occur again for many years. I will only say for the present that the right hon. gentleman who leads this government will carry out the promise which he made to take over these roads, on a proper basis. He is a gentleman who always carries out his promises, and the government will be prepared to take them over after investigation to find out what branch lines on the Intercolonial can be taken over that will become feeders of that road, and not milkers of it; that is to say, it will take them over on a fair and equitable basis.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John). Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to hear from the Minister of Railway (Mr. Cochrane) that it is intended to take over only branch lines which would be profitable to the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is what the resolution says.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that the policy of the government as laid down by my right hon. friend the leader of the government before the election in the telegram which he sent to the member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) was to take over the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway if they could be acquired upon reasonable terms. The resolution which my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has moved is as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable in furtherance of the transportation interests of this Dominion, that the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial railway, as a government operated railway, should be widened and extended by securing by lease or otherwise such of the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial, as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway.

I do not understand that this resolution professes to deal with the matter from the standpoint of revenue only. If that were the policy adopted by the government in relation to the Intercolonial railway, then they would be dealing with the branch lines of the railway and with the various sections of the country which are served by those branch lines just as the most

economical and most parsimonious railway corporation owning a trunk line system would deal with them. I do not understand, I would be sorry indeed if it were the case, that when the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) gave to the people of the province of New Brunswick, through the Conservative candidate for Kings and Albert in the last election, an assurance that the Conservative party believed in the policy of taking over the various branch lines, and if they were victorious would carry out that policy, he intended to limit his promise simply to those branch lines which would yield a revenue to the Intercolonial railway if they were taken over, and that, therefore, the matter would be looked at entirely from the standpoint of revenue to the government railway system. The matter has never been so regarded in the past. The very branch which the hon. member for Kings and Albert was urging upon his leader more especially is a railway running from Salisbury to Hillsboro and thence on to the village of Albert in the county of Albert and has never been a profitable road, from the standpoint of revenue. But the hon. member from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), I have no doubt, represented to my right hon. friend the leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Borden) who was then appealing for the support of the people upon the policy of that party in regard to branch line railways as well as other questions, that the portion of that road from Hillsboro to Albert had actually been closed because the traffic had not been found remunerative, and that the late government, through the then Minister of Railways, had made an arrangement under which second-hand rails belonging to the Intercolonial railway would be sold to the company operating that road on credit with the understanding that at the then next session of parliament a Bill would be introduced for the purpose of taking over that road either by way of lease upon terms submitted by the various branch line railways or acquiring it for a cash amount in accordance with an offer which had been made to the late Minister of Railways by the president of that company. The hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) is not in his seat to-day but I am sure if he were here he would be more than surprised and disappointed to learn from the Minister of Railways that the minister does not propose to take over the Albert railway unless it can be demonstrated to him it is going to be a profitable feeder for the Intercolonial railway, looking at the matter simply from the standpoint of revenue. Let me ask my hon. friend if when he considers the question of operating the great canal system of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario he asks himself whether these canals yield a revenue to the federal treasury. My hon. friend knows very well they do not. When he comes to consider the question of expending a great many millions to deepen and widen the Welland canal, will he ask himself what revenue this canal will afford the federal treasury? Then when he comes to consider the question of building the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, which I am glad to learn from the newspaper reports he favours and which is so warmly advocated by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), is he going to look at the matter simply from the standpoint of whether or not that great public work is going to yield a revenue in dollars and cents to the treasury of this country?

Words cannot express the feeling of regret with which I received from my hon. friend this intimation of his policy with reference to the taking over the branch lines. We know that in Ontario there were but few branch lines which were paying their way until they were taken over by the great trunk systems. All over Western Ontario there were branch lines which were not paying their way, which were yielding no revenue to the companies who had put their money into the undertakings, but these lines, when taken over by the trunk line systems, put in order, operated efficiently as they can be operated only by a great trunk line company, became in many cases paying feeders of the trunk line systems. So it will be with the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway. To-day many of them do not yield a revenue, some of them scarcely do more than pay the running expenses. That is due to the extra cost of management and inefficient operation. Quite a number of them have fallen into a state of decay, they are not giving a satisfactory service, and if my hon. friend were to look at them simply from the standpoint of whether or not they are revenue-producing he would, in a number of cases, have to decide against their acquisition. I have always understood, certainly the policy of the late Minister of Railways was, that the matter should not be looked upon wholly from the standpoint of revenue, that the interests of the country through which these branches run and which they were intended to serve, would be considered, that it would be regarded as a very important factor that these roads were not giving to the people of the different sections of the country that accommodation which it was expected they would give when their construction was aided by public funds. Surely my hon. friend will see that while a short branch line operated by a company independent of the trunk line system might not itself be actually earning a revenue, yet if it were taken over, if it were put in good condition, even

although it might cost a considerable sum of money to put it in good condition, and then operated as a part of the trunk line system, it might be made revenue-producing not only in so far as the branch is concerned but also in so far as the main line of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned.

What did my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) say to the people of New Brunswick when he sent the telegram to my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler)? The telegram, as quoted by my hon. friend from Westmorland, is as follows:—

Summerside, P.E.I., Sept. 8, 1911.
Mr. George W. Fowler.

Am convinced that interest of Intercolonial railway demands acquisition of branch line railways as feeders, and we propose to acquire them on reasonable terms if returned to power.

(Sd.) R. L. BORDEN.

Does that convey to the people of New Brunswick any idea that the Conservative party is going to look at the matter from the standpoint of revenue? Not at all. What my right hon. friend intended to convey, and what he did convey, to the people of New Brunswick was that the government recognized that these branch lines were not giving to the people that accommodation to which they are fairly entitled, that in many respects they were not in an efficient condition, not in a proper state of repair, that in most cases, if not in all, the people were obliged to pay the double freight—one freight upon the main line and the other freight upon the branches, and that they were put in a very unfortunate position as compared with those who are living and doing business upon the main line of the Intercolonial railway. I am sure that any one reading that telegram would understand that it was the settled policy of the Conservative party to deal with this question in a broad and generous manner; not to look at the question simply from the standpoint of revenue, but that their policy would be to take over all these branch lines, put them in a proper state of repair and operate them as part of the Intercolonial railway system. Having so understood my right hon. friend from the telegram which was published, I am sure that the people of New Brunswick so understood him and it is a matter of very grave disappointment to-day to find the Minister of Railways disposed to take a narrow view of the question and to look at it simply from the standpoint of the earning powers of these branch lines. I cannot but express the hope that upon further consideration and a better understanding of what has been the declared policy of the Conservative party, as expressed by its leader, my hon. friend will take a different view and will look at the matter from the standpoint of the public generally and from the standpoint of the people of the very important localities which are served by these lines of railway.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has expressed his regret that the government of which my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) was formerly a member had not taken the necessary steps to carry out what he calls—and properly calls—these reforms. Let me say to my hon. friend that with respect to any great proposed change, particularly one involving a liability or a call upon the Dominion Treasury, it is a matter of education in order to arrive at results. My hon. friend from Westmorland had been for a long time advocating the taking over of the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway. As my hon. friend has well said, the people of New Brunswick, through their representatives in the legislature, a number of years ago, unanimously expressed the view that these various branch lines of the Intercolonial railway should be taken over. My hon. friend from Westmorland and other representatives from the maritime provinces pressed that view from time to time with the greatest possible earnestness upon the late government. It was, as I have said, a matter of education. There were gentlemen in the government who at first thought that perhaps it would be assuming too heavy a burden to agree to take over all the branch lines connected with the Intercolonial railway. Had my hon. friend from Westmorland suggested that he would have been perfectly satisfied and that the maritime provinces would have been satisfied if only those lines were taken over which would be profitable to the Intercolonial railway from a revenue standpoint I do not think he would have met with the opposition which he did, but his argument was that they should be taken over upon a different basis and viewed from a different standpoint; that is from the standpoint of giving accommodation to the sections of country through which those lines run. After not only he but other representatives from the maritime provinces had pressed the matter year after year, the late government finally came to the conclusion that it would be in the interest of the country that all these branch lines should be taken over and should become a part of the Intercolonial railway system. Their policy is well known; it was declared to parliament in the resolution submitted by the late Minister of Railways and Canals that all the branch lines connected with the Intercolonial railway should be taken over. I think they were named.

Mr. BORDEN. In what year was that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was during last session.

Mr. BORDEN. I am referring to the statute.

Mr. EMMERSON. In 1910.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that was in 1910. Then, at the last session, my late colleague the Minister of Railways submitted to the House a resolution naming the different branch lines of the Intercolonial. This list included the Albert railway, the Hampton and St. Martin's railway, the Moncton and Buctouche railway, the Caraquet railway and Gulf Shore railway, the York and Carleton railway, the International railway, the Cape Breton railway, the Temiscouata railway, the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, the Elgin and Havelock railway, and the Kent Northern railway, all branch lines of the Intercolonial railway. There was no attempt on his part to discriminate between those which were revenue producing and those which were not revenue producing. The idea was to take them all over upon reasonable and fair terms. The hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), knowing well what was the policy of the late government, knowing with what anxiety the people of many sections of the maritime provinces viewed the attitude of the two parties upon this question, realizing that the taking over of these various branches, making them a part of the Intercolonial railway and operating them efficiently, as they would be operated as part of the Intercolonial railway, would be greatly to the advantage of the people, and my hon. friend's county being perhaps more deeply interested in this question than any of the other counties in New Brunswick, he evidently felt it necessary, in order to reassure the people, in so far as the Conservative party was concerned, to telegraph to my right hon. friend the leader of the government to ascertain where the Conservative party would stand upon this question, and my right hon. friend sent the telegram which has been quoted. I do not complain of my right hon. friend sending that telegram, although I am satisfied that if such a telegram had been sent by my right hon. friend who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) my right hon. friend the leader of the government would be charging him with attempting to bribe the people and to improperly influence them in the casting of their votes in the election. I am making no complaint against my right hon. friend the leader of the government at the present time, but what I do say is that if the policy of taking over the branch lines is to be limited and emasculated as now suggested by the Minister of Railways, then he sadly and most improperly deceived the people of New Brunswick when he sent the telegram to influence the people of Kings and Albert which has been quoted by my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat amusing to observe the sudden interest which has been developed by the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley), in the subject which has been frequently brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), but in which, so far as I am aware, the hon. member for the city of St. John manifested no deep interest until he went into opposition. My hon. friend the member for Westmorland has been an advocate of this policy for a great many years, and I am bound to say that he has been an advocate of that policy whichever party has been in power, because it was largely due to his efforts that a certain measure was placed on the statute-book by the late administration in 1910. Now, I am disposed to think that my hon. friend from Westmorland has made a deeper study of this matter and knows more thoroughly what he is talking about than my hon. friend from the city of St. John. I say that in no disrespectful way, but for the reason that the hon. member for Westmorland has devoted an amount of time and attention to it that has never been equalled by the hon. member for St. John. The resolution proposed by the hon. member for Westmorland has been accepted by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and in the very terms in which it has been proposed; thus, if the hon. member for the city of St. John carried out in action the observations with which he has favoured the House, he should have proposed an amendment to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Westmorland, because his complaint is directed as much against that resolution as against the answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend support the amendment?

Mr. BORDEN. When my hon. friend proposes the amendment, I will let him know what I will do about it. Now, I did not understand the Minister of Railways and Canals to speak of revenue at all or to use the word 'revenue' in the remarks which he addressed to this House. But even if he had taken that into consideration, he would have been carrying out the exact policy presented this House in legislation by the late government, of which the hon. member for the city of St. John was a member. Does he not recollect their legislation of 1910? If he does not, perhaps it might be as well to remind him of it; and let him remember that even accepting his construction of the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals, which I do not accept, these considerations were had in regard by the late administration and by himself as a member of that administration. Section 3 of chapter 25 of the Acts of 1910 provides:

The Minister of Railways and Canals is authorized and empowered, upon the recommendation of the Government Railways Managing Board, and subject to the authority of the Governor in Council, to lease, in whole or in part, any line or lines of railway connecting with the government railways, if such line or lines are reported by the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals to be in a good and safe condition for operation, and to operate any such line or lines of railway as a part of the government railways; and any such line or lines of railway so leased and operated shall become and form part of the government railways: Provided that no such lease shall have any force or effect nor shall any such connecting railway be entered upon or operated on behalf of the government of Canada until the said managing board, and the said chief engineer shall have approved the terms and conditions of such lease, having regard to the beneficial result therefrom to the government railways, and until the parliament of Canada has first ratified such lease.

Further than that, the said board, in their report to the minister recommending the lease of any line of railway, were required, in addition to their report upon the physical condition of the road and its cost, to state the total receipts and expenditures for the three years last past and to give an estimate of future receipts and expenditures in the event of the road being leased as a branch of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is fair to say that that amendment was inserted by the Senate.

Mr. BORDEN. That may be true. My recollection is in accordance with that of the hon. member.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was upon that we had a conference.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not remember. At any rate the legislation passed the House as a government measure with these provisions. It seems manifest, therefore, that the revenues of the roads as part of the Intercolonial railway were taken into consideration. I do not mean to suggest that as a necessary result of that legislation a road which might not be for some years a profitable part of the Intercolonial railway should not be accepted, and I am bound to say that this government have arrived at no conclusion in that regard. Every one of these cases must be dealt with on its merits. In the meantime, we are quite willing to accept the motion of the hon. member for Westmorland in the terms in which he has proposed it, and I have no doubt that in proposing it in these terms he took into consideration the fact that it would be necessary for the government of this country, in undertaking the acquisition of railways of that kind, to have some regard to the revenue which would be derived from them in the future as well as what had been derived in the past, which would be a guide to what might be expected in the future. I agree with what my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has said with respect to the saving which might be effected in many cases by the operation of these branch lines under the management of the Intercolonial railway. There is no doubt there would be some saving in that regard. On the other hand, when these lines were taken over, a very much improved service would probably be expected by the people and asked for. All these matters are matters for consideration by the government, and in dealing with them I can assure my hon. friend from Westmorland that the government will be disposed to approach the question with a broad outlook; and, while we cannot say with respect to any particular instance what will or will not be the action of the government, we will endeavour to deal with the whole subject along the lines of this resolution, which we are prepared to accept in the very terms in which it is moved.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has my hon. friend's attention been called to the resolution of which the late Minister of Railways gave notice, and which will be found on pages 974 and 975 of 'Hansard'? In that resolution my hon. friend will find that it is recited that although the Act to which my hon. friend refers was passed, no leases had been entered upon under that Act, and it was decided to make these other provisions which are contained in this resolution. It was that resolution which embodied the policy of the late government to which I was referring, and in it the only condition placed on the government is that it shall not be deemed compulsory on the government to take over any of these branches unless, having regard to the convenience of the public or the interest of the Intercolonial railway, the terms and conditions proposed by the company are fair and reasonable. That was the last settled policy of the late government.

Mr. BORDEN. What was the date of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will find it in the notice paper of the 17th May, 1911. He will see that that broadens out very much the basis on which the government could act.

Mr. BORDEN. Was it passed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was under consideration on the very evening before the adjournment, as my hon. friend from Westmorland has said. It was submitted and considered for a short time in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BORDEN. I cannot say that my attention was directed at the moment to that particular resolution. In fact it did not

occur to me that that resolution was induced more by the probability of an impending election than by any desire for the development of the Intercolonial.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When that was introduced in May, I had no thought of a general election and I do not think any other member of the government had.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester). I would like to add a few words in corroboration of what has been so well said by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) on this question. I have already in previous parliaments given expression to my approval of the policy embodied in this motion. I do not believe that the reproach is at all merited, given by the right hon. the First Minister to my hon. friend from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Pugsley), to the effect that my hon. friend did not show so much zeal for the acquisition of branch lines when he was a member of the late government. Both my hon. friend and myself have had at all times confidence in the devotion of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to this particular policy, and at many times we may possibly have allowed him to shoulder the burden of developing it for the benefit of this country. If this policy were not pushed through as rapidly as my hon. friend from Westmorland and we on this side would have desired, it was in great measure due to the fact that public opinion of Canada was not yet won over to the support of such a policy. Owing to the fact that the Intercolonial railway had not been a paying railway, the people, particularly in the province of Ontario, were averse to any attempt to increase expenditure on it; but thanks to the better administration of my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) when he was Minister of Railways, supported by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) as well as myself and others, public opinion has undergone a change more favourable to the development of that road. For years the popular impression has been that anything done on behalf of the government to improve the Intercolonial railway was done for the special benefit of the maritime provinces. We have, however, always contended that the improvement of the Intercolonial railway was for the welfare of the country at large, that the manufacturers of Ontario benefited from any expenditure and development of that line just as much as the people down east. No doubt in many portions of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, some of the branch lines have not been profitable. That was due, no doubt, to the fact that the companies who owned these branch lines were not in a financial position to give them the facilities and improvements required. It is, therefore, all the more incumbent on the government to acquire and develop those branch lines so that the Intercolonial railway may draw from them greater revenue in the future. No doubt in the course of a few years, after further development of transportation facilities, those districts served by these branch lines will furnish more traffic and thus increase the revenue of the trunk line as well as the branches. In my opinion every branch line which connects with the Intercolonial railway to-day should be taken over by the government regardless of present financial conditions, and solely with a view to future development. With better transportation facilities and with the increase of population which we are having to-day, we may in a few years be able to make these branch lines profitable. My hon. friend from Westmorland has mentioned the Caraquet railway, and has given as good a description of the resources of the county which I have the honour to represent as any one could desire. That county is no doubt one of great resources. Its fisheries are not only inexhaustible, but may be improved and enhanced from year to year; and according to the figures of last census its population shows the largest increase in the province.

I do trust that my right hon. friend the First Minister will put no obstacle in the way of acquiring as rapidly as possible those branch lines. I trust he will not take advantage of the fact that perhaps our party on this side, when in office, did not act as rapidly as possible. If it did not, that was because the education of the people had yet to be made in order to bring about a consensus of public opinion on this matter independent of party. If anything was left undone before the last election, I trust the right hon. the First Minister will endeavour to expedite the acquisition of these branch lines by announcing that policy at once. As has been pointed out by my hon. friends from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) and St. John (Mr. Pugsley) a telegram was sent during the election by the then leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) which commits the latter to the resolution now before the House. That telegram was sent to the Conservative candidate who was interested in the acquisition of branch lines in this county.

And, therefore, he had that one in mind when the despatch was sent. There is no reason why the government should not to-day announce that policy. I hope I understood correctly the last words of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and that he will accept the resolution of my hon. friend from Westmorland, and will give it substantial expression in as short a time as possible.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). It seemed to me that my

hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) drew from the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) an inference and conclusion not justified by those remarks. And I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) when he comes to read what was said by the Minister of Railways will feel that he has not been quite fair to that hon. gentleman in placing the matter before the House as though that hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) were throwing cold water on the project of acquiring these branch lines. To make sure on the point I sent out to the 'Debates' room and got the stenographer's report of the remarks made by the Minister of Railways. They were as follows:

Mr. COCHRANE. In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) I have to say that it seems a strange thing to me that, while he occupied the position of Minister of Railways, he did not carry out those improvements which he asks us to carry out now. The government of which he was a member had an opportunity of extending the Intercolonial railway up to the Great Lakes at the time the Canada Atlantic was sold. They missed an opportunity then that will probably not occur again for many years. I would only say for the present that the right hon. gentleman who leads this government will carry out the promise which he made to take over those roads, on a proper basis. He is a gentleman who always carries out his promises, and the government should be prepared, after investigation to find out what branch lines on the Intercolonial can be taken over that would become feeders of that road and not milkers of it; that is to say, it will take them over on a fair and equitable basis.

Thus the Minister of Railways and Canals has stated distinctly that this government is prepared to carry out the promises made by my right hon. friend who leads the House in the telegram which he sent to the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) during the recent election campaign. Some criticism has been indulged in because my right hon. friend sent that telegram. But it must be remembered that the country was being told, and the people of Kings and Albert were being told that unless they voted for the candidate of the party opposite there would be no hope of these branch lines ever being taken over by the Intercolonial railway. It was only right, in order to meet a canvass of that sort, which I think, had little if any basis in fact, that my right hon. friend should send that telegram. And the hon. member for Kings and Albert took the proper way to set at rest a canvass of that sort which was calculated to do him a great deal of harm in the election. It was the promise contained in that telegram that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says will be carried out. That telegram reads as follows:

G. W. Fowler.

Am convinced that interests of Intercolonial railway demand acquisition of branch lines as feeders, and we propose to acquire them on reasonable terms if returned to power.

There is no mistaking the language of that telegram, there is no mistaking the language of the Minister of Railways and Canals when he says that the pledge of the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) will be carried into effect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me?

Mr. HAZEN. Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What meaning does the hon. gentleman take from the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals that he proposes to discriminate between such branches as he regards as 'feeders' and such branches as he regards as 'milkers'? The right hon. the leader of the government makes no distinction of that kind.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend must remember that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) was discussing the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) declaring the opinion of this House:

That the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial railway, as a government operated railway, should be widened and extended by securing by lease or otherwise such of the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial, as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway.

Not all these branch lines are to be taken, but such as 'will serve as direct and profitable feeders'. That is all my hon. friend from Westmorland asks the House to affirm, and it was in discussing that that the Minister of Railways used the language referred to. I understand, of course, that it is not always possible merely on hearing a speech to catch its full import. But now that I have read the 'Hansard' report, I am sure that the hon. member for the city of St. John will see that he drew from the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals an inference and conclusion not warranted by the language used.

Now, the fact that a branch line of railway has not been profitable under independent management does not necessarily mean that it would not prove a profitable feeder to the Intercolonial railway if taken over by the government. It seems to me that the business of a short, independent line, of which we have so many, cannot be developed as that business could be developed if the road were part of a trunk line system. As the hon. member for Westmorland has pointed out, the branch roads may be supplied with rails and bridges that have been removed from the main line because of

the heavy locomotives used thereon. Also, if the line were part of a system managed from a centre, as the Intercolonial railway is managed, not only could great economies be effected in its operation, but business could be developed that would make the line a profitable feeder to the Intercolonial railway. When the Minister of Railways referred to roads that would be 'feeders and not milkers', I have no doubt that he had in mind this idea that, even though a road had not been profitable when independently conducted, it might be of great value as a branch of the Intercolonial railway. The hon. member for Westmorland, who is a public man of long experience, and an old parliamentarian, in moving his resolution must have realized as must every one who understands the situation, that the government must justify on public grounds the taking over of a branch line. It must justify it on the ground of great benefit to the communities served by the line and also to the Intercolonial railway under whose management it is to pass. And I think the hon. gentleman was perfectly right in so wording his resolution as to provide for the taking over of such lines as would serve as 'direct and profitable feeders'. It is natural, I suppose, for gentlemen in opposition—and I have been in opposition myself—to be in a very great hurry about the accomplishment of desirable public objects. My hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) knows that this is not at all a new question. It has been before the public for ten or twelve years. I remember when, in 1889 or 1890, a resolution was passed by the House of Assembly of New Brunswick, when he was a member, and, I think, a member of the government as well, favouring the taking over of the Canada Eastern by the Intercolonial railway. The Canada Eastern was taken over. The logical result, it seemed to me, was to commit the Intercolonial railway to the policy of taking over other branch lines that could be taken over in the public interest.

Yet, although ten or eleven years have intervened, although during that time my hon. friend opposite has been either a member of the late government, or in sympathy with it, we find that down to the 21st of September last no action has been taken by that government along the lines which he now asks this government to take, a government which has only been in power three months; or rather he finds fault with this government because it has not already accomplished what the government which he supported, and of which he was a member, failed to accomplish during so many years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Pardon me, I made no complaint that the government had not taken them over. What I was complaining of was that, whereas the right hon. leader of the government gave the people of New Brunswick to understand that he was prepared to take over the branches of the Intercolonial railway, I thought the Minister of Railways was intimating in his statement that there were a good many branches that he had not thought of taking over; and presuming he had given the subject consideration, I thought he was dealing with it from too narrow a standpoint.

Mr. HAZEN. I am glad to find that I was wrong, and that my hon. friend has no fault to find with the government for not going ahead in a more rapid manner than they have done. I am sure my hon. friend will find, with regard to the other point he mentioned, that he has no ground to find fault with the statement of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). I would not like to say one word that would interfere in any way with the building of those branch lines referred to, in order to get a proper railway service. I believe the people of the lower provinces are entitled to a proper railway service, and I do not wish to say one word that would militate against their getting a proper and a better service by the acquisition of those branch lines. I quite agree with the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) that they are entitled at this time to a proper railway service. When I was sitting on the other side of the House, and when these matters were brought up, I opposed the taking over of branch lines of the Intercolonial railway by the government. I do not think that anything that can be said on the subject will cause the House or the country to believe that if you take several hundred miles of branch lines on the Intercolonial railway, you will not increase the capital account of that railway very much. Some forty years ago we started out with $40,000,000 of capital account, now we have something over $80,000,000 of capital account, and not one cent of interest has it ever paid. It is quite possible that by taking over these branch lines you may benefit the existing main line. Personally, however, I do not think it would, but I am not prepared to offer objections to proper railway facilities being provided to the people who are living at a distance from the main line. I quite agree with the sentiment that what is of interest to the lower provinces is also of interest to the whole Dominion. But the question occurs to me, are we going to do the best thing possible and in the best possible manner? For my part, I do not think we are. I think it would be more advantageous to the people of the lower provinces, and, therefore, to the whole Dominion, to sell the Intercolonial railway, or lease it to some company who would be in a position not only to handle the main line profitably, but who would find it to their interest to build branch lines through-

out the whole of the lower provinces, build branch lines to a far greater extent than any government in Canada will ever do. Not only will they build branch lines, but they will do far more towards establishing industries of all kinds throughout those lower provinces than any government would do. Now it has been urged against such a policy that the Intercolonial railway was built, not as a commercial railway, but as a bond of union to bring the different provinces together into the Dominion of Canada. I acknowledge that. The building of the road carries with it the responsibility of operating it, but it does not necessarily mean that if a better arrangement can be made, we have got to operate it ourselves for all time to come. It must be borne in mind that within the last few years another government road has been built down through the lower provinces, and we have to keep this fact in mind when we are seeking the interest of the people of that section of the country. I was a little sorry to hear, not only the Prime Minister but the Minister of Railways, intimate that it was the settled policy of the government to continue adding to the capital account of the Intercolonial railway by taking over many of these branch lines. I have not the slightest doubt that if this be the policy of the government, all the branch lines will be taken over, and it is quite possible, as I gathered from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that under a different management than has hitherto prevailed, the branch lines might become paying institutions. But we have the record of the last forty years, showing that the Intercolonial railway has not paid under any management we have ever had in the past. I have no doubt that possibly that failure may be accounted for partially by the fact that lower freight rates are charged. But there is this to be borne in mind, that other people in the lower provinces who are not livin right on the Intercolonial railway, but who are tributary to other railways, have to pay higher rates and also their share of the deficit, that is, the interest on capital account. While I will be glad to support anything that is likely to give better railway facilities to the people of the lower provinces, I think that the government, before entering into a policy of that kind, should consider whether that cannot be better accomplished either by a sale or a long lease of the Intercolonial railway, by which, while we might not get a very heavy amount of interest for the capital that has already gone into the road, we would prevent any more loss in the future, and in my opinion the people would get a much better service than they will ever get from the Intercolonial railway by taking over the branch lines under any system of government management. There will be more men employed on the Intercolonial railway, perhaps not as many on some jobs, but there will be more men employed in the aggregate, and more material purchased, simply because any business company will go on building other branch lines, and will go into other enterprises contributory thereto, to a far greater extent than any government will do. Let me say in conclusion that I hope the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways will give some consideration to the views I have put forward before they finally decide what policy to adopt in taking over branch lines.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). I see that our hon. friends opposite are not united on this question. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has put in a very strong plea in favour of these branch lines. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) on the contrary——

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is not a party question at all.

Mr. HAZEN. There is an endeavour to make party capital out of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. PELLETIER. I think the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) had an idea, perhaps it was only in the back of his head, of making an amendment to the motion of the hon. member for Westmorland. He spoke very strongly on the matter, and no doubt what he said might be used on some occasions in the maritime provinces.

It has been very well put and very strongly put that from the remarks of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) some people might understand that he had some reproaches to make against the government on account of the policy which we were pursuing in this matter. One of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House, who comes from the western provinces, has just told us that we ought to be very cautious and that he has grave doubts whether these branch lines will ever pay. The gist of his speech is that the government ought to be very prudent in the matter and if I thoroughly grasped my hon. friend's meaning it is that we ought to approach this question in a very prudent way and that it might be better not to do anything at all about it.

Mr. TURRIFF. No.

Mr. PELLETIER. My hon. friend says not, but when he reads his speech in 'Hansard,' he will himself come to this conclusion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do you agree with this or not?

Mr. PELLETIER. With what?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Doing nothing.

Mr. PELLETIER. Doing nothing? Well I do not believe in governments who do nothing, I believe in governments who are up and doing. I think it would be quite proper to say at this moment that the middle course which the government intends to pursue in this matter is perhaps the best one. There ought to be no question in a matter like this about money spent in the west and money spent in the east. We should hear as little talk of that kind as possible during the course of the present parliament; that is my humble advice, that the east and the west should work together, hand in hand, and that the members for the west should not grudge moneys spent in the east. Thus we would have the right kind of reciprocity if members from the east would not grudge moneys spent in the west. Let us be Canadians, let us have some give and take in this matter, help the west, help the east—and try to be Canadians before all.

Mr. TURRIFF.—I think the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) misunderstood me. What I tried to say was that in my own judgment what my hon. friend who is moving this resolution has asked for would be better accomplished in another way, but if the government does not propose to accomplish that by the disposal of the Intercolonial railway I am quite in favour of giving the necessary assistance to provide railway facilities for those people in the maritime provinces who do not now enjoy them. It is not a question of east or west, it is the one question, it is a question of the best way of accomplishing what my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) is setting out to accomplish.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland). The Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) has not been in this House during the past 10 or 12 years, or he would not have given expression to his surprise at any divergence of opinion that might exist on either side of the House on this matter. I have repeatedly heard suggestions similar to that of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). I heard them when I was sitting on that side of the House from my own friends and from those who then sat on this side and I am sure if my hon. friend were to consult my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) he would find that there was a wide difference between the opinions held by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and that hon. gentleman as he would find indeed a very wide divergence of opinion between the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) and the ex-Minister of Railways the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) started out not realizing that this was advanced not in any party spirit or from a political standpoint. While I was a supporter of the previous government sitting on that side of the House I advanced precisely the same idea.

I am glad that we have had the discussion this afternoon. I was certainly a little disappointed at the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane), perhaps more at the tone in which he gave utterance to those remarks than the actual remarks themselves. But I am glad he spoke in that way, because he has certainly cleared the atmosphere and what he said and the way he said it has served to bring out a clear explanation as to the attitude of the government. My only desire is to understand as nearly as I can what that attitude will be and how the matter will be treated. I have no complaint to make against the government with respect to any want of action on their part thus far. I assume that their time has been pretty well taken up in some directions, and I would simply urge upon them that they lose no time in dealing with this matter.

This is not a party question, it is simply a business question which affects the Intercolonial railway. I remember an occasion some two or three years ago when the then Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) made the remark that the question of branch lines was one that must be shortly faced as it does not need an authority on transportation and railway traffic to understand that there can be no prosperous main line unless it is fed by branches stretching out into adjacent territory. That has been the doctrine which I have endeavoured to preach and that is what I would like to impress upon this House at this moment, that the Intercolonial railway cannot be a prosperous railway until it has acquired these branch lines, stretching out into remote sections. This is from a business standpoint. From the standpoint of justice, these people living remote from railways are entitled to receive from the government of Canada proper railway facilities.

This is not a question of west or east. I made reference to the fact that we propose to spend many millions in the west in connection with the Hudson's Bay railway. Even although this was only to be used for three or four months in the year, I make no complaint on behalf of the east with respect to that expenditure. But I pointed out that if these expenditures were being made in the interests of transportation, then surely the government of Canada, not in the interests of the east or of the west, of this province or of that, but in the interest of the transportation facilities of Canada, should direct attention to

those sections remote from the Intercolonial railway which are traversed by the branch lines proposed to be acquired.

I am glad the discussion has taken the line it has and that emphasis has been laid on the terms of the resolution which I have moved. I have said that the government should acquire:

> Such of the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway.

It depends much upon the definition which you shall give to the word 'profitable'. The Intercolonial railway, I hold, has been the most profitable venture that has ever been entered upon by the Dominion of Canada and yet, in the matter of its accounts, as between the profit and loss side of the ledger, we will not find much on the profit side of the account. I hold that, while it may not show a profit in the accounts, nevertheless it has been profitable to the trade of Canada, profitable to internal and interprovincial commerce, profitable to the people generally, profitable to manufacturers, merchants and consumers. It has been profitable alike to everybody interested in the progress and development of our Canadian trade. That is the definition that I would give to the word 'profitable'. Many of these branch lines of railway to-day, I am sure, would show a loss in the operation, but the moment they became a part of the Intercolonial railway and were operated as a part of the government system of railways, I am satisfied that even in the matter of dollars and cents as shown in the account, they would show a very great improvement. To-day along these lines of railway, at points 10, 15, 20 and 25 miles removed from the main line of the Intercolonial railway, you will find natural industries and many flourishing communities, but I make this assertion that under the conditions that prevail to-day in respect to transportation you will not find a man, capitalist or otherwise, willing to invest a dollar in industries or in the development of natural resources. I have in my mind with respect to this the Albert railway, to which reference has been made and in which my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) is interested. There was in operation a very great industry known as the Plaster industry and they had a very large mill which was used for the purpose of manufacturing their gypsum. That was destroyed by fire. Many hundreds of men were put out of employment, the gypsum quarries were idle and the question arose as to whether that mill should be renewed there by the company or whether they would take it into Cape Breton in the province of Nova Scotia. They felt that if there was no possibility of their getting proper transportation facilities they would remove that mill over to Cape Breton where they had acquired large gypsum interests. They got the assurance that this railway would be made a part of the Intercolonial railway and that they would have facilities that were adequate and necessary for the proper carrying on of their business. Then, they commenced the construction of a mill. It is now under construction and it is therefore a very important matter to them, to the town of Hillsborough and to the surrounding towns in the county of Albert that they should have these proper and adequate facilities. If there had been no prospect of securing these facilities this $100,000 would not have been invested by the Albert Manufacturing Company. I simply invite the attention of the House to that as an illustration of the conditions which prevail on many of these branch lines and I hold that any action that is taken by this government that will serve to develop the districts traversed by these roads will make these branch lines profitable to the country and to the Intercolonial railway. If that is the meaning that is given to the word 'profitable' I am quite content with the statement that is made by the Minister of Railways. I am certainly very well satisfied with the manner in which the right hon. leader of the government dealt with the question and I am sure that there are no mental reservations in his mind in respect to the matter. We want this action to be taken as promptly as is consistent with the conditions and circumstances and if action is taken I am sure that the people of eastern and western Canada will not only be profited by it but that they will be satisfied and grateful for the action taken.

I hope that the Minister of Railways and Canals did not wish to make this a party question when he said that it seems strange that, because I had been a member and supporter of a former government, this matter had not been dealt with. I will not say what my hon. friend will learn, but I learned that all these matters mean a process of evolution. When I first came to this House it was like talking against a stone wall to make any reference to the further development of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). You might as well talk free trade to the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, as my hon. friend from Red Deer suggests, I might as well talk free trade to this government as talk Intercolonial railway to this House at that time. But, I believed that it was a good business proposition and I continued it. Gradually, in time, I got a better reception, the government thawed out and gradually—very gradually it is true, and very

slowly—they brought down the policy embodied in the resolution moved before the House in July last by the then Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). The progress of that resolution was interrupted by reason of the adjournment which was necessary to enable the right hon. Prime Minister of that day and other parliamentary delegates to go to England to attend the coronation. Then came that other adjournment in the nature of a dissolution. The resolution to which I have made reference was suspended and it was in suspense until the 21st of September last when the matter came into new hands. It is all very well and I know it is the practice for governments to shield themselves behind the action that was taken by their predecessors. That will not go in Canada. It might do for a little party warfare across the floors of this House. If a government has not been what it should be, the government that succeeds should be what it is expected to be and what it has preached it would be.

Relying upon that being the government policy respecting this matter, I place this resolution, thankful that my hon. friend has accepted it, in the hands of the House, and thereby in the hands of the government, for action at as early a date as possible.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS AND NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. There appears to be a growing tendency in the House to depart from the rule with regard to questions and to notices of motion standing. In rule 32 it is laid down that questions put by members and notices of motion not taken up when called may, upon the request of the government, be allowed to stand and retain their precedence, otherwise they will disappear from the Order Paper. I have repeatedly waited, after calling these questions and notices of motion, to know whether the government requested them to stand, but the request has come more frequently from private members than from the government. Therefore I think it my duty to draw attention to the matter at the present moment, so that the House may be governed by the rule a little more closely in the future than it has been up to the present.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TURRIFF moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. This is a very short amendment to one of the clauses of the Railway Act, to provide that special tariffs adopted by the different railway companies must be submitted to the Railway Commission and have the assent and approval of that Board before they become law. At the present time a railway company must have the assent of the Board of Railway Commissioners to any general tariff, but it may put in force any special tariff by giving the Board 30 days' notice. Formerly the company could put a special tariff in force by giving ten days' notice. At the present time a great deal of the freight of the country is carried under special tariffs, which are often very much lower than the general tariff, and at present a railway company may increase a special tariff to any point lower than the general tariff without consulting the Board of Railway Commissioners further than giving 30 days' notice. It is then put in force and becomes the law, and then the Board of Railway Commissioners do not take any action with reference to it until somebody who has suffered an injustice by what he considers an overcharge makes a special complaint to the Board. My experience has been that many shippers put up year after year with what they feel to be a gross injustice in the matter of freight rates rather than take the onus of going into a fight with the railway companies and bringing the matter before the Board of Railway Commissioners. Now, if it is right that a railway company must have the consent of the Board of Railway Commissioners before it can put a general tariff in force, why in the name of common sense is it not also right that the same Board should be consulted and give its consent before a special tariff is increased? If it is thought advisable to allow a railway company to lower its special tariffs without consulting the Board of Railway Commissioners, I think we might fairly give them that latitude, because I do not think they will go very far on these lines.

Mr. HAGGART. Can a railway company make a special rate lower than the tariff rate without the consent of the Commission?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, that is just the difficulty.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the law is against it.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Railway Act allows them to make a special tariff without the consent of the Board of Railway Commissioners by giving 30 days' notice. All this Bill asks is that before any special tariff is put into force or any existing special tariff rate is increased, the railway company shall submit it to the Board of Railway Commissioners to secure its consent.

Mr. BORDEN. Before this Bill is read the second time, I would like to say that since the Railway Act was adopted by this House in 1903 there have been a great many amendments—sometimes several during the one session. There is therefore very ur-

gent need, I believe, of a thorough revision of the Act for the purpose of incorporating in it the amendments already passed from time to time in the way I have indicated and also possibly for the purpose of adopting some other amendments which the government have under consideration. Under these circumstances I think perhaps it would be unwise to deal with the Act in a desultory way during this session. At all events I would be very glad indeed if for the present my hon. friend would permit his Bill to stand until we can give a little consideration to the matter I have just mentioned. Therefore, if I may be permitted to do so, I would suggest that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. TURRIFF. Of course I would like to get the Bill sent to a committee and have it become law, but I know perfectly well that, in a matter of this kind, I am in the hands of the government any way, and I can quite understand there is a great deal of force in what the right hon. gentleman has said. He does not hold out any promise whatever that the Railway Act will be amended and consolidated this session.

Mr. BORDEN. I am afraid that would hardly be possible. We have had a good deal of parliamentary work during the past twelve months and I would like to get through as soon as the public interest permits. It would be practically impossible to take up so important a matter as the version of the Railway Act and the consideration perhaps of the further amendements before the end of the session.

Mr. TURRIFF. In that case, I would be willing to let the Bill stand, in the meantime, I would not like to take the position that it should not be passed this session. My right hon. friend will understand, I am sure, and especially the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), that at present, in the western country at all events, the question of high freight rates is a very prominent one, and these high rates have in many instances been created under this very system of raising them without consulting the Board of Railway Commissioners. So that while quite agreeable to let the matter stand at present, I would like it to be understood that I shall want to press the Bill a little later on.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. BURNHAM moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to do away with the deposit in Dominion elections. In Ontario that deposit has been done away with in provincial elections, and I desire to bring our Dominion Elections law in this respect in conformity with that in Ontario at least. Of course it would be out of the question to urge that the deposit should be done away with in Dominion elections in one province and not in the others, and therefore, I propose to repeal the provision requiring a deposit as regards the Dominion generally. While the deposit of $200 may seem a very small one, there are very large objections to it from one end of the country to the other, the opinion of the labour people is against it, and they are a very prominent and forceful portion of the electorate. Since the request comes from these people, it ought to be taken seriously; and since we have adopted the provincial franchise, it is but consistent that we should follow the provincial practice as much as possible in our elections. So far as I know, the argument against the abolition of the deposit is not one of a technical or legal character. It is the argument that by doing away with this deposit, we shall encourage the candidature of irresponsible parties. Well, that has not been found to be the result in the province of Ontario, in the provincial election, and these are of minor importance to the Dominion elections. Therefore, you may reasonably conclude that such a contingency would be less likely in the Dominion elections. In any event, since the doing away with the deposit in the province of Ontario has not been found to facilitate the entry of irresponsible parties into provincial contests, I do not see why that argument should have any weight in Dominion matters.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend has suggested that as the Dominion franchise is based at present upon the provincial franchises, it would be desirable to make this particular feature of the Act conform to provincial legislation, but I would like to remind him that provincial legislation is not uniform on this subject. In the province of Ontario, it is true, there is no deposit required, but that is not the rule in some of the other provinces. The deposit is required in more than one, so that the adoption of the rule my hon. friend has suggested would not necessarily lead to the elimination of any provision for a deposit in federal elections. I do not think that the proposed legislation should be adopted without further consideration. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to let his Bill stand, I shall take into consideration the question of having it referred to a special committee for the purpose of inquiring into the considerations he has brought to our attention. I therefore beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT—PRIVATE SECRETARIES.

Mr. BORDEN moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by providing that a private secretary to a minister may be appointed a clerk in subdivision B of the first division, or in subdivision A or B of the second division, and paid a salary not exceeding the maximum in such subdivision.

He said: His Royal Highness the Governor General having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, has assented to the same.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. Such of the Bills as are ready, and then we will take up the estimates if there is no objection, beginning with civil government.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.31 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 11, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg to move that the names of Mr. Boyce and Mr. Fripp be substituted for those of Mr. Chabot and Mr. Foster (Kings, N. S.) on the Committee on Railways and Canals; that the name of Mr. Boyce be substituted for that of Mr. Foster (Kings, N. S.) on the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills; that the name of Mr. Foster (Kings, N. S.) be substituted for that of Mr. Boyce on the Committee on Public Accounts; that the name of Mr. Foster (Kings, N. S.) be substituted for that of Mr. Bradbury on the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization; that the name of Mr. Bradbury be substituted for that of Mr. Stewart (Hamilton) on the Committee on Marine and Fisheries; that the name of Mr. Foster (Kings, N. S.) be substituted for that of Mr. Boyce on the Committee on Mines and Minerals; and that the name of Mr. Stewart (Hamilton) be substituted for that of Mr. Bradbury on the Committee on Forests, Waterways and Water-powers.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg to move that the name of Mr. Thompson (Yukon) be added to the following Select Standing Committees:—Miscellaneous and Private Bills, Agriculture and Colonization, and Mines and Minerals.

Motion agreed to.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 59) to amend the Patent Act. He said: This Bill is a very short one but it proposes some rather important changes. The time limit at present within which a patentee or his assignee must manufacture in Canada is limited to two years, and the time within which importation is prohibited is at present one year—that is importation from a foreign country. I believe it is in the public interest that these two periods should be extended. In England the time to manufacture extends throughout the whole length of the patent. I only propose to extend the time within which the patentee must manufacture from two years to four years, and the prohibited period during which he may not import the manufactured article from one to two years, and I propose to repeal the present clause of the Patent Act which provides for an extension of the time, so that hereafter, should this Bill become law, there will be a definite fixed time and no extensions. At present some persons obtain extensions and others do not, so that there is an inequality in the working out of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CAUSAPSCAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Postmaster General received a petition respecting the post office at Causapscal?

2. If so, what is the object of that petition?

3. Is it the intention of the minister to change the site of the post office at Causapscal?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. Yes, one asking that the present site should not be changed, and a request that it should be changed.

3. The site has been changed.

CENSUS COMMISSIONERS AND ENUMERATORS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) whether the balances due the different census commissioners and enumerators have

yet been paid. In the city and county of St. John—and I presume the same remarks apply to other sections of the province—I have had urgent requests to communicate with the minister on this subject. These balances are due a very considerable time. They are not large sums individually, but the withholding of them has caused very considerable inconvenience. If these have not been paid, when may the commissioners and enumerators expect to receive them?

Mr. BURRELL. The larger portions due have been remitted already, and the payment of such balances as still remain due will be expedited directly the final revision takes place, and that is very close at hand. Within a very short time all claims will be cleared up and paid.

INQUIRIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 19) to amend the Inquiries Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before we proceed with the consideration of this motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to a point of order. I think that in asking the House to give this Bill its second reading my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) is acting contrary to the rules of the House. This Bill imposes charges upon the revenues of the country which may amount to a very large sum though whether large or small would not affect the principle to which I wish to call attention. The Bill provides that the commissioners appointed under the Inquiries Act may employ architects, engineers, counsel and other expert assistants in connection with their work and also that they may delegate to other persons power to act as commissioners in their stead in various sections of Canada. This clearly imposes a charge upon the revenue. The matter is governed by rule 77, as follows:

77. If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House thinks fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to the Committee of the Whole House, before any resolution or vote of the House do pass thereupon.

My hon. friend, Mr. Doherty, is asking the House to vote upon this Bill. The subject is dealt with by Bourinot at page 638:

It is the invariable rule that all measures involving a charge upon the people or any class thereof, should be first considered in a Committee of the Whole. Rule 88 orders——

This rule is numbered 77 under our present rules, and is the one I have already quoted. Bourinot quotes the rule and proceeds:

Under this rule, all Bills providing for the payment of salaries or for any expenditure whatever out of the public funds of the Dominion must be first considered as resolutions in Committee of the Whole. And all such resolutions necessary to the introduction of a Bill, must first obtain the recommendation of the Governor General.

I suppose my hon. friend's attention has not been called to the rule or he would have presented this matter to the House in the manner which the rule makes necessary.

Mr. DOHERTY. It seemed to me that the Bill before the House does not fall within the rule which the hon. member, Mr. Pugsley, has read. This Bill proposes to confer certain powers upon the commissioners that may already be named under the existing Inquiries Act, chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes. It gives them power, it is true, to employ counsel, accountants and other expert assistants, and further more it confers power upon them to delegate to commissioners whom they may choose the investigation of some particular matter or matters. But the Bill does not deal with the question of the payment of the people who are to be so employed. I submit that when it comes to be a matter of determining what payment is to be made to the people who are to be employed, we shall be called upon to get, in the regular manner from this House, a vote authorizing these payments. But, for the moment, the Bill does not provide for these people being paid at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me: Suppose there were no further legislation upon the subject, and an engineer or counsel were employed and did the work, could not he proceed before the Exchequer Court to recover payment for his services, and would not the government be bound to pay him?

Mr. DOHERTY. I think it would be doubtful. We have no authority from parliament to take such action that an engineer could proceed and recover through a court of justice. I did not come prepared to discuss the question fully; but only last week I came across a case in which a man who had been appointed commissioner and empowered to carry on an investigation, in the absence of an express arrangement for his payment had no action to recover. I could find that judgment for the satisfaction of the hon. member, should he desire to see it. It was not in connection with this matter at all, but I am in a position to state that it was a case that actually arose. It arose by reason of a difference of opinion as to the amount which ought to be paid, but the decision was that, in the absence of any authorized order in council fixing the amount to be paid,

there could be no action and no point of merit. I am not suggesting that the gentlemen to be appointed under this measure shall not, in some regular and proper way, be paid or that the necessary means to provide therefor will not be taken. But, for the moment, what the Bill asks to do is purely and simply to provide that commissioners whose appointment is already provided for under the existing law shall have these further and more extensive powers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If no other hon. member wishes to speak, I desire to say that it seems to me that, if parliament passes an Act authorizing the employment of experts to carry on work for the public they would clearly have the right to recover in the Exchequer Court. They could show that they acted under an Act of parliament, that the commissioners had empowered them to do the work and that parliament had authorized the commissioners to so employ them. I should differ with my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) with great reluctance, but it seems to me absolutely clear that the persons employed under these circumstances would have the right to recover through the Exchequer Court whatever their services were worth. This Bill provides also that these sub-commissioners, whose appointment is not provided for in the original statute may call witnesses and employ experts, and so impose heavy charges upon the public revenue. If it were necessary in the first place, when the original Inquiries Act was introduced, to present first to the House a resolution and seek the authority of a Committee of the Whole House, it seems to me equally necessary now, because this Bill greatly increases the burdens that may be placed upon the revenues of the country. It proposes to create a roving commission, with power not only to act themselves throughout Canada, but with power to appoint one, or twenty, or a hundred different sub-commissions to engage in carrying on their inquiry. And it gives authority, in the name of the government to employ people, thus imposing a charge upon the revenue. I have never before known of an attempt made in the House to have a Bill imposing a charge upon the revenue presented except upon a resolution. Take, the case of the Grain Bill, submitted before the recess by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). That Bill is an amendment to the Grain Act. It is intended to give wider powers to the commissioners appointed under the Act. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did not suppose for a moment that he could bring the Bill before the House in the first instance otherwise than by resolution. At the same time, as there is such a rule we ought to be very careful indeed to follow it.

Mr. DOHERTY.

Mr. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say authoritatively that the original Act was so introduced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was that if it were necessary, when the original Act was introduced to parliament, to precede it by a resolution, it would be equally necessary now in making an amendment to the Bill. I cannot conceive that the Act could have been introduced without a resolution in the first place, to be considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BORDEN. I have not examined the procedure followed when the original Act was presented. My hon. friend's argument in that respect would have a great deal more force if he had established his premise; but if he does not establish his premise, he does not advance a step. But the question remains to be debated, whether the original Act required that procedure or not. I do not understand that the government could pay out a dollar under this Bill unless the money were voted by parliament; and even if there were a judgment in the Exchequer Court, such as my hon. friend has suggested, I do not think the government could pay out money under that judgment until it had been voted by parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think a judgment is necessarily paid without an appropriation.

Mr. BORDEN. I have seen in the estimates over and over again items for the payment of such liabilities. Unless there is some special provision in the law that every judgment of an Exchequer Court must be paid, then it would be necessary to vote it in the estimates in the ordinary way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that is the case, the statute authorizes such judgments to be paid.

Mr. BORDEN. If that is the case, there is no need of further argument on that point. But so far as this Bill is concerned, it seems to me very much as if it were in this position: Suppose you added a clause that any of these persons so to be employed might be paid out of moneys to be voted by parliament for that purpose; in that case you must come to parliament and get the money voted. Therefore, no charge is imposed upon the people until that money is voted by parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not put that limitation.

Mr. BORDEN. Not in so many words, but is not that the precise effect of it? I do not understand how any government could pay any of these persons named in the Act of the Minister of Justice unless the money had been voted by parliament

for that purpose. Then that money might be paid by order in council to the parties, and for the purpose for which parliament had voted it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose the Minister of Public Works were authorized to let a contract for the construction of a bridge across the Ottawa river, and pursuant to that authorization, he let the contract. Suppose there was a dispute which came before the Exchequer Court, and the Exchequer Court decided that the contractors were entitled to recover upon that contract. In that case would not the Finance Minister have to pay the judgment if, under the general statute, there is no authorization to pay judgments out of the revenues?

Mr. BORDEN. It would depend altogether on the provision of the general statute to which my hon. friend has alluded. There may be such a statute in existence. But apart altogether from that, it seems clear to me that these sums can only be paid out of moneys voted by parliament. Therefore there is no charge until parliament votes the money.

Mr. SPEAKER. My attention was not directed to this Bill beyond the inquiry which I made if there was anything in it that imposed a charge upon the revenues of the country, and the reply was that there was not; therefore I assumed the Bill was properly introduced. But it seems to me, from the argument I have heard, and after looking over the Bill, that there is a nice point involved in it. Therefore, I would ask that the Bill be held over until another day until I can look into it.

Motion allowed to stand.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 31) to amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act, 1899. He said: When this Bill was introduced to the House I explained that the object was to reduce the number of commissioners in Quebec from the present number of 9 to the number of 3, thus bringing it into line with the harbour commissioners of the port of Montreal. I may say that the request for this amendment comes from the Board Council of the Board of Trade in the city of Quebec. For some years past the Board of Trade have petitioned the federal government with regard to this matter. Under the Act of 1899, which was a consolidation of previous Acts.

The 'corporation' consisted of nine commissioners appointed and elected as follows: Five appointed by the Governor in Council, one elected by the council of the Quebec Board of Trade, one elected by the council of the Levis Board of Trade, two elected by the shipping interests.

Each commissioner so elected holds office for a term of three years. In December, 1907, the Quebec Board of Trade petitioned the government to reduce the number of commissioners from nine to three, and otherwise reorganize the commission. The commissioners, under date 17th December, 1907, replied to such petition that they are carrying out the improvements in the harbour of Quebec to the best of their ability, and in accordance with the plans and views of the governmeent, and that they feel strongly that they are better able to judge of the requirements of the port of Quebec than the members of the Board of Trade. On the 2nd August, 1910, the secretary of the Quebec Board of Trade advised the Department of Marine and Fisheries of the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

Moved by Mr. G. E. Amyot, seconded by Mr. W. H. Wiggs, and resolved, that while we recognize the necessity of reorganizing the present Harbour Commission, as this cannot take place before the next ses ion of parliament, we the members of the Council of the Quebec Board of Trade, in view of the commercial and shipping interests of the city, deem it advisable under the circumstances, to proceed to the election of our representative on the Quebec Harbour Commission, which representative in the opinion of this council, should be the president of the board.

On the 23rd October, 1911, the Quebec Board of Trade again memorialized the government to reorganize the Harbour Commission on the lines of their previous petition.

The purpose of the present Bill is to reduce the number of the commissioners from nine to three. It is drafted on the lines of the amendment in that respect to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act.

The revenue of the commission for the year ending 1st December, 1910, was $121,036.84, and the expenditure for the same period was $117,007.16, leaving a surplus of $4,029.68. The advances on loan from the Dominion government to date amount to $3,622,802.42. The interest payable on such loan is four per cent. The overdue interest on these loans amounted, on the 31st March, 1910, to $3,312,795.40. The commission have only paid $72,300 interest all told, and the last payment was made in November, 1890. The commission have issued debentures to the public to the extent of $750,000. They pay interest on these debentures at the rate of four per cent semi-annually, The interest on them is paid up to date. Under the provisions of chapter 36 of the Statutes of 1907, the commissioners were authorized to issue $800,000 in reference bonds. So far only $400,000 have been issued. The secretary-treasurer advised the Department of Marine and Fisheries, under date of the

8th November, 1911, that the balance would be put on the market on the 1st December instant.

By-law No. 108 as approved by order in council of the 17th May, 1910, reads as follows:

Each commissioner attending a meeting of the commission or a sub-committee meeting at the time fixed for holding the same, shall be paid the sum of not less than $5, but not exceeding $10 for each attendance at such meeting.

I have also figures here which may be interesting to my right hon. friend:

Extract from a report of the Quebec Harbour Commission, as contained in the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, 1911, page 41.

"Three hundred and forty-seven vessels of a total tonnage of 1,578,135 tons register entered the different docks and landed 283,413 tons of cargoes. Ninety-five vessels of a total tonnage of 341,633 tons register and cargoes of 26,525 tons left the harbour during the season of navigation. The increase of vessels in 1910 over 1909 was 33 vessels, 257,692 registered tonnage and 68,846 tons freight inwards and 6 vessels, 246,627 tons register and 5,279 tons freight outwards. Thirty thousand eight hundred and three R.S. lumber and timber were shipped in 1910, against 28,741 in 1909, or an increase of 2,062 R.S. lumber and timber. Lower ports steamers, 2,861 tons, cargo shipped 10,065 tons, 157,487 bushels of grain and 148,060 railway ties were landed. Ten thousand four hundred and ninety-seven first-class, 43,903 second and 107,870 third-class passengers were landed during the year ending December 31, 1910. The total revenue for 1909 was $102,165.84. 1910 was $121,036.84, an increase of $18,871. The total revenue for the year was $121,036.84; the expenditure, $117,007.16, and the surplus $4,029.68."

Quebec Harbour Commissioners—Revenue and Expenditure for 1910.

Dec. 31, 1910.			Dec. 31, 1910.	
To tonnage dues	$8,593 47		By administrative, engineering staff, salaries and fees	$ 19,153 70
Import dues	5,430 43		Legal expenditure	2,371 95
Export dues	2,439 50		Notarial expenditure	97 00
Harbour dues	3,712 88		Miscellaneous expenses, printing, stationery, advertising, harbour master's service, general labour, &c	12,976 50
	$20,176 28		Workmen' liability	329 28
Wharf and property earnings:			Property expenditure, taxes, insurance, repairs, &c., and the maintenance of docks, wharfs and stores	52,078 73
To East India wharf	$1,565 76		12 months' interest on bonds, 62-63 Victoria, chap. 34, and 6-7 Edward VII., chap. 36	30,000 00
Grand Trunk wharf	2,000 00		Surplus	4,029 68
Atkinson's wharf	2,636 66			
Wellington's wharf	2,556 67			
Reynard's wharf	1,200 00			
St. Charles docks and wharfs	85,385 53			
	95,344 62			
Beach and deep water lots	1,157 03			
Interest	4,347 91			
Fines	11 00			
	$121,036 84			$121,036 84

I have also a statement showing the imports and exports dues which I will be happy to give to the House if required. This Bill practically puts the Harbour Commission of Quebec, so far as the number of commissioners is concerned, on the same footing as the Harbour Commission of Montreal. The Montreal Harbour Commission was at one time composed of nine or eleven members who represented special interests and it was considered far more desirable in the interests of the business of the port that three commissioners should be vested with authority to carry on its affairs. That has worked satisfactorily in regard to the port of Montreal and there would be no disposition there to-day to return to the old order of things. It is believed that the smaller number of Harbour Commissioners in Quebec will also result in that body working more easily together as it will not be so unwieldly, and that good results will flow from the change.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The general idea with regard to Harbour Boards all over the country is that they should represent the different trading interests of the community, and Montreal has always been treated as an exception to that rule. Under present conditions, a certain number of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners are appointed by the government, a certain number elected by the Quebec Board of Trade, a certain number by the Levis Board of Trade and two are appointed by the shipping interests. The minister has quoted resolutions which have been frequently passed during the last three or four years by the Quebec Board of Trade, asking that the system in vogue in Montreal with reference to the control of the harbour should be adopted there. These resolutions were

brought to my notice when I was in office, but I do not recollect that either the shipping interests or the Levis Board of Trade, which are both interested in the matter, have ever passed similar resolutions. Naturally on this subject there is a division of opinion and while I do not know that the Quebec Board of Trade is unanimous on the question it must be that a majority favours the change. However, the subject was referred to the Quebec Board of Harbour Commissioners, and my recollection is that that body was in favour of the continuance of the present system. As I understand it now, the commissioners who were appointed by the government some ten or twelve years ago, and who were in office on the 21st of September, have been removed by the minister and new appointments made by him. The hon. gentleman has not told us that he has consulted this new board and that they have endorsed the proposal he now makes. Has he so little confidence in the new men he has put in office that he did not think it worth while to ask their opinion on such an important matter? Is he treating his friends so cavalierly, that having appointed them less than two months ago he will now cut off their heads without asking them whether or not they wish to submit to the operation? What did he appoint them for? Was it simply for the pleasure of dismissing them? If they were fit men for the position, does he not think that their judgment on this question would be worthy of some consideration?

If he does I think that before he proceeds with this measure the least he can do is to refer it to the present Harbour Commissioners and see whether or not they agree to have their heads cut off so soon after their appointment. I think it would be wise for my hon. friend, before proceeding further, to give us the opinion of the present Board of Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. HAZEN. This Bill was introduced early in the session before the adjournment of the House and although its terms were generally known no protest against its passage has been received from any source, either from the Board of Trade of Levis or from any shipping interests of Quebec. I assume that those interested, who are very keenly alive to what affects their business, would have taken means to make known their opposition to this Bill if they did not wish for its passage.

My right hon. friend referred to the changes recently made in the personnel of the Harbour Commission. As in 1896 so in 1911, three of the gentlemen who are the nominees of the government on the commission have been retired and others put in their places. I requested my colleague the Postmaster General to consult with those three gentlemen with regard to the merits of this measure and I am assured that they are of the opinion that it is in the interests of the shipping of the port of Quebec that the Bill should pass. Not a word of opposition to the Bill has developed since it was introduced which leads me to believe that it will meet with general acceptance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Has the Bill been referred to them?

Mr. HAZEN. No, but their opinion was asked in regard to it.

Mr. PELLETIER. The shipping interests of Quebec, the whole trade of Quebec, wish this change and have been asking for it for years and years. The Board of Trade will be accepted as voicing the wishes and desires of the merchants of Quebec. That board have passed a resolution, I think unanimously, in favour of this measure. I have had occasion to speak of this matter very often both before and since the election and have taken the stand that we should have in the harbour of Quebec such a board as they have in Montreal, and I have heard nothing but praise of that suggestion. No newspaper in Quebec has opposed the change except that we have cut off the heads of certain gentlemen who were Liberals. This Bill represents the wishes of the population of Quebec at large.

The right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has declared that the old board were opposed to the change but they were about the only ones in Quebec who were; they thought that they were the right men in the right place but every one except them was of a different opinion. When the work of these commissioners was brought to the attention of the government we thought it desirable to remove some of the appointees of the late government. The Dominion government is entitled to appoint five men on that board. We replaced only three of them. The three gentlemen whom we have appointed to the board were taken not from the ranks of the Conservative party alone but from among the business men of Quebec, and I have heard nothing but praise of the choice which has been made. As the Minister of Marine has not had occasion to go to Quebec as often as I have, I undertook to consult those men about the proposed change. I have met the present Harbour Commissioners as a body, not only those who were appointed by us but those who were appointed by the late government and whom we have retained because I wish to emphasize the fact that we have kept two of the gentlemen appointed by my right hon. friend. We have only removed these whom we thought were perhaps inclined to think

that there should be some politics in the administration of the Harbour Board.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Who are they?

Mr. PELLETIER. Mr. J. B. Laliberté, one of my right hon. friend's friends, Mr. Tanguay and Mr. Larue. We have kept the two others appointed by the right hon. leader of the opposition, Mr. Macpherson and Mr. Thom. They were two first class business men, and although they were appointed by the late government we have retained them. I have met these gentlemen in Quebec and they knew very well it was the intention of the government to change the board and to put it on the same footing as the Montreal board. Not one member of the board opposed the change. I have been told that the right hon. gentleman when he was Prime Minister had intimated that he thought this change might be made at a very early date. The right hon. gentleman has said that we do not seem to have confidence in the men whom we have ourselves appointed since we are going to cut off their heads.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER. I may inform my right hon. friend that when they were appointed these gentlemen were told that their appointment would be of very short duration, that it would be only temporary as a Bill would be introduced by which the board would be reduced to three men. Those are the facts and I am sure that in this measure we are doing something which will help the trade and shipping of Quebec.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Who are the three new commissioners.

Mr. PELLETIER. Mr. Victor Chateauvert,——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good man except for his politics.

Mr. PELLETIER. That part of it we are going to take care of ourselves. I am glad to hear that the appointment is good in all other respects. We have appointed another gentleman to whom I am sure the same certificate will be given by the right hon. the leader of the opposition, that is Mr. J. B. E. Letellier, a name which will appeal to the hon. gentlemen on the other side. There is no fault to find with him I suppose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. PELLETIER. The third is Mr. Belleau who has always been considered a good Liberal. It may be that he did not see eye to eye with the Liberal party on the reciprocity question but there are so many in that position that probably no one would think of reproaching them for that. My right hon. friend will admit that except for politics these are good appointments. We have not appointed political friends, we have appointed business men, recognized as such, known as such in Quebec and they themselves are strongly of the opinion that this Bill should pass.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the tenth section, which provides:

> The president and the other commissioners may be paid, out of the revenue of the harbour, such remuneration for their services as the Governor in Council determines.

I understood from my hon. friend that this Bill was intended to copy the Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act, and, if my memory serves me, the salaries of the harbour commissioners in that case are fixed by the Act.

Mr. HAZEN. I cannot say off-hand whether that is the case or not.

Mr. PELLETIER. I may say that the law officer who prepared this Bill informed me that it was exactly on the same footing as the Montreal Bill. But I will find out.

Bill reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT—PRIVATE SECRETARIES.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by providing that a private secretary to a minister may be appointed a clerk in subdivision B of the first division, or in subdivision A or B of the second division, and paid a salary not exceeding the maximum in such subdivision.

Mr. BORDEN. By section 39 of the Civil Service Act—the amendment Act of 1908—it is provided:

> Any person chosen by a minister to be his private secretary may, without examination and irrespective of age, be appointed for a period not exceeding one year, and paid as a clerk in subdivision (b) of the second division, and after one year's service as such secretary he shall be deemed to be appointed to such rank.

The salary for sub-division 'B' of the second division being $800 minimum increasing to $1,600 as a maximum, it is necessary that any one so appointed should be appointed at the minimum. Therefore, this requires that a private secretary to a minister appointed to the Civil Service should be appointed at $800 in the first

instance, with of course the usual allowance to a private secretary of $600. It is not thought that this salary is sufficient to command the services of persons suitable to fill a position of that kind. At least that has been our experience. Therefore, it is proposed to amend that section of the Civil Service Amendment Act by providing that a private secretary to a minister may be appointed a clerk in subdivision 'B' of the first division, or in subdivision 'A' or 'B' of the second division, and paid a salary not exceeding the maximum in such division.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection at all to offer to the idea involved in this resolution. I think it is quite important that the status of private secretaries should be clearly fixed. I do not think that this is the opportune time to discuss the question, but shall reserve further remarks until the Bill is up for the second reading.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 60) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Charges of management—Printing of Dominion notes, $275,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is an increase there of $100,000. What is the reason for it?

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Leeds). This is made necessary by the demands of the circulation. There was a very large increase last fall and we expect a further increase in the coming year.

Mr. BUREAU. Is it altogether because of the increase in the circulation, or is because of any change with regard to the use of old notes?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It is because of the expected heavy demands of the circulation. Last fall, the demand was so heavy that we had to put out $4 notes. I believe that at one time the American Bank Note Company were printing 30,000 sheets a day in order to meet the demand. In other words the bank note circulation is not nearly adequate to meet the public demand, so that last year a very serious situation arose and had to be met by increasing the circulation of Dominion notes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why are these $4 notes issued? In commercial circles this is regarded as a very objectionable denomination. The notes are apt to be confounded with the $1 notes. I am informed that in the city of St. John the feeling among business men is that as soon as possible these $4 notes should be taken out of circulation. Is it necessary to issue notes of that denomination? Must the law be changed before the issue can cease?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I entirely agree with what my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) says as to notes of $4 denomination. The reason so many were issued was that the plate for printing them was made, and it takes a considerable time to prepare a plate to print such notes as we issue. Last year, prior to my becoming Finance Minister, and, no doubt, owing to the exigencies of the occasion, the $4 notes had to be issued to meet the demands for circulation. Only within the last few days I have been considering with the controller of the currency the advisability of issuing a $5 note. I agree that the $4 note is decidedly objectionable because it is easily confounded with the $1 note, and for other reasons. My present opinion is that a $5 note should be substituted. I think that some further relief can be given by a revision of the Bank Act, for instance, by carrying out the suggestion which has been made that the banks should be allowed to issue circulation against gold. That is a matter for further consideration. But we have already been considering the question of substituting a $5 note for the $4 note, the latter being, I agree, objectionable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is the work of printing to be done by the American Bank Note Company, or is it intended to make a new contract?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The contract with the American Bank Note Company expires October 1 next, and I am now considering the subject of advertising for tenders for a five year contract, and have for some time past been considering the proper specifications. I think that within the next week or so I shall be able to call for tenders both in this country and Great Britain—although I hardly imagine it likely that any British company will be able to put in a tender as they would be required to establish themselves here. When the tenders come in we will consider the awarding of a contract.

Removal of foreign and uncurrent coin from circulation, $15,000.

Mr. MURPHY. There is an increase of $7,000 in that item.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). An arrangement with the banks exists, made by my predecessor, under which, for a stipulated commission, the banks assist in this removal of foreign and uncurrent coin from circulation. The amount asked is in accordance with the estimate made by my department of the probable cost of the work. If so

much is not required the money will not be expended. I think the arrangement to which I have referred is a very good one.

Governor's General's Secretary's Office—salaries and contingencies (including allowance of $300 to Mr. A. F. Sladen), $66,925.

Mr. BORDEN. There is an increase over last year, which is due, I am informed, to an additional number of aides de camp, and to statutory increases.

Privy Council Office—salaries, $40,200.

Mr. BORDEN. There is a slight increase there, due in part to the statutory increases, and to the fact that a translator is here provided for which was not provided for last year in the supplementary estimates. There are now 9.

Administration of Justice—salaries (including D. Clark at $1,100), $114,115.41.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if it is his intention, or if he has considered the advisability of appointing extra judges in the province of Ontario?

Mr. DOHERTY. A request has been made from the province of Ontario, which is at present receiving our most careful consideration. I may explain that there does not seem to be absolute unanimity in the province as to the necessity, in some cases at all events, of the suggested increases in the number of judges.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why is the name of Mr. D. Clark specially mentioned in this item?

Mr. DOHERTY. Mr. Clark, I understand, is the gentleman who occupied the position of secretary to the late Minister of Justice, and he is specially mentioned by name here for the purpose of enabling him to pass into the class which will entitle him to receive a salary of $2,400.

Mr. MURPHY. I think my hon. friend is under a misapprehension as to that individual. The Mr. Clark referred to is employed in the Exchequer Court, and not in the Department of Justice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The mention of his name in this item is not in accordance with the Civil Service Act. Mr. Clark evidently is not qualified to receive that amount he is there voted, according to the Civil Service Act, therefore it is necessary to mention him by name. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) knows that that is a very vicious practice. I do not know Mr. Clark at all, he may be a very worthy gentleman. With regard to Mr. Sladen, mentioned in the second preceding item, he is a very good officer. But I submit to the Minister of Justice that if he commences at this early stage of his administration putting men in the estimates against the rule of the Civil Service, he is going back upon all his former professions.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Sladen is not in the Civil Service, he is paid out of contingencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Therefore, he is mentioned here by name. I have nothing to say against the item at all, I think Mr. Sladen deserves the money, he is in the Governor General's office. But in the case of Mr. Clark, I am satisfied his name is mentioned because he cannot get the salary which is voted under the rules of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps in regard to Mr. Sladen we may be following the bad example of our predecessors. But it is the same as last year. His salary is expressly stated in the statute which provides for the salaries of Ministers of the Crown and others. My attention was not directed to this at all. As to the principle, I concur with the leader of the opposition that it is desirable to avoid this practice as much as possible. But we could not put that item in the estimates this year until we have amended the statute, which we have not yet had time to do. So far as the general principle is concerned, I think it is right, and I have urged that many times in this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to Mr. Sladen's case I have to observe that the office of the Governor General is one by itself. It is difficult to apply the same rule to that office as to other offices. The office of the secretary of the Governor General is fixed by statute, it is a very small sum, only about $400, and no doubt his salary should be improved. I do not find fault with that, but it should be done in a regular manner. The Governor General's office is a peculiar one. But putting that aside, we come to the regular Civil Service and we find here an officer, Mr. D. Clark, who gets a salary this year not in accordance with the Civil Service Act, and the result will be that every one of my hon. friends sitting on the treasury benches will be pestered with demands—I wont break my heart over that—but they will have a great increase of trouble because they have set up a very bad example.

Mr. DOHERTY. It is true that, as the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) has said, I have mentioned the wrong Mr. Clark. The explanation of this item, I am informed, is that Mr. Clark, in the promotions of last year, got no increase.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why did he get no increase last year? Is not this treating others who occupy the same position unfairly, and will it not lead to dissatisfaction and to pressure on the government to give

others the same benefits? I presume Mr. Clark had reached the maximum of his class and was not entitled to an increase in his salary and the moment you depart from the Civil Service Act in this way you will create jealousy among others.

Mr. DOHERTY. As I understand it, when Mr. Clark was promoted last year he did not get his $50 increase.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why?

Mr. DOHERTY. We were not in control last year and cannot be expected to know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must have been because he was not entitled to it under the Act.

Mr. DOHERTY. I could only rely on the recommendation of the registrar, and I am informed that if he does not get his $100 this year he will miss the statutory increase for one year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a principle involved in it and the item should stand until we know why he did not get the statutory increase last year.

Mr. DOHERTY. Very well.

Department of Militia and Defence—salaries, $142,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Explain the increase.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Disregarding the statutory increases and one special increase there is a decrease in the vote of $150. There is a special increase of $400 for the account. I wanted him to get more but did not succeed in obtaining it.

Mr. MURPHY. Who gets that increase?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Borden, paymaster and accountant, a cousin of the late minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There seem to be other promotions.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Panet is promoted from being secretary to the minister to being an officer in the department. Col. Brown is promoted and an architect named McKenna is transferred from the Public Works Department by the Civil Service Commissioners.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The minister has stated outside the House that he proposes to drill one million men and twenty-five thousand cadets, but he did not mention that he was to have an architect. What does he want with an architect?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My predecessor found that having taken over the construction of militia buildings costing fifteen thousand dollars or less, the Public Works was so busy with various works throughout the Dominion that the Militia Department was neglected and he got one of these expert architects from the Public Works Department. Inasmuch as this transfer took place before the fatal 21st of September, I do not know that I should be held criminally liable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh no, I am not at all finding fault with my hon. friend. I see that he is following the policy of the late government in regard to the Militia as well as in regard to the Navy.

Mr. BUREAU. Is that $900 simply for statutory increases for sorters and packers?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is an increase in the number of packers and a decrease in some of the higher departments. One packer named Littlefield was made a messenger at a salary of $800 and the others were statutory increases.

Mr. MURPHY. I asked if there had been an increase in the higher divisions in addition to the promotion of Col. Brown.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Col. Brown's salary was $2,100 and it has now been advanced to $2,200 in accordance with his classification to complete the establishment.

Department of the Secretary of State—salaries, $62,275.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the secretary explain the difference between the total salary of this year and last year?

Mr. ROCHE. It is owing to the fact that there are several vacancies at present in clerkships which are not now being filled.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery—salaries, $72,950.

Mr. MURPHY. I assume the difference between the aggregate of last year and of this is due to the abolition of certain offices and the transfer of other officers to the King's Printer's advance account.

Department of Interior—salaries, $958,411.27.

Mr. OLIVER. I notice that in the first division, sub-division A, while the number of officials is the same, there is an increase in the vote of $600. What has been the basis of this $600 increase? There is no provision made for statutory increases for all the officials of that subdivision. There is evidently provision made only for six. The House will be interested in knowing what particular reason for the difference there is.

Mr. ROGERS. There were 15 statutory increases at $100 and 4 at $25, making $1,600. Then, R. E. Young, who received a salary of $3,800, and who died, has been replaced by a man at a salary of $2,800, making a saving of $1,000. This explains the difference of $600 between the vote of last year and the vote of this year.

Mr. OLIVER. In subdivision B of the first division there is a difference of $883.50 with the same number of clerks.

Mr. ROGERS. There are 36 increases of $100 each, one at $50, one at $12.50, one at $75 and one at $25, making a total of $3,762.50, and there are decreases through superannuations.

Mr. OLIVER. Have all the clerks in the Interior Department received their statutory increases?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. There is an increase in the clerical assistance of $5,000.

Mr. ROGERS. That is to pay temporary clerks appointed during the fiscal year 1912-13. They were employed during six months and were appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Department of Indian Affairs—salaries, $118,175; contingencies, $13,050.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a difference of five in the number of clerks in each class and it appears as if five had been taken out of subdivision B, second division, and put into subdivision A, third division.

Mr. ROGERS. Five clerks had not passed the Civil Service examination and had to be reduced to a grade below.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose I may assume that, with that exception, the statutory increases have been given in all cases.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). If there is no objection we will go back to the estimates for the Department of Justice. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is prepared to explain the item.

Administration of Justice—salaries (including D. Clark at $1,700), $114,115.41; contingencies, $11,500.

Mr. DOHERTY. I have made inquiries and I find that there is nothing which I can say to justify this increase of $50, except the recommendation of this gentleman's superior officer. I understand that does not, under the law, entitle him to have that special $50. I move that the item be reduced to $1,650. I do not want to insist on something that I cannot justify.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Cut out the name and make it $1,650.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even without being specially named he will get the $1,650. I understand that he is included in this general salary vote of $114,115.41. The reason his name was mentioned is that otherwise he could not get beyond $1,650.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). That is right. That total should be reduced by $50.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Doherty moves that the item be reduced by $50.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Strike out the name.

Office of the Auditor General—salaries, $113,850; contingencies, $6,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an increase here of $6,550 in salaries.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Part of that is statutory, and there have been some promotions. They are all on the recommendation of the Auditor General. If fuller information is required I shall be glad to have it ready at eight o'clock. I hardly expected that we should reach the consideration of the estimates this afternoon. I have sent for particulars regarding my own department. If the committee will allow the item for the Auditor General's Department to stand, I will be glad to take it up afterwards.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Stand.

Department of Customs—salaries, $276,225; contingencies, $14,000.

Mr. BUREAU. There is an increase here of $14,987.50. Would the minister please explain.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We have added twelve members to the staff in the second division, subdivision B, and two in the lower grade. Owing to the increase in the revenue, making so much more work, the commissioner informs me, it was necessary to add to the staff. He accordingly had to go to the Civil Service Commission and employ a certain number more in the department. It will be seen that we are employing those who have passed the Civil Service examination and are starting the new officers at the minimum.

Mr. MURPHY. That is only temporary employment up to the present, but the minister is providing for permanent additions to the staff.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They will be permanent after they have served their six months' probation.

Department of Inland Revenue—salaries, $107,937.50; contingencies, $8,300.

Mr. NESBITT. Will the minister please explain the increase of $1,850?

Mr. NANTEL. There has been one superannuation, but the position so made vacant has been filled at a lower salary.

Mr. BUREAU. Does the minister say that salaries were reduced by replacing officers with others receiving less?

Mr. NANTEL. One was superannuated.

Mr. BUREAU. In what class?

Mr. NANTEL The explanation of the increase is that one was superannuated. But his successor receives a lower salary.

Mr. BUREAU. That is no information. I see that in the first division, subdivision B, there is one clerk more than in 1911-12.

Mr. NANTEL. I have given the explanation of the increases.

Mr. BUREAU. Who is the man who was superannuated? What salary was he getting?

Mr. NANTEL. I will get the information and give it to the committee if it is necessary.

Mr. BUREAU. I want to know.

Mr. NANTEL. Then let the item stand.

Department of Agriculture—salaries, $399,675; contingencies, $24,500.

Mr NESBITT. There is a decrease here of $3,512.50 in salaries.

Mr. BURRELL. The main item in that decrease is due to the fact that Dr. Saunders, head of the experimental farm, resigned, and Mr. Grisdale was appointed to the position at $1,200 less salary. The rest is made up of the ordinary changes of officials.

Mr. NESBITT. If Mr. Grisdale was appointed to Dr. Saunders' position, why was he not given the same salary?

Mr. BURRELL. That is a question my hon. friend might put to the late minister.

Mr. NESBITT. But I am asking the present minister

Mr. BURRELL. And I am pointing out that it took place before my time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) propose to follow the late minister in everything as well as in this? If so, it will be much to his credit.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—salaries (including W. P. Anderson at $4,000), $219,050.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to be observed that while there are 5 less officials in the Department, there is an increase of upwards of $7,000. Would my hon. friend explain that.

Mr. HAZEN. I may explain matters by taking up each division by itself. In the first division subdivision A, the only changes from last year's estimates other than the regular statutory increases are an increase of $450 in the salary of Col. Anderson, who is the chief engineer of the department. Then there are two additional clerkships, promotions from the class below. Mr. Adams is one and Mr. J. G. Halkett, who was receiving $2,500, is promoted to this division at a salary of $2,800. The other amounts consist of statutory increases. In subdivision B, 4 officers of this class have been promoted, and 3 new positions have been created. This leaves 5 positions to be filled. On the advice of the officials of my department, and with my approval, it is proposed to have a new official to act as general inspector, at $2,500. He will have the duty of inspecting all the agencies of the department. This duty of inspecting the different agencies was supposed to be performed by Mr. Boyle, but it has been found that his time is fully taken up with attending to the duties of accountant in his department, and unless another official is appointed there will be no proper inspection of the different agencies of the department. It is therefore proposed to appoint an inspector at an initial salary of $2,400. Then Mr. D. H. Steele, whose salary is now $2,050, is promoted to a salary of $2,100; Mr. Noble is to get $2,100 and Mr. D. C. Campbell is also to get $2,100. It is also proposed to appoint an assistant chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspectors, at a salary of $2,100. My information is that this is an appointment that is absolutely necessary. There has been for some years past in the estimates an item of $1,200 to provide for the salary of such an officer, but it has been found impossible to obtain an official having the necessary knowledge for that salary. It is necessary to have an official who will render assistance to the gentleman who is now occupying the position as chairman of the board, and one who will be qualified to succeed him when he retires from the service.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does that refer to the inspectorship in New Brunswick?

Mr. HAZEN. No, that refers to the general inspector. We have different inspectors of the hulls of steamboats in the several provinces, but this refers to the chairman of the steamboat inspectors. In the second division, 5 positions are available. Mr. Halkett is transferred to the outside service. Mr. Stewart, inspector of gas buoys, is transferred to the inside service. Then there is a draughtsman for the marine architects' branch, at $1,650, another for the engineers' branch, at $1,600. In the second division, subdivision B, there is a decrease of 2 from the estimates of last year, when 26 positions were provided for. In the third division of subdivision A, there is one vacancy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the organization of the department provide for 18 clerks in the first division of subdivision B?

Mr. HAZEN. I presume it must. But it is not intended to change the organi-

zation in that division. There is only one new position, that is the inspector of marine agencies. Then there are promotions of 4 clerks from a lower class. One is Mr. Cowie, who will be employed by the department in educational work among the marine officials. Then Mr. Steele is promoted to $2,100, as well as Mr. Noble and Mr. Campbell.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are ten promotions in the higher divisions of this department involving an increased expenditure of about $20,000, and my impression is that these offices were provided for on the reorganization which the Civil Service Act called for when it came into force. Are these additions made so as to change the organization?

Mr. HAZEN. I am informed there is no change in the organization and that this is simply in accordance with the practice.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there is a change in the organization an order in council must have been passed.

Mr. HAZEN. The orders in council were passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then the organization has been changed. Why has it been found necessary to name Mr. Anderson.

Mr. HAZEN. My deputy minister called my attention to this matter and I acted on his advice. The assistant deputy minister is getting $4,000 a year and the Commissioner of Fisheries $4,000 a year, and it was felt that the salary of Mr. Anderson the chief engineer, who has been in the department for a great many years, and who I am informed discharges his important duties with very great satisfaction, should not be less than that of these other officials. We know that to-day it is not easy to get a man, possessing high professional and technical qualifications such as Colonel Anderson has, and I think a salary of $4,000 is a very moderate one for the services he renders the department and the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the minister think it is in the interests of the Civil Service that one official should be taken out of the law and given a salary which the Act does not provide for, while other officials who may perhaps not have so many friends to intercede for them are allowed to perform equally important duties at a smaller salary? I have in my mind some engineering officials in the Department of Public Works whose salaries are far smaller than the earnings of men discharging similar duties outside of the public service. Take the district engineers throughout the country, the assistant deputy minister of the department, the chief engineer, all of whom are performing duties of the highest class and their salaries are not as high as that now proposed for Colonel Anderson.

Mr. HAZEN. Does not the chief engineer of the Public Works get this salary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think he only gets $3,600.

Mr. HAZEN. How long has he been in the service?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twenty years or more. I believe that most of the engineers of the different departments receive salaries inadequate to the important services they render, but if it is desirable to increase, why not do so by amending the Act so that all will be treated alike? It will surely cause dissatisfaction if individuals are selected by name and increases given to them in violation of the Act.

Mr. HAZEN. I agree that the salaries paid to technical and professional officers are very moderate. I am advised by one of the officers of the department that the salary of Colonel Anderson can be made four thousand under the law, but that it cannot be made more than four thousand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then why do you name him?

Mr. HAZEN. I do not see why he should be named, but as I am new in the department that escaped my notice. Colonel Anderson has been in the department since 1875 and I infer from what my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) said that he thinks four thousand dollars only a moderate salary for the duties performed by him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not objecting to the salary, but I am objecting to the evasion of the law.

Mr. HAZEN. I understond that there is no evasion of the law, but that anyway you cannot be evading the law when you ask the supreme authority of parliament for what you are doing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is an evasion of the law. Colonel Anderson is a very good officer, and I have no doubt he is worth the money it is proposed to give him, but he is in a class the maximum salary of which is four thousand dollars, and that maximum is reached by an increase of one hundred dollars a year, so that you evade the law in this way by giving him seven years increase in one. I am very glad to bear testimony to the efficiency of Colonel Anderson and to say that he is a very good officer, but he is no better than Mr. Lafleur and Mr. St. Laurent of the Public Works Department. The Minister of Trade and Commerce used

to take us severely to task and now will he allow his own colleagues to do what he would not allow us to do?

I knew a time when he insisted on the law being carried out to the letter. I have no objection to Colonel Anderson being paid $4,000 a year, but if it is done in this way it creates in the service a feeling not at all conducive to the best interests of the country. There are men in other departments who will think they are not fairly treated in not being allowed to jump the increase of four years in one year. My hon. friend is creating a precedent not conducive to the welfare of the service.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not think that difficulty will arise in connection with the increase to Colonel Anderson. The gentleman next to him in the service, the purchasing agent, who is receiving $3,550, has been in the department only a few years while Colonel Anderson has spent a lifetime in the department, and I do not think any feeling of jealousy or ill-will will be aroused in the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me cite some cases of injustice of which I know. There are gentlemen performing duties of accountants in some of the departments through whose hands vast sums of money pass, such men as the accountant in the department of the Auditor General, who handles millions of dollars, whose salaries are very much less than $4,000.

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think a good many years.

Mr. HAZEN. Thirty-six years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know we had to consider the matter when arranging for the organization of the different departments under the Civil Service Act. We recognized that we would be pressed to make exceptions in favour of individuals but we steadfastly refused to do so for the reason given by the right hon. the leader of the opposition that it is unfairly discriminating against individual members of the Civil Service. The only way in which satisfaction can be given, is to assign certain salaries to different divisions and subdivisions and adhere to hat. The moment you depart from that rule you must necessarily do what many members of the Civil Service will believe to be injustice, and you open the door to pressure to have increases made in different directions. The late government steadily refused to make such increases, with possibly some exceptions like that of an official in the Governor General's office.

Mr. HAZEN. One of the officials in the department who is now receiving $4,000 received an increase at one jump only four years ago of $500 or $600 to put him into the next class.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the Civil Service Act?

Mr. HAZEN. Since the Civil Service Act came into force.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On no, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) would never have allowed that.

Mr. HAZEN. I had no idea the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) possessed such influence with the late government.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). The Minister of Trade and Commerce was not omnipresent. He tried to watch you all he could, but you slipped in many things he could not possibly watch.

Mr. HAZEN. I am told that the chief engineer of the Public Works Department, who has been in the service many years less than Colonel Anderson, is getting $3,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He gets it under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. HAZEN. He has been in the department many years less than Colonel Anderson. I am told the Chief Architect gets more than that.

Mr. NESBITT. It is a principle that is at stake. The minister makes an exception in this case. I can see that all other gentlemen in the Civil Service who want their salaries increased in the same way will attack the ministers and will attack the House. These things will come up continually and while I say nothing against Colonel Anderson of whom I know nothing, it may be that the young man of whom the minister spoke was promoted for ability and he must have been promoted according to the Civil Service Act. I do not see why Colonel Anderson cannot be promoted according to the Civil Service Act, and be satisfied like the rest. The moment the minister introduces exceptions he opens the door to repeated demands for the same treatment. I certainly protest against the law being broken. Why make an exception of this one individual as against all other individuals? I do not know anything about Colonel Anderson, he may be the best or the worst man in the world, I am speaking of the principle.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) said that he could not be omnipresent and that many things escaped his eye under the previous administration. But here is a thing that is under his eye. I am sure that if he were on this side of the House he would rage and storm and this item

would not pass without strong opposition from him. Has he changed since last session?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) must have his joke, I suppose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is more than a joke, it is very serious.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). It is now his turn to storm and rage. I have been doing it for some time, I had some success but not as much as I would like, and my right hon. friend now has the opportunity to transform himself into the virtuous watchdog of the Civil Service Act and to see that it is carried out as nearly as possible, for all general rules will have exceptions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). There is no doubt about that. My right hon. friend was supposed to work under the Civil Service Act, and if in this present estimate there are two or three items which seem to transgress the spirit of the Civil Service Act, I think it will be found on examination that they are meant to correct injustices in the past. It would not take much research to discover in the course of the Civil Service administration for the last fifteen years instances of the grossest favouritism whereby men whom ministers wished to advance beyond the degree permitted by the Civil Service Act were advanced to the detriment of and in rank injustice to men who were their superiors in service and in ability. Sometimes it becomes necessary to take one of those rank injustices and transform it by an Act of parliament even though it must be against the spirit of the Civil Service law. I am as strongly in favour of keeping to an Act or law as my right hon. friend, just as strong as when I sat in opposition. I do not like to see those exceptions made, I would rather they were not made, and my right hon. friend will not find many in my Civil Service estimates. But my right hon. friend knows that young blood is strong, and that we cannot always keep things as we older gray headed men would like to keep them.

Whilst we will try to do the best we can and will come out at a high average in comparison with the administration of my right hon. friend, once in a while justice may be done as the result of something that appears to be not merely in conformity with the spirit of the Act. I think the Civil Service Act itself might be improved, and I hope within the next year that it will be improved in many respects. I would like to have an Act so perfect that it would be impossible to violate the spirit of it; but I am afraid that we shall live a long while before either party on this side or the party on the other side obtains an Act so diverse as that of the Civil Service Act without on some few occasions seemingly to offend against the spirit of the Act; but the judgment will have to be on the general results.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not at all dispute the good intentions of my hon. friend or of the administration in this matter. There is a certain hot place which is said to be paved with good intentions, and I am sorry to say that this government is very like that hot place in this respect, though that is not the only point of comparison between them.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). That is a very lurid comparison.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But here is a deliberate and wilful intention to violate the Civil Service Act. Whatever the intention, there is the result; yet that Act was passed not only with the concurrence but with the strong approval of my hon. friend only three years ago. My hon. friend is now correcting an error by which a good and deserving officer in his department was passed over. There are others in the different departments in a similar position, and they will not give any peace to my hon. friend or to his colleagues between now and the time they prepare their estimates for next year until they are dealt with in the same way. What is done in one case should be done in all. Let us have a law and adhere to it which treats all alike.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I suggest is that this might as well be left over. I presume there will be supplementary estimates, and in the meantime perhaps the government might consider a question which was under the consideration of some members at all events of the late government, regarding the engineering staff of the various departments. These engineers urged that a Bill, which was submitted to the late government, should be passed having in view a more thorough organization of the engineering staff of the various departments, including both the inside and outside service. That Bill provided for an increase in the salaries, and I thought it was calculated to do justice to the engineering staff. I feel just as strongly as I did before recess that it would be unfortunate to single out any one member of the engineering staff and take him out of the Civil Service Act. That would lead to the impression that there is favouritism, and I am sure would cause dissatisfaction.

It would be very much better to have one law for all. That was the idea in enacting the Civil Service Act; but the effect of this Bill is to evade that Act by providing in one jump an increase of $450 to one engineer. I had my attention called to the fact, when I was Minister of Public Works, that there are many engineers throughout the country, in the outside as well as the inside service, most inadequately paid for the very important duties they perform. The duties of some of those engineers are just as important as those of Mr. Anderson can possibly be, and they are paid much less salaries. To increase at one bound Mr. Anderson's salary from $3,550 to $4,000 seems to me not in accord with sound principles.

Mr. HAZEN. I have very great respect for the suggestions of my hon. friend, but as there is but one engineer in the Marine and Fisheries Department, I do not see how increasing his salary can be regarded as invidious. Before we took recess, I heard of the case of Professor Prince in the Fisheries Department who was given a very large increase of salary, and I understand that was done since the passing of the Civil Service Act. In the estimates of 1909-10 I find that provision was made for an increase in the salary of Professor Prince from $2,800 to $4,000, an increase of $1,200, and Professor Prince had not been in the service nearly so long as Mr. Anderson has been. Mr. Anderson has been in the service 36 years and has the reputation of being a splendid officer. I am not acting on my own initiative, but after consultation with the officials of the department. These officials believe that in justice to Mr. Anderson, we should give him this increase. I am assured by them that the increase would not in any way cause any feeling of envy or jealousy in the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about the other departments?

Mr. HAZEN. With the other departments I am not dealing. My right hon. friend referred before recess to the salary of the chief engineer of public works. That gentleman is now getting $3,800 and will soon be getting $3,900, and he has not been in the service nearly as many years as Mr. Anderson. If Mr. Anderson were to drop out to-morrow, under the Civil Service Act another chief engineer would be appointed at a salary of $3,200, which would go, by yearly increases of $100, to $4,000, so that in eight years he would get the salary we propose now to give Mr. Anderson, who has been in the service 36 years. That being the case, the House will only do justice to Mr. Anderson by granting him this increase.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I am not astray, a new office has been created to which Professor Prince was called when his salary was increased. I think he was then appointed a fisheries commissioner under our treaty with the United States, and his duties were very much enlarged. It is rather invidious to say anything against the increase of salary of a meritorious officer. No one denies the qualifications of Mr. Anderson, and I would be very glad, if it were regular, to give him the increase now asked. But what I would call attention to is this, the Civil Service Act was amended and consolidated three years ago for the very purpose now sought to be evaded. Before that time the estimates were full of exceptions to the Act. Increases were given notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary. In every department there were increases given against the terms of the Civil Service Act. That Act was amended and consolidated in order to do away with that practice. The Act has now been in force three years. My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen), as has been said by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), is a young blood, full of zeal and disposed to rush. There is no objection, so far as I know, to our rewarding the services of Mr. Anderson, provided it be done regularly.

But if it is desired to reward Colonel Anderson for his services, and if the intention is to do it regularly, then it must be done not for him alone, but for other parties. This afternoon the same thing was sought to be done for a gentleman in the Exchequer Court named Clark, whom I do not know. It was proposed to give him a salary he was not entitled to under the law. And these other exceptions are also against the law and are not regular in any way. Coming again to the case of Professor Prince, I am quite sure of what I say. He was given a new position. But Colonel Anderson was not given a new position; he is doing to-day what he did yesterday; his duties were not increased. There are similar officers in the Department of Public Works. Mr. Lafleur is an engineer. I believe he thinks he is not properly remunerated, and many agree with him. And the same with Mr. St. Laurent. Why take up the case of Colonel Anderson and not that of Mr. Lafleur. Why this invidious distinction? But the only way to avoid such invidious distinctions is to take this matter up on a regular system and according to law.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me quite pardonable for a new government, coming into office and finding glaring inequalities to exist, to seek, in spite of the Civil Service Act, which, after all, is still only on its trial, to remedy these glaring injustices. In my own department, and in others also, I

am sure, you will find efficient civil servants who have been in the service for twenty years, and alongside of them recent arrivals, not placed above them, it may be, but almost on a parity with them and having almost equal salaries. Is this just? And for what reason are the increases of these men's salaries left in abeyance, while others but newly arrived are given remuneration almost the same as that given the experienced men? I say, where cases of that kind present themselves that, until the civil service law is properly amended or some more satisfactory way is found of administering it, it is not surprising that, in a spirit of fairness and justice, heads of departments should try to equalize conditions somewhat. Now, as to what has been said by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), it has been a surprise to me since entering upon the duties of my office to find that our engineering service is in such a confused condition. In my department, and also in the Department of Railways and Canals, the government employs a large number of engineers. They are taken entirely out of the operation of the Civil Service Act, and you find in the treatment of them every description of inequality. That condition has existed for quite a number of years; and one naturally asks why the government has not sought to improve that condition, particularly when the Society of Civil Engineers has long pressed upon the government the necessity of passing legislation which would have the effect of placing this class of professional men upon a fairer and better footing. That has not been done hitherto. For a couple of months past I have been in pourparlers with the representatives of that society, and it is my intention—for it is a necessity—to improve that condition of affairs, and to that end, without delay, to lay before parliament during the present session a law prepared by the Society of Civil Engineers, in order that at once parliament may have the opportunity of examining that proposed law and learning the conditions proposed by the civil engineers and may legislate with regard to this professional class upon whom so much of the efficiency of our civil service depends. I am sure that as soon as parliament has taken cognizance of the proposed law——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why not let this stand over until then?

Mr. MONK. These estimates are required without delay. Why did not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) or the government of which he was a member, deal with the question when they had it before them for such a long time? Probably they were estopped by the question of remuneration. That is a serious question. No doubt what is said here is perfectly true, that our engineers are altogether inadequately remunerated. When you give an engineer of the first class—and we have such men in the service of the government—a salary under $4,000, and when you consider how engineers in that class are paid outside the service of the government, you cannot but be impressed with the inadequacy of their remuneration here. The matter is one to be carefully considered. My hon. friend and his government had it before them for a number of years. It is not surprising that in the short space of a couple of months, a new ministry called upon to deal with vast arrears of business and plunged at once into the work of preparing for a session of parliament, should not be fully prepared to deal at once with this question. But I can assure the House that it will be considered as soon as the government has time to consider it; and not later than next session some clear and definite scheme will be laid before the House for its approval. In the meantime, I am not at all surprised that my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) should have seen fit to provide what I would call merely sufficient remuneration for one of the engineers—the chief one, I believe, employed by his department. But for the fact that I have had before me the measure of legislation proposed by the Society of Civil Engineers, and so have had the prospect that the subject would be dealt with by the government, I should have been inclined to deal in the same manner with some of the engineers of my department. I hope that the committee will not place any obstacles in the way of passing this item.

Mr. HAZEN. The right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said that the increase given to Professor Prince was because he occupied a different position, but that Colonel Anderson is doing the same work as formerly. I would point out that last summer, with the recommendation of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and with the endorsation of the minister of that time, Mr. Brodeur, and confirmed by an order in council, very much additional work was given to Colonel Anderson. He was given the whole of the construction work in connection with the lighthouse branch along with other construction under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Formerly a portion of the work was under control of the Commissioner of Lights. The change meant that very much additional work was imposed on Colonel Anderson.

My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Public Works, referred to the case of Mr. Lafleur, who is getting $3,800. I am not saying that Mr. Lafleur should not get more pay than

he is getting; but on looking up the Civil Service Act, I find that Mr. Lafleur received his first permanent appointment in 1904, and that was the date of his present appointment; so he has been a permanent official for only seven years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend will find that in the Department of Public Works out of the whole number of some 200 officials of this class, only a very few are in what is known as the permanent service.

Mr. HAZEN. I find that Mr. Lafleur was in the outside service before that time, but the Civil Service List shows that he received his first permanent appointment in 1904. Colonel Anderson has been in the inside service during the whole of his tenure of office of 36 years. His first permanent appointment was in 1875, and the date of his present appointment was in 1882. I believe that the work Colonel Anderson performs is fully as much entitled to the salary of $4,000 as that of any other gentleman in the department who is receiving that salary at the present time. There are men in the department who have been there a comparatively few years, who are now receiving close on $3,500 and in some cases that full sum, but whose services I do not think require the amount of ability, and experience, and the amount of training that the duties discharged by Colonel Anderson require.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I wish to inquire of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Colonel Anderson comes within the provisions of chapter 7 of the Act of 1909, an Act which authorizes certain increases of salary to members of the civil service?

Mr. HAZEN. I presume he does.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does my hon. friend mean to say, then, that he proposes to amend this statute by a money vote, or does he think this can be done in that way?

Mr. HAZEN. I am not amending the statute.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). This Act passed in 1909 provided that increases of salaries may be made to members of the civil service upon the report of the deputy head. Then another section of the Act provides that the maximum increase shall not exceed a certain amount at any one time. I am not much interested as to whether the proposed increase is justifiable or not, the question is whether, under that Act, the minister is taking the proper course to give this increase.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I am of the opinion that the country will view with some disappointment the attitude of the government upon this particular vote. What has been the record of those gentlemen in opposition, and indeed for ten years past? From the Prime Minister downwards, they have posed before the country as civil service reformers; that is a fact which cannot be gainsaid. As my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition has pointed out, this particular instalment of civil service reform is to drive a coach and six through the Civil Service Act. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a man of a sympathetic nature, and he appeals very strongly to those who have similar sympathies with himself. But I should like to point out that a reference to 36 years of service, while it does not fall upon unsympathetic ears or hard hearts, has nothing to do with the question which has been raised by my hon. friend from Halifax. A real attempt was made to reform the Civil Service Act in the Act of three years ago. That was done by practical agreement between the two sides of the House. The country knows that was done. The country knows the professions we have heard from the Prime Minister and his followers of their earnestness for civil service reform during the last ten years at least. Now a step such as this on the part of the Minister of Public Works, if it means anything, means that we are to open the door for the examination of every individual case upon its merits. If it does not mean that it means nothing. As a civil service reformer he proposed to this committee to do something in spite of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend forgets that the engineers are not provided for by the Civil Service Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes they are.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Then this debate has been an absolute waste of time. All the speeches have gone upon the ground that there is a method for advancing the salary of this engineer. Now we have had a very different example of how civil service reform should be approached in the case of the Minister of Justice himself. An irregularity was pointed out, briefly and courteously, to the Minister of Justice. He examined the case, he conceded the point; and I am bound to say, in the interest of the civil service, in the interest of the public, even in the interest of the hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends, that action of the Minister of Justice will be viewed very differently from the action of the government with regard to Colonel Anderson.

If in the case of Colonel Anderson you drive a coach and four through the Civil Service Act there is no reason why you

should not do it in every other case. I trust the Minister will let the item stand until we have an opportunity of looking into it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Under the Civil Service Act all the officials of the government at Ottawa were included in it, the engineers the same as others, and the Minister of Public Works is in error when he says that they were not. Colonel Anderson was classified at the salary he was then receiving just as all the other officers, and no doubt since that time he has been getting his statutory increases, as provided by the Act, so that in violation of the terms of the Act the minister asked the House to vote Mr. Anderson $450 in a lump sum as an increase for the present year. That evasion of the Act is indefensible and will lead to all kinds of difficulties. The late government was pressed to make allowances to different officials who were doing extra work as translators and such, after hours, and a strong case was made out, but the government refused on the ground that it would be an unfortunate departure from the Act. The Minister of Public Works tells us that he has under consideration a Bill submitted by the engineers—which I presume was the Bill submitted to the late government and on which it was too late for them to take action—which provides for an increase to the engineering staff, and he tells us that he has delayed doing what he considers an act of justice to the engineers in his department until that Bill is submitted, and in stating that he has given us the very best reason why he should not allow one of his colleagues to do what he feels it would not be proper for him to do. The Minister of Marine cannot look upon the question as only pertaining to his department, because we are here to prevent injustice being perpetrated on officials in every branch of the service. There is Mr. Howden, for example, who is in charge of dredging operations, and who has been in the service for forty years and more, whose duties are of a very responsible character. His salary when he comes to retire will affect his superannuation allowance just as Mr. Anderson's will. There are others in the Public Works Department who are performing just as onerous duties as Colonel Anderson and they are receiving smaller salaries than he. Personally I would like to see Colonel Anderson get four thousand a year and I think he is worth it, but I am not prepared to violate the Civil Service Act by giving him what the Minister of Public Works considers he ought not ask the Committee to give the engineers in his department at the present time.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer).

Mr. BUREAU. We do not dispute Mr. Anderson's long term of service nor his ability, and the only issue is the question of evading the Civil Service Act. The Minister of Marine told me that Mr. Lafleur was first appointed in 1904, but the Civil Service Act shows that Mr. Lafleur has been in the service of the government for over thirty years and he is now chief engineer of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works tells us that we will soon have under consideration a measure amending the Civil Service Act, so that these glaring injustices, as he pathetically describes them, may be remedied, and I would suggest that it is much better in the interests of the service and of the country that we should wait until that general Bill comes down rather than to single out an individual officer for this generosity.

Mr. HAZEN. Hon. gentlemen opposite discussed this question as though it were unparalleled since the passing of the Civil Service Act to ask to increase the salary of an official in this way. Now, section 27 of the Civil Service Act states in positive language that the salary of a deputy head shall be $5,000.

Yet in 1910, when my hon. friend himself was a member of the government, I find that the salary of the Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs was increased to $6,000 per annum, $1,000 was added to his salary in spite of what is said in the Civil Service Act. My hon. friend may say that additional duties were imposed on the Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs, and probably they were, and I am not complaining of the amount paid; but what becomes of the argument advanced that the civil servant is bound to give his whole attention to the government no matter what position he may fill, and therefore Colonel Anderson should receive $4,000 because of the additional work imposed on him by order in council passed last summer? In this case, although the Civil Service Act says that the salary of a deputy minister shall be $5,000 the salary of a deputy minister was increased to $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was not a new office created, that of Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs, to which Mr. Desbarats was appointed?

Mr. HAZEN. No, I am informed that that was not the case, that the Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs was in the first instance a deputy minister under the operation of the Civil Service Act which says that the salary of a deputy minister shall be $5,000 and the amount was subsequently increased by $1,000 on the theory that in addition to being Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs he was also to discharge other duties as Controller of Naval Affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He was appointed Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs by statute. The salary was afterwards fixed by a vote of this House. But I am shocked and horrified to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) taking refuge in the example of his predecessor. We all thought that they were reformers on that side of the House, that they were to do better than we were doing. They charged us with sins innumerable, yet the moment they are in office, they do the very things for which they reproached us. The country will see how they were deceived in believing the protestations of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The Act respecting the increases of salaries paid to members of the civil service does not apply to deputy ministers, only to officials below the rank of deputy minister. I think the Minister of Marine should give the House some reason for amending a public statute in this manner. All the Minister of Public Works has said about engineers and their salaries, has little or no bearing on the question before the committee. Neither is it important whether Colonel Anderson's salary is what it should be or not. The matter is in this condition that three years ago this parliament, after mature deliberation, provided a method for increasing the salaries of members of the civil service. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any other minister can give a reason for amending the provisions of that Act in this way we should have it. It is no answer to say that Colonel Anderson has been in the employ of the country for a long number of years, and that his salary is inadequate. That surely is not a reason for amending a public statute. The minister should not ask this committee to pass this vote unless he at least pretends to give something which looks like a defence for the request.

Mr. HAZEN. On turning up the estimates for that year I find this item:

Department of Naval Service—salaries, including $6,000 to G. J. Desbarats, $82,800.

The Naval Service Act provides for the appointment of a deputy minister, and the Civil Service Act provides that a deputy minister shall be paid $5,000, and it was only by performing the operation that my hon. friend describes as violating the Civil Service Act, and bringing down something like this Act, especially mentioning the deputy's name, that the salary was increased to $6,000. I say that because my hon. friend would lead this House to believe that such a thing as I am proposing in order to do justice to an old civil servant had never been heard of since the Civil Service Act was passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine I think has failed to recognize the distinction between the case of a deputy minister of a new department which was being created, and the cases of other officials of the department with regard to whom the law makes special provision for annual increases. A deputy minister gets no increase. He is appointed at a certain salary, and he may be a deputy minister for 15 years, but he gets no increase, while a young deputy gets the same salary as an old deputy. When the Naval Department was created it was thought desirable to have Mr. Desbarats, owing to his very great ability take charge of that department, and it was agreed to give him a salary of $6,000. He would probably have preferred to have remained as Deputy Minister of Marine rather than go to another department with greater responsibilities at the same salary. But in the case of all other officials, including Colonel Anderson, as my hon. friend from Halifax has pointed out, who enter the civil service under the Civil Service Act at a certain salary, the statute provides that they shall receive certain annual increases, in the case of Colonel Anderson the increase would be $100 a year. That is the law adopted in 1909. Surely my hon. friend must see that when he picks out this one man out of the thousands of people in the departments here, and says that in respect to him the law of 1909 shall be violated, and that instead of receiving an annual increase of $100 he shall get a jump of $450, he must see that there is a great distinction between that case and the case of making a new appointment of a deputy minister to a new department, then being created in regard to which parliament had a perfect right to act. Here my hon. friend is asking us to depart altogether from the provisions of the Civil Service Act. While I personally would be glad to see Colonel Anderson get all his services are worth, I cannot persuade myself that it is right to select one man when there are scores, probably hundreds of others just as much entitled to a special increase as Colonel Anderson is.

The Minister of Public Works has stated that the engineering branch of the Department of Public Works is in a state of confusion. I do not quite understand what my hon. friend means.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps it would be better to defer the explanation until I come to my estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend does not think he ought to give us the explanation?

Mr. MONK. I think it might be better to dispose of this and reserve these explanations in regard to the condition of affairs in the Public Works Department until we come to that department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then surely it would have been better to reserve everything, it would have been better for the minister not to have stated that he found the engineering branch of the Public Works Department in a state of confusion if he intended to refuse to give an explanation.

Mr. MONK. I do not refuse to give an explanation. In the Department of Public Works we have engineering districts all over the country that in my estimation from what examination I have made of the conditions in the departments, are not properly defined.

In charge of those districts are engineers who are not classified in any way and whose duties are not clearly defined, nor is there any general rule by which their salaries are determined. The Department of Public Works depends for its efficiency entirely on the services of its engineers, and it requires to have relations with the immense outside branches through its engineers, under uniform rules. If those uniform rules do not exist, I think there is some reason for saying that there is room for useful reform.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is different from the statement that my hon. friend found the engineering branch of the department in a state of confusion, which is entirely contrary to the actual condition. What I understand my hon. friend to mean respecting the engineers of the department throughout Canada is that their duties are not sufficiently defined. I should be glad to hear further from my hon. friend on that subject. My idea, from the experience I have had in the department, is that there has been a pretty successful effort to place the different district engineers, so far as salaries are concerned——

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will admit that there is no classification whatever.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I will not admit that. In the offices of the different district engineers young men are taken on at comparatively small salaries, which are increased year by year at the rate of $50, sometimes $100, and in cases of exceptional merit there have been larger increases. In view of the arduous duties which my hon. friend is called on to perform, and of which he complained at a banquet given in his honour in Montreal, when he intimated that he had not much time to devote to the duties of his office because of the numerous demands of office-seekers, which made his life laborious——

Mr. MONK. I do not think I was correctly reported in that regard.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can say to my hon. friend that he has a pretty hard job in the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MONK. I am sure my hon. friend knows that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I do. It is a very arduous department, and I sympathize with my hon. friend. But my hon. friend is fortunate in having a splendid staff behind him. I do not believe that in any department of any government can you find more efficient men than my hon. friend has to assist him, from the deputy minister down through the various branches of the department, notwithstanding the small salaries these gentlemen are receiving. Take Captain Howden, who has been 40 years or more in the service, upon whose shoulders rests largely the responsibility of looking after the building of dredges and tugs, the repairs of dredges and tugs, throughout the country, and whose salary is only a little over $3,000, very considerably less than Colonel Anderson is receiving. Then, Mr. St. Laurent, the assistant deputy minister, is a man of surpassing ability, who could go out of the department and command a salary of from $7,000 to $10,000. He has a chief engineer of great skill and experience, who has been in the department for 30 years or more, and is getting to-day less than $4,000 a year. Mr. Dufresne, assistant chief engineer of the department, who is in charge of the contract dredging work, a very responsible position, only gets about $3,000 a year. Mr. Ewart, the chief architect of the department, who has been there 30 or 40 years and whose responsibility is very great, has a salary very much less than that of Colonel Anderson. In view of these facts, does not my hon. friend feel that he would be doing a grave injustice to the officials of his own department charged with these enormous responsibilities, under whose supervision there is expended every year between $15,000,000 and $16,000,000, if he consented to an engineer in the Department of Marine and Fisheries having his salary jumped up by the amount of $450? Does not the injustice appeal to my hon. friend? Does he not feel that when to-morrow morning he goes to the department he could not with a cheerful face meet the gentlemen to whom such an injustice was done? Let him pause and prevent this great injustice being done, which will lead to jealousy and dissatisfaction and disorganization, and destroy the spirit of fairness which demands that all the officials of the government should be dealt with on equitable principles.

Mr. NESBITT. Suppose we acknowledge the truth of what the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say with reference to these gentlemen not being properly paid, that is not the question before us. The question is, why break the Act in this crude way? The statement that somebody else did wrong is the poorest excuse any one can give for doing wrong. Why not do as the hon. Minister of Public Works suggests, amend the Act if, as I quite admit, these gentlemen are not receiving as good salaries as they should for the positions they occupy? We are not saying anything against this gentleman. I personally do not know anything about him, and I would vote for giving him any reasonable salary that he should get, but not in this way. Hon. gentlemen opposite are breaking an Act which they assisted to pass, and I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not take the position that might is right, as well as the position, 'oh, you did it.'

Item agreed to—yeas 57; nays 37.

Office of the Auditor General—salaries, $113,850; contingencies, $6,500.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). There is an increase in the salaries of $6,500. This is caused by eight statutory increases at $100 each and 60 at $50 each. There are also several promotions and two new appointments at $500 each to examine the annuities.

Department of Inland Revenue—salaries, $107,937.50; contingencies, $8,300.

Mr. BUREAU. When the item was first called, I asked the Minister of Inland Revenue a question and he promised an answer. I understand that there have been some superannuations. Who was superannuated, and why?

Mr. NANTEL. Mr. Newby was superannuated and another employee died. Mr. Newby had a salary of $1,600 and his successor has a salary of $800.

Mr. BUREAU. Why was he superannuated?

Mr. NANTEL. On account of his age.

Mr. BUREAU. Was he requested to ask for it?

Mr. NANTEL. No, he was not.

Mr. BUREAU. How old was he?

Mr. NANTEL. Over sixty.

Mr. BUREAU. How is it that in the second division of subdivision 'A' two more officials were appointed?

Mr. NANTEL. We promoted Mr. Piton from a lower grade and we made a new appointment to take his place at $1,600, the minimum of the class.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On page 20 there is a very extraordinary item in the weights and measures branch, namely, mechanic, Thomas H. Burgess, $1,000. Why was it necessary to mention his name?

Mr. NANTEL. His salary was voted for a couple of years, but, as his name was not mentioned, the Auditor General refused to pay him. So, we decided to put his name in.

Department of Naval Service—salaries, $94,550; contingencies, $20,000

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the minister please explain this vote?

Mr. HAZEN. The total number of clerks provided for in this service for the coming year is 78, an increase of 12 over last year. Hon. members will notice that so far as the deputy minister, the first division subdivision A, and the first division subdivision B are concerned, there are no changes in the number, the only change being in the statutory increases of salaries. In the second division, subdivision A, there is an increase of four clerks, one of whom is assistant to the superintendent of wireless telegraphy, which service is under the control of the Department of the Naval Service. The other three are promoted from subdivision B of the same division. In the second division, subdivision B, there is a decrease of three these being the three clerks promoted. The third division, subdivision A shows an addition of two clerks, promoted from subdivision B of the same division. In the third division, subdivision B, there is an increase of eight clerks, which, allowing for the two promoted, makes a net increase of ten. These clerks are needed for the lower grade work shorthand writing, typewriting and the lighter class of bookkeeping and accounting. The department has been shorthanded in this class, and, during the year has had to employ a number of temporary clerks whose services will no longer be required under the present arrangement. The item for messengers shows an increase of one in the staff. The present office building is too small for the staff and other quarters will have to be provided for some of the employees. This will necessitate more work in carrying files and messages between the offices and so another messenger is necessary. The estimate provides the usual increases authorized by statute. The amount for contingencies is the same as for the current year and covers all items for office expenses and also for temporary clerks.

Mr. DEVLIN. Do I understand that the minister is increasing his staff in connection with the naval service?

Mr. HAZEN. I do not know that it is right to say 'the minister' is increasing the staff. But the staff is to be increased because of the greater quantity of work to be done. In making the increase, I am acting on the reports I have received from the deputy minister and controller of the naval service who advises me of what is necessary in order to carry on the work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is Mr. Desbarats directing the policy of the government in this matter?

Mr. HAZEN. No, but he is advising and suggesting; and, in most cases I find that his opinion in connection with the work of the office is well given.

Mr. DEVLIN. Are we to understand that the naval service is to go on as it was before.

Mr. HAZEN. Perhaps a better time to discuss that matter—as there is likely to be considerable discussion—I submit to my hon. friend, will be when the general estimates for the naval service are under discussion.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am speaking of the staff. I understand that the minister is increasing the staff by eight clerks.

Mr. HAZEN. I believe that there will be ample work in the naval service department for the increased staff to do. This department deals not only with matters of naval defence, but also with the fishery protection service, the Marconi service, the coast service and the tidal surveys.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad that the law of the naval service is not to be repealed this session. It will be very hard upon the immediate neighbours of my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen). And it will be very hard for the chairman who signed this item as 'passed'.

Mr. HAZEN.

Mr. PELLETIER. It is very satisfactory for us that this naval service law is considered so bad that it has not been and will not be acted upon.

Department of Railways and Canals—salaries (including L. K. Jones at $3,650), $148,012.50; contingencies, $17,000.

Mr. CARVELL. Why this increase in the salary of Mr. Jones?

Mr. COCHRANE. I propose making him assistant deputy minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why does not the hon. minister ask council to change the organization of the department so as to provide for the assistant deputy minister, and then make the salary what he proposes, instead of putting it in the records in this way, which seems to be a glaring departure from the Civil Service Act. I do not see why it should not be done in the way I suggest. There are assistant deputies in other departments, and they are not named. This seems the very thing the Civil Service Act was intended to avoid.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think we should have to name Mr. Jones in the estimate too. I may be wrong, but I so understood, and was so advised. The order in council will have to be passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I mean not only an order in council appointing Mr. Jones as assistant deputy, but also amending the organization of the department and creating the position of assistant deputy.

Mr. COCHRANE. I meant that.

Department of Public Works—salaries, $421,525; contingencies, $20,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an increase of $28,000 in salaries for Public Works. Will the hon. gentleman give us an explanation?

Mr. MONK. On page 25 will be found the details of this increase of $28,000. I will read a meno. giving particulars:

1911-12.	1912-13.	Positions.	——
			First Division—Subdivision 'A.'
10	12	2	Two promotions expected to be earned by officers in subdivision 'B' —Sec. 24, C.S. Act.
			First Division—Subdivision 'B.'
25	27	4	Two engineers to be appointed under section 21, Civil Service Act, and two promotions expected to be earned by officers in the second division subdivision 'A,' under section 24, Civil Service Act.
			Second Division—Subdivision 'A.'
45	52	9	For promotions which it is expected will be earn by clerks in subdivision 'B,' under section 24, Civil Service Act, and for new appointments under section 21, Civil Service Act.
			Second Division—Subdivision 'B.'
80	81	9	Applications made to Civil Service Commission for 4 appointments, viz.: 2 draughtsmen for chief architect; 1 clerk for accountant; 1 clerk for chief engineer; and for 5 new appointments that may be made before 31st March, 1913.
			Third Division—Subdivision 'A.'
58	62	4	This is to provide for four promotions from subdivision 'B.'
			Third Division—Subdivision 'B.'
38	45	11	To provide for the permanent appointment of eleven clerks now employed temporarily.
			Messengers.
15	17	2	To provide for appointment of two additional messengers.

This accounts for the increase. There may be idle persons in some of the departments, as some people pretend; but I think my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works will agree with me in saying that the officers with whom we are in immediate contact are extremely busy men. So far as I have been able to observe, they discharge their duties in the most satisfactory manner. At times they are overworked, and it is to provide for additional men that this increase has been found necessary.

Mr. MURPHY. Is the appointment of the two new clerks in the first division, subdivision B, to be made under section 21 of the Act?

Mr. MONK. Two engineers are to be appointed under section 21 of the Act; new men, that we require for the service of the department. Also we expect two promotions to be earned by officers in the second division.

Mr. MURPHY. Section 21 of the Act is that which exempts appointees from examination.

Mr. MONK. They will have to submit to examination.

Department of Mines—salaries, $235,030.

Mr. NANTEL. There is an increase of $10,841. That is due mainly to promotions. There are three new men, one at $600, one draughtsman at $1,200, one messenger at $500. In the geographical survey an assistant is required in the photographic division, at $700.

Post Office Department—salaries, $637,040.

Mr. PELLETIER. The increases are mostly statutory, with some promotions. There are 15 increases of $100 each, 183 at $50 each, 7 at $30 each. There are 20 new clerkships. The business of the Post Office Department is increasing by leaps and bounds, and fortunately the revenue is growing in the same proportion. We require 10 additional messengers, porters, packers and sorters. A portion of the increase is due to the inclusion of the Annuties Branch in the Post Office Department, which was previously in the Department of Trade and Commerce. There

are 50 increases of $50 each, and one new promotion of $100. That makes a total of $56,260, less the difference between the salaries of employees who have died, left the service or been promoted to higher classes, totalling $19,900, and the salaries of persons appointed or promoted, $13,600.

Mr. MURPHY. These estimates provide for 44 more employees than there were in the department last year. A portion of that number is represented by those who have been brought over in the Annuities Branch. How many come in from the Annuities Branch?

Mr. PELLETIER. Sixteen.

An hon. MEMBER. There would seem to be a number of ladies in that branch?

Mr. PELLETIER. May be that was one of the reasons why Mr. Foster transferred it to me.

Mr. BUREAU. Was the increase of $5,200 for clerical assistance caused by the transfer?

Mr. PELLETIER. No. The Civil Service Commissioners having been unable to furnish clerks who were qualified for permanent appointment, it has been found necessary to accept temporary clerks until they have had an opportunity to pass the examination and their salaries are paid out of this vote.

Mr. BUREAU. Does this include the salary of the commissioner who is investigating the politics of the postmasters in the province of Quebec?

Mr. PELLETIER. No.

Mr. BUREAU. It will be paid from some other source?

Mr. PELLETIER. We will find some means of paying it.

Mr. MURPHY. Have these extra eleven messengers and packers been appointed yet?

Mr. PELLETIER. No, we will have to ask the Civil Service Commissioners for nominations.

Mr. MURPHY. Will they be appointed in that manner or will the minister nominate them?

Mr. PELLETIER. The law says we will have to ask the commissioners to send them over to us.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is better than you did.

Mr. MURPHY. I am suspicious that it will not be done now.

Contingencies of the departments generally, $98,000.

Mr. PELLETIER.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate last year was only $63,000 so that this is an increase of $35,000, and by the Auditor-General's report, the total expenditure for the year was only $53,998, so the government is asking for the caretaking and cleaning of the buildings $45,000 more than was actually expended.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Prima facie the increase seems large, and it is quite right there should be an explanation. I was much surprised to find on taking charge of the department that in addition to having under me such matters as the national debt, and the tariff, and banking and insurance, I had two hundred and fifty charwomen under my control. It will be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite to know that I have not yet been obliged to make any dismissals.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a good example not followed by your colleagues.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Judging by the increase one would suppose that these ladies have votes.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If they had I believe that my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) would have endeavoured to avail them for his party. The appropriation for the year 1912 was $63,000 and the appropriaition asked this year on the old basis would be $75,000 and on the new basis $98,000. The increase of $12,000 on the old basis is due to the very large increase in the char service, because of our taking over the Victoria Memorial building and other public buildings. The late administration was probably responsible for the increase upon the basis of the former wages.

Other contributory causes have been the necessity for boiling and distributing drinking water, &c., and making provision to meet demands for new offices after estimating for 14 additional women and four additional men for the current year. The substantial increase over the $75,000 is due to the fact that I have provided a dollar a day instead of 75c. a day for these poor charwomen. I do not know that it is necessary to argue the matter. These women come a long distance to their work, they put in substantially the forenoon at their work and in returning to their homes. It seemed to me that, having regard to the increased cost of living and other considerations, a dollar a day was little enough for these women. I gave the matter reasonable consideration and concluded that this government could well afford to pay these charwomen $1 a day instead of 75c. The result is an increase of a considerable sum, but one which I venture to say my chivalrous friends opposite will hardly venture to challenge.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have always failed to understand why these charwomen should be under the Finance Department.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think there should be a change and they should be placed under the control of the Public Works Department. There is nothing political in their appointment, they are principally widows and they might very well be placed under the charge of the superintendent of Dominion Buildings. Then a member wishing to have a widow appointed might proceed immediately to the superintendent, where he has perhaps 20 other requests to make. instead of going before the Minister of Finance, who is dabbling away at figures.

Commission of Conservation — salaries, $24,525.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is quite an increase in these salaries.

Mr. MONK. I think most of that increase of $3,762 is composed of statutory increases. The expenditure is very small. I have been on that commission until this year, and I think the committee will admit that its usefulness has been amply demonstrated. They increase their researches every year, and I suppose they have been obliged to increase the staff to some extent.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The details are supplied at page 31 of the estimates. It will be observed that there is a total increase of one in the staff of the commission.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Monk, House adjourned at 9.57 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 12, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.'—Mr. Chabot.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Premier Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BRADBURY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 64) to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act. He said: I feel constrained to introduce this Bill on account of the almost intolerable condition of things on the Red river north of Winnipeg. Previous to the building of the dam at St. Andrews lock, the river was flooded out at least once a year. Since the construction of the dam we have had a large body of still water extending from the dam to the city of Winnipeg. The sewage of the city of Winnipeg, of St. Boniface, of Brandon and of Portage la Prairie has been deposited in the stream. The conditions have become almost unbearable for the residents along the Red river north of the city of Winnipeg, and something must be done to correct this evil. Previous to the erection of the dam the conditions were not so bad. But, at present, when the water is run off in the fall, it is run off gradually, and the sewage precipitates and is left on the bottom of the river. And among the places that suffer most from this condition of affairs is the town of Selkirk. The object of the Bill is to prevent if possible a continuance of this evil.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—CUSTOMS DUTY ON TWINE FOR LOBSTER POTS.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Before the motion is put I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid, Grenville) not for the purpose of provoking any discussion on the matter at present, but for the purpose of securing from him some information. There appeared in the press, at least in the maritime provinces, in the month of December, a copy of notice purporting to be issued by the Commissioner of Customs in reference to the duty on lobster twine. I do not know whether that notice is accurate or not, but as published in one newspaper it reads as follows:

Department of Customs,
Ottawa, Dec. 16, 1911.

You are advised that lobster twine used in making the heads in lobster pots is dutiable under tariff item 548, (25 per cent). This notice is sent you so as to ensure payment of duty in accordance with the law, having been made at some ports to obtain free entry under item 682.

JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner of Customs.

I do not know whether this circular was issued to the various customs ports or whether it was issued to the trade generally. I would like to inquire of the Minister of Customs if there has been any change in the regulations recently with regard to the twine used by the lobster fishermen and known as 'twine used in making the heads

of lobster pots.' And if there has been any change, what is the reason for it.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs). The first I heard of this circular being issued was some time in the latter part of December, when I received a telegram from an hon. member in the lower provinces asking me whether this circular was issued and if any change had been made. I find on inquiry that it was simply a departmental matter, and came about in this way: Information was given to the department that some people were importing manilla twine and entering it under item 682 under which classification 'barked marline and net norsels of cotton, hemp or flax' are admitted free for the fisheries. Under item 548, twine and cordage of all kinds n.o.p. is dutiable at 25 per cent. When the information was brought to the department, the chief of the statistical branch issued the following circular which is on the lines of that which the hon. member (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) has just read:

Department of Customs,
Ottawa, 14th December, 1911.

Collector of Customs,
Port of .....

You are advised that lobster twine used in making the heads of lobster pots is dutiable under the tariff item 548. This notice is sent you so as to ensure payment of duty in accordance with the law, efforts having been made at some ports to obtain free entry under item 682.

The chief statistical officer made a mistake in this circular in using the words 'lobster twine.' And when the fact was drawn to the attention of the department, the following circular was issued to correct that mistake:

Department of Customs,
Ottawa, December 27, 1911.

The circular letter sent you on December 14th, 1911, relative to lobster twine used in making the heads in lobster pots is cancelled, and the following substituted therefor, namely:

Under item 682 'barked' marline is free for the fisheries. Other marline (not 'barked' marline) is dutiable under item 548 although for use in the fisheries.

It appears other marline than 'barked' marline is being imported for the manufacture of heads in lobster pots, and such marline is dutiable, although for the manufacture of lobster pots.

On inquiring from the commissioner, I was told they were using some other kind of twine instead of the 'barked' marline in the manufacture of heads in lobster pots, and some of them are substituting the regular marline. For that reason the first circular was issued, and it was a mistake of the statistical officer in using the words 'lobster twine' which caused the trouble. It never came before me or before the government it was simply a departmental matter. As soon as it was brought to the attention of myself and the commissioner the mistake of the officer was remedied. If any one has paid any duties on barked marline, of course the amount so paid will be refunded on application being made to the department in the regular way.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is anything dutiable now?

Mr. REID (Grenville). There has been no change whatever in the tariff. Anything that has been coming in duty free under this tariff since 1907 will still come in free.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I was already a little suspicious, owing to the ruling of the Customs Department in reference to lumber, that possibly some of the persons interested were successful in the interviews with the Minister of Customs. I would ask the Minister of Customs if he would be good enough to lay on the table all the papers in connection with this matter. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, if I am not out of order, that the grounds of my suspicion are, that in the month of September last the manufacturers of cordage in Canada announced to the wholesale and retail purchasers of their manufactured articles that in the event of the defeat of the late minister——

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken, and I would ask him to refrain from speaking a second time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman will get a chance when we are in Supply.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not want to have it said that I am occupying the time of the House improperly, or against the rules, and in order to put myself in order I will make a motion.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is still out of order, he cannot make a motion if he has not a right to speak.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand the Minister of Customs to say that a person engaged in lobster fishing and who wished to get a better class of twine than he has been using heretofore, would have to pay, under the tariff as it stands now, a duty on this better class of lobster twine?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have said that those who are interested in the lobster fisheries can bring in the twine that is specified under item 682, no matter what the quality is. If they want to get another twine than that specified in the item, they will have to pay duty on it if it is classified under some other item of the tariff. I have no power whatever to change the tariff.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has power to change the application, as he has done about the lumber duties.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The right hon. gentleman knows that in the case of the lumber duties, when an application is made to the Minister of Customs for an interpretation of that article, he has a right to interpret it, or to refer it to the Board of Customs. In the case of the lumber duties it was referred to the Board of Customs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Board of Customs is the minister.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have never even mentioned the question of lumber duties to the Board of Customs, and I am surprised at the leader of the opposition making that statement. No man in this country, not even the leader of the opposition, will deny that the Board of Customs gave a correct interpretation in saying that lumber that was planed on two sides was dutiable. Surely the leader of the opposition will not deny that imported lumber that is dutiable must pay the duty. Surely he does not wish to encourage smuggling when he makes that statement.

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

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $2,425,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is an increase in this item of $200,000. It is required to pay the statutory increases under the Civil Service Act; also to pay salaries of additional officers at existing ports, owing to increase of business, and at new ports and outports, also for additional contingent expenditures which may be incurred.

The increase in the item for the fiscal year 1911-12 as compared with the fiscal year 1910-11 was $300,000, or $100,000 more than the proposed increase for 1912. During the present fiscal year, to the 19th November, 1911, increases amounting to $112,695 have been granted to 1,542 officers in various ports out of a total of 2,200 officers, so that increases have been granted to 70 per cent of the staff. During the same period 109 officers were appointed at various ports and their yearly salaries amount to $80,600. At this date we have applications from various collectors for the appointment of 48 additional officers with yearly salaries amounting to $42,750, and the Commissioner of Customs reports that these additions to the staff are necessary for the efficiency of the service. Owing to the additions to the staff by reason of increased business and the extension of the service the officials estimate a yearly increase of $7,500 for overtime pay of officers and $10,000 for contingencies. Based upon these figures the increase in the estimate for this year is $253,545, as follows: Increase in salaries, $112,695, the same as last year; salaries of additional officers, $123,350; increase in pay for overtime, $7,500; increase in contingencies, $10,000; so that the total if we were to take it on the same basis as last year, would be $253,545. The commissioner tells me that he is of the opinion that we may be able to get along with $200,000. I have discussed the matter with him again since that, and I do not believe that it will be possible for us to do so. I fear that we may yet have to come down with a supplementary estimate and ask for a further amount and for this reason: The revenue of the country has increased very fast. Last year we had about $10,000,000 of an increase, it is increasing this year and it will continue to increase. If the revenues are greater there is more work to do, we have to have more men to do that work, and for that reason it is impossible to keep the expenditure within the limits of the previous year. It is only natural that these men who have been in the service for some years should receive their regular increases.

Mr. CARVELL. Did I understand the minister to say that last year there was an increase in the salaries of the outside service of about $112,000?

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is right.

Mr. CARVELL. And did I understand him to say that there might be increases in the coming year of about the same amount?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. If that be true would there be increases granted to officers who had their salaries increased last year? It would seem that we would be running the salaries up pretty high if that method were adopted.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman knows that men generally start in the service at very small salaries, and they receive a small increase each year. In the inside service the statute allows officers an annual increase of in some cases $50 and in some $100. The officers of the outside service should receive a similar increase. The salaries of very many of them are very small and surely these men are entitled to a small increase. It seems somewhat hard that men in the inside service should get their regular increase of $50 or $100 while the two or three thousand officers in the outside service receive nothing although they may be doing much more work. There are many

ports, even small ports where, owing to the increase in importation, these officers are doing more work and where the revenue is increasing. Naturally they apply for a small increase. I feel that we are perfectly justified in giving them their regular increase. The hon. member knows that this is not a new principle, but that it has been the custom of the government for some years to give a regular increase.

Mr. CARVELL. I quite agree with almost everything the minister has said along these lines. I am not criticising him in any fault finding manner. I only want to know whether he has any well defined principle in his mind, or intends to adopt any well defined principle, in granting these increases. Personally I believe the outside service is not paid in proportion to the inside service for the work that is being done. We have lots of officers in the outside service of the Customs Department living on salaries of $700, $800 and $900 and supporting families, whereas, in the inside service, you pay more than that to the man who carries messages from one department to another. I would like to know whether the minister thinks that these gradual increases should apply to the heads of the department in the outside service as well as to the clerks. From a somewhat limited examination of the matter I have come to the conclusion that the customs collectors are probably being fairly paid but that the clerks under them who are really doing the work are insufficiently paid, and if some system could be adopted whereby the minor officers could get their regular increases every year and, if necessary also extending it to the heads of the department, it would be a move in the right direction. If you carried out the general principle of progression you might put the salary of the collector of customs beyond what it ought to be and at the same time you might not be doing justice to the officials who actually do the work. I would draw the minister's attention to this and I think I can say speaking for myself and for hon. members on this side of the House, that there is no objection to give whatever reasonable increase ought to be given to the men who are actually doing the work in the outside service.

Mr. REID. (Grenville). I have no defined policy as to how this money will be distributed during the coming year. It has been the policy of the government to put an amount in the Estimates for increases. I see from this statement that last year the Minister of Customs distributed these increases among 1,542 officers out of 2,200 so that 70 per cent of the staff got an increase. I do not know by what rule he was guided but I suppose that the minister must take each case as he finds it.

Mr. REID (Grenville).

There are men, as the hon. member states, getting very small salaries and I often wonder how they do live. The only thing I can say is that we will have to take this matter up and endeavour to distribute this money fairly among the officers that we feel are entitled to an increase giving all such a proportion, as the officers of the department shall conclude that they are entitled to. I have a great deal of sympathy with many of them. The policy I have adopted is to try to get young men into the service, give them a fair salary to start with, see that they get their increases and treat them in such a way that they may make good officers and give good service to the country.

Mr. CARVELL. I presume from what we are reading in the newspapers as to the policy of this and other departments that there will be very many dismissals in the hon. gentleman's department on account of active political services during the last elections. Will the minister apply the policy which he has foreshadowed in promoting clerks and officials to chief positions of the outside service, or will he feel that it is incumbent upon him to import—shall I say worthy, or perhaps hungry, political friends?

How many customs officers have been removed from office for political partisanship during the last three months?

Mr. REID (Grenville). When vacancies occur, I will have to fill them as I deem best in the public interest. When the late government was in power appointments made in the Customs Department were made without any reference to the rule of promotion.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). If a customs officer is charged with partisanship is he given an opportunity to defend himself.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am following the policy laid down by the House. When a member charges that an official has been an active partisan in his constituency I ask for his dismissal. But in the case of another constituency where there is not a member to represent the constituency if a charge is made I have an investigation, and if it is proven that the official has been an active partisan, of course he is dismissed.

Mr. EMMERSON. You don't take the word of the member who represents the constituency in all instances.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What does the minister consider to be offensive partisanship warranting dismissal?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I judge each case on its own merits. When an hon. member states that an official has been an active partisan I act on the information.

Mr. CARVELL. And I suppose the minister would take the word of a member on this side of the House.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, I would take it into consideration.

Mr. BUREAU. Does that rule apply to your newly appointed officers who have themselves been offensive partisans.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They could not be offensive because we have had no election since.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The customs officer at Mahone Bay, Lunenburg county has recently been dismissed, and I think I can say positively that not since his appointment to office had he been guilty of any partisan act or anything that might be construed by any person as such.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think that was the case where the previous official who had been many years in office, and who had been discharging his duties satisfactorily was dismissed without any notice, or any explanation whatever, and I came to the conclusion that that man who had been so badly treated should be restored to office.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not know what the record in the department is, but I can assure the minister that the official to whom he refers was very properly dismissed, and that very grave charges, though not of a partisan character, could have been sustained against him. The minister had no right whatever to restore that man to office.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There were no charges against this man to be found on the records of my department.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). You don't want to look too far back.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The rule for the outside service formerly was that if a person exceeded the age limit of 35 or 36 years he would not be appointed, and I understand that the minister has announced that his policy was to appoint young men. Recently, in the town of Windsor, a young man of 30 years, Mr. Brian, has been dismissed, and it is reported he is to be replaced by a man of over 60 years.

Mr. WILCOX. In view of the information required by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) it may be well to explain. He refers to Mr. Thomas Bryan, a preventive officer, of the city of Windsor, who received his appointment fifty-two-days before the election, and he was dismissed on my recommendation, and I assume full responsibility for the recommendation. In this question of dismissals and nominations to office, I feel that it is my duty as a member of this House to be guided by the policy that has been assented to by both parties heretofore in this House. I have before me the doctrine laid down by the Liberal party just after the change of government in 1896, as it appears in the Ottawa "Free Press', and it reads:

> The rank and file of the Liberal party will acclaim a plain statement of the need for a closer loyalty of the department to this accepted principle of party government—all patronage should go to the friends of the party. Every departure from this is an act of disloyalty to the followers and supporters of the party.
>
> No cabinet minister nor any supporter of the Liberal party can assault this position and be loyal to his party.
>
> Every new appointment, every power of patronage, belongs by right of system and precedent to the members of the Liberal party.
>
> To appease a political foe by gifts of patronage is a sign of cowardice, or even worse.
>
> In the initial appointment or in the awarding of a government contract, it is expected that the party in power shall be loyal to its frineds. Without such loyalty the party becomes disorganized.—Ottawa 'Free Press.'

Mr. CLARK (Essex). What is the date of that antediluvian quotation?

Mr. WILCOX. My hon. friend will find it in the 'Hansard' of January 26, last year. And this principle was so clearly followed by my hon. friends who now sit in opposition, that the church, to which I think my hon. friend adheres, in conference assembled, passed the following resolution:

> That the sordid system of patronage unfortunately obtaining in this country is not only folly from the party point of view with which as such this conference has nothing to do, but that it is contrary to public policy and an offence against the people, inasmuch as it proceeds on the assumption that the party in power is justified in administering the affairs of the country to the advantage of that section of the electors who have assisted in returning it, whereas according to any true view such party should regard itself as a trustee of the whole people.

This was clearly the Liberal policy, but I am inclined to follow the policy subsequently assented to by both parties in this parliament, that men who enter the civil service of this country should not take an active part in politics, is a sound policy and that policy shall be followed in my constituency in the case of men who, to my personal knowledge, acted as partisans in the elections. This is a matter of statute, because, as pointed out by the Prime Minister, the law clearly and distinctly prescribes the duties of the civil servant and also prescribes what he shall not do. One of the

things which, according to the law, he is not to do is to take an active part in a political contest under penalty of dismissal. Therefore, it is my duty as a humble member of this House to maintain the law in those cases, and when I find that a civil servant who is under my jurisdiction, has violated the law, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not enforce the provisions of the law. But the civil servants in the riding of North Essex who are now under my jurisdiction, so far as dismissal and recommendation is concerned, will be accorded fair treatment. They will not have handed out to them the lemons that were handed servants left there by the Liberal-Conservative party in 1896. I would ask my hon. out to that splendid army of civil friend why customs officer Church, of Essex, was dismissed in 1896, a prominent officer, without any examination or investigation whatever. I would ask why W. M. Scott, of Leamington, a trusted civil servant left there by the Liberal-Conservative party, was dismissed and a Liberal put in his place? I would ask him why Mr. McCormick, why Captain Caldwell, of Amherstburg, were dismissed? I have here the answer received by Mr. Caldwell, of Amherstburg, who wrote to the department asking for an investigation and for the papers relating to his dismissal. He received the following reply:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, respecting charges preferred against you by Collector Gott, of Amherstburg, and report by Assistant Inspector Colcock.

In reply I beg to state that I am not authorized to furnish you with a copy of any such documents.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner.

That was all there was to it, he was put out and a Liberal was put in his place. In those days the Liberal party had no criticism to offer for the dismissal of these trusted employees without investigation. I would ask my hon. friend why postmaster Ira Pastores, of Harrow, was dismissed and a Liberal put in his place. It seems to me that in view of the fact that I have in the city of Windsor the seventh largest port in this Dominion, with 140 officers under my charge as a member of this House.

An hon. MEMBER. My charge?

Mr. WILCOX. Jurisdiction.

An hon. MEMBER. What do you say to that, Mr. Minister?

Mr. WILCOX. I will say that was a mistake, I will put it, our charge. In view of the dismissal of all these splendid officers it is almost hypocrisy for hon. members opposite to criticise the dismissal of a man only six weeks in the service who I have every evidence was a most offensive partisan in the election of the 21st September. I might also ask why Mr. Killackey, that young man of Irish parentage, maimed physically, but a giant intellectually, was kicked out of the service and a Liberal put in his place? The Windsor 'Record,' the Liberal paper in that city—and I have nothing personally to say against the boys in the 'Record' office—although they have carried on a terrible criticism about the dismissal of this man to which my hon. friend has referred—kept up the refrain Killacky, you must go back, Killacky, Killacky you you must go backey.

You must go backey—and he was dismissed. There was not a word of remonstrance against this dismissal from my hon. friend at that time or against the dismissal of many others whom I could mention. Take for instance the Windsor Post Office. Miss O'Connor was dismissed, an orphan, who had been two years in the service, who had given good service, and against whom no charge was made. She was dismissed and a Liberal put in her place. Then there were Belleparche and many others. In view of these facts, it seems to me that the criticisms offered by my hon. friends opposite are hardly justified. Just a word regarding Mr. McHugh, whose nomination I recommended, to take the place of Mr. O'Brien. I recommended the dismissal of Mr. O'Brien and he was dismissed. Mr. McHugh is just as active a man as I am.

An hon. MEMBER. Is he Irish?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, and none the worse for that. He is clerk of the Township of Maidstone. He has been an accountant over twelve years and is auditor of the county of Essex, holds a first-class certificate, and from the standpoint of integrity and ability I defy my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) to mention his superior in the county. I believe in the principle of appointing reasonably young men to the service, but I had further a particular reason for recommending Mr. McHugh. It was reported to me by the collector of customs, Mr. J. A. Smith, that, owing to the wonderful growth and development and increased revenues of the port, an auditor will shortly have to be appointed for that port. Mr. McHugh, having special qualifications for that position, I thought he would be an admirable man to fill it. I did not consider it would be fair to the township to leave him clerk of the township of Maidstone at the beginning of the year two or three months and then take him away, so I recommended Mr. McHugh

for the place of Mr. O'Brien, and when the proper time comes, he will be recommended by me for the more important position, and I defy my hon. friend to say he is not qualified to fill it. While on this subject I may say that, as a moderate man in politics, I recognize that in this young country, of which we are all so proud, human ingenuity has never devised a system of government equal to the party system. I have no hard feelings against the Liberals or the Liberal party, but there are certain principles laid down in our constitutional government, and it is my duty to carry out those principles as closely as I possibly can. There are in the city of Windsor a few officials whose dismissal I should consider it my duty to recommend. Their dismissal will be a gentle reminder to those left in the service. It will teach them that they must do their duty or they will meet the same fate. I shall not discuss the little schemes in view which were played by those who had the adminstering of patronage in North Essex, because—miserable little schemes to catch the votes of my supporters in certain sections of the country. But I may say to the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that every one of those men who were guilty of those schemes will be dismissed because I have absolute evidence that they were guilty of violating the law. And when my hon. friends opposite hear of their dismissals, I hope they will not be free with their criticisms, knowing as they must, that I had just cause for recommending their removal. There are in the Customs Department 42 officials. In order that I might be properly qualified to do my duty as a servant of the people, I have studied with great care the schedules of the various offices, and I find that in these there are some 13 officials on the temporary list. These officials never received their permanent appointment. Why they have been permitted to remain three years in the customs service at the port of Windsor without being permanently appointed I am unable to perceive. But that would only show that those who had charge of the administration of patronage for the riding of North Essex were derelict in their duty. Possibly they were kept on as temporary employees and not brought under the Civil Service Act, in order that they might be let loose at election time and take part in the contest. Whether that was the object or not, I do know that that is just what a number of them did. My hon. friends opposite need have no fear with respect to the recommendations which I shall make regarding those who are in the civil service at the port of Windsor. They shall be given fair treatment, and the policy agreed to by both parties in this parliament will be followed as closely as possible, and those guilty of violating the law will be recalled.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I do not think my hon. friend, who has just spoken, has given any clear definition of what he understands by partisanship. We had a very curious case in Montreal the other day. It was not the case of a man acting immediately under the control of the government, but of a man employed on the harbour commission, Mr. Garneau, a very good servant and worthy superintendent. I do not think he was an offensive partisan in any way because I wanted him in my division but could not get him. After the elections were over, some hon. member insisted on the commission dismissing this man. He asked what there was against him, and the only charge of conduct that might be considered offensive was he was seen on one occasion riding in a cab with the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

That was while the present leader of the opposition was Prime Minister. If that is to be regarded as 'offensive partisanship,' I think the fact ought to be known. The line ought to be drawn somewhere. The fact of Mr. Garneau being invited to step into Sir Wilfrid Laurier's carriage and drive through the streets of Montreal on the way to the Windsor Hotel, surely ought not to have caused his dismissal from the Montreal Harbour Board.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I did not rise on a former occasion for the purpose of critising the dismissal of Mr. Brian, nor did I rise to criticise the appointment of McHugh. Mr. McHugh is a very estimable gentleman, and if a man of mature years is to be appointed to the service, I do not know of any person I would rather see appointed than that same gentleman. But my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) seems to have had a guilty conscience in this matter; for, when I rose to ask a question with regard to the age of appointments in the department, he felt it necessary to justify the dismissal of this young man Brian. It must be pleasing to Mr. Brian, and a matter of congratulation to his friends to know that for the only ground that can be found for his dismissal, we must go back to a date prior to 1896 and find the declaration by some zealous Liberal that the policy ought to be 'to the victors belong the spoils.' That policy was not acted on after 1896.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). No. But even if it were, it was very much condemned by the party now in power; and by adopting now the policy which they denounced then—'to the victors belong the spoils'—the hon. gentlemen are repudiating all

their pretensions in the way of civil service reform. Reference has been made to Mr. Killacky, and I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilcox) must have had in view the Irishman of the township of Maidstone when he referred to that gentleman. He was an offensive partisan.

Mr. WILCOX. Was he such after his appointment?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Would my hon. friend expect a man appointed as Mr. Killacky was to be retained? He went up and down the concessions carrying on an offensive campaign, and having his appointment in his pocket. Then when the government was defeated, this defeated government passed an order in council appointing this Mr. Killacky to a deputy collectorship. I do not think you will hear any person on this side complain of a dismissal of any official appointed under circumstances such as these. It is a rare commentary on the dismissal of Mr. Brian, that the only excuse for it is an old article in the Ottawa 'Free Press' declaring that 'to the victors belong the spoils.'

Mr. WILCOX. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, that is not the principal reason.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). What did Mr. Brian do that he should be dismissed?

Mr. REID (Grenville). He was appointed a few days before the elections.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). But I would like to know what he did. That is what his friends have been trying to find out. And Mr. Brian himself asked for an explanation.

Mr. WILCOX. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke, Essex) was present at the Liberal nomination in the city of Windsor at which Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Healy and Mr. Ed. O'Neal were the candidates, and he will remember that Mr. O'Neal, one of the candidates, openly declared that certain civil servants in the port of Windsor had been canvassing the delegates from different parts of the riding against him.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). But not Mr. Brian. I know to whom he referred.

Mr. WILCOX. That statement was made, and I have the evidence. There is another gentleman who was transferred immediately previous to that convention into the civil service for reasons which were very questionable. Mr. Brian was transferred from the Immigration branch to the Customs Department just about this time, and he took an active part in that convention, and in the election that followed. Mr. Brian was pointed out to me upon three different occasions, by men prominent in Windsor, as one who was very busy in securing the registration vote. I was informed by one of the most prominent citizens of Windsor that he was present when this young man brought in three votes for registration. It was actions of this character that led me to the conclusion that this young man was taking a part in the election. There was also the fact that he was also only temporary assistant, and that he could not receive an appointment except upon my recommendation. And I felt it my duty to give my recommendation to a friend rather than to a foe.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I am glad to hear the further reasons given by the hon. gentleman, that Mr. Brian was an offensive partisan. If he were such, then I assume that the policy is to dismiss all such people. I am not going to criticise that, if the party think that the proper system to adopt. But I do not believe that this man was an offensive partisan. My hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox) himself does not know it of his own knowledge. I have made inquiries, and Mr. Brian has asked for an investigation, declaring that the charges were not true. That investigation was denied, and Mr. Brian and his friends justly feel sore. It was said that he was only temporarily employed. They are all temporary in the same sense. There was not a better officer in the customs service than 'Tom' Brian. He was recognized by the officials there, and by the inspectors who came from Toronto; and I do not think the minister will say that he had a better officer for his years. He had been an immigration officer and desired to be transferred to the customs, in which he had been engaged for a few months, and that was made a pretext for his dismissal. It is not material to me what policy is adopted. They can fire the whole of them; and, from a party standpoint I would sooner they did. They would be going back on all their professions. But it is due to the civil service that a policy should be laid down, and that a minister should not take shelter behind one of the members. He gives his supporters carte blanche, apparently; and whether a member acts from malice or on mistaken judgment he has only to say that this or that man is to be dismissed, and the minister will dismiss him. If that be the policy, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the hon. gentleman approve of the government making appointments to the civil service between the dissolution, and the holding of the general elections?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is the case of Mr. Killacky with whose dismissal by the Liberals my hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox) finds fault. There may be cases in the

course of the administration of government where that must be done. But that is not the case here. Mr. Brian was appointed long before the elections.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, he was appointed in August, after the dissolution.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I do not know how that is. At any rate it was before the election, and before there was a suggestion of a change of government. He was only transferred from one department to another. At that time he had been some years in the other department, and had held the highest position in the Immigration Department. But the minister has not answered my question as yet. I think it is fair to the service, and to the people to know whether the rule as to the age limit is going to be carried, as it was under the former government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman does not mean to say that the former government had an age limit in the Department of Customs.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I certainly do mean to say it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I know that in the Customs Department the former government appointed men all the way up to 75 years of age, within the last few years.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). If my hon. friend will look up the correspondence with regard to the county of Essex, and particularly Windsor, within the last year, he will find that perhaps half-a-dozen have been refused certificates recommended by those having the patronage, because they exceeded 36 years of age, on the ground that that limit was being enforced.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know anything about the county of Essex, but I do know that the late government, throughout the Dominion, have been appointing men right up almost to the time they left office, men up to 60 years of age.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Perhaps the minister will say that in his appointments he recognizes no age limit.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In the outside service we are not compelled by law to recognize an age limit. But I may say for the information of the hon. gentleman, that I have been appointing only those who are under 36 years of age in almost every place, except in special cases. In the case at Windsor, the hon. member for that county advised me of the special qualification of this particular man, and I understand he is about 50 years of age.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). He is over 60.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is the age of the hon. gentleman's appointee?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know, but he has special qualifications, and will be a valuable officer. The hon member knows that in some cases you cannot apply an age limit, as for instance in the case of appraisers. But I am apointing those under the age limit in every case, except in those mentioned by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox).

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). What do you mean by age limit?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Under 36 years of age.

Mr. CARVELL. We have from the government a rather remarkable statement in the declaration of the Minister of Customs to the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox). An hon. member comes into this House and reads a resolution passed by a prominent religious denomination in Canada condemning in the strongest terms the policy of dismissing men from office, and then he goes on to say practically, that to the victor belongs the spoils. He turns down the policy declared by this religious denomination, and so far as we can see, the hon. gentleman must have come here as the exponent of the government, because he is prepared with all the data and documents on which he made this extraordinary speech. Now we have had a declaration of the policy of the government as shown by the hon. member for North Essex. I would like to ask the minister a question. He tells us that in cases where the constituency is represented in this House by a member supporting the government he will take the word of that member in regard to the offensive partisanship of any public official, and the minister will remove him from his office if the member recommends his removal. In other cases where the constituency is represented by an opponent of the government, I understand an investigation of some kind will be held. Will the minister tell me whether counsel will be employed by the government, or whether they will allow the accused to be represented by counsel? Will the government allow the man accused reasonable notice in order that he may make his defence at the investigation? Or will the minister simply send a man around the country and ask some questions of Conservative politicians and dismiss the man on their representations?

Mr. REID (Grenville). In cases where investigations are held there is a regular commissioner duly appointed by order in council for that purpose. If there is no counsel employed, then the commissioner must notify the man charged, who will have a right to appear and give evidence, or rebut evidence that may be brought

against him. He can take any means he likes to disprove that evidence, and the commissioner must take the evidence under oath. Then a report will be sent to the department, it will be looked into, and if the evidence is sufficient to justify the dismissal the dismissal will have to be made.

Mr. CARVELL. I am not going to find fault with the declaration of policy on the part of the minister. I may say that only to-day I received notice that one of those commissioners had arrived in my town yesterday afternoon, and up to that moment not a single official had ever received notice that he was coming. Perhaps the commissioner was only on a scouting expedition for the purpose of spying out the land, and getting his witnesses and coming back later on. But no one had received any intimation whatever that he was coming. I am glad to learn that the minister is going to give these people a chance to defend themselves. Would the hon. gentleman say who are the commissioners appointed in the different ports of Canada for the purpose of holding these investigations?

Mr. REID. (Grenville). In New Brunswick, the commissioner appointed is Mr. E. T. C. Knowles. In Nova Scotia the commissioner is James A. Macdonald of Halifax. There are one or two others down in the lower parts of the province, whose names I can get if the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). Who will be the commissioner in this Windsor case?

Mr. REID (Grenville). A commissioner is not necessary in that case. I have proof that he was an active partisan.

Mr. EMMERSON. In case of an hon. member making a charge to the minister of offensive partisanship of an official, does the minister require full particulars of the charge, or does he simply take the statement of the member declaring that such a man is an offensive partisan?

Mr. REID. (Grenville). In cases that have come before me the member has generally stated that this man has been an active partisan, has shown partisanship, either by attending meetings, or canvassing, or doing something of that kind, and I have taken the member's statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. Must the member state of his own personal knowledge that the official has been guilty of special acts of offensive partisanship?

Mr. REID. (Grenville). The member cannot in all cases speak of his own personal knowledge, because the official accused may have been attending a meeting some miles away. A case was brought to my attention where an official had been present at a public meeting and had made a speech, and I considered that was sufficient evidence.

Mr. EMMERSON. A case of that kind would perhaps be a matter of public knowledge. Where it is not within the knowledge of a member I want to ask the minister if he does not think that he should have either an investigation of it, and accompanying the declaration of the member, does he not think there should be the affidavit or the sworn declaration of the party who imparted the information to him?

Mr. REID. (Grenville). Members who have made charges of this kind have always stated that they have themselves made a very particular investigation. No member has ever asked for the dismissal of an officer without first having made an investigation himself.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you require to have his statement in writing?

Mr. REID. (Grenville). They write me a letter to that effect. Hon. members on this side of the house are not anxious to dismiss officials who have not been active partisans, but those who have been active partisans certainly deserve it. If a member states to me that he has personal knowledge or that he has evidence based on personal inquiries that a man has been an active partisan I am satisfied to take his word and dismiss the official.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Would the minister mind bringing down the report on Mr. Brian?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Certainly, I will bring down the report on Brian or any other man.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The difficulty is that the policy which the minister has enunciated has not been carried out. In my constituency men are dismissed without any investigation whatever or any complaint being made against them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the hon. gentleman tell me the name of any?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I cannot give the name of any in the minister's own department but I can give him the name of a man in the Department of Public Works—Roderick Sutherland. I can also give him the name of a man in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think the hon. gentleman should refer to the Department of Customs; that is out of order.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understood that my hon. friend was speaking not only of the

policy of his own department but the policy of the government generally with regard to the dismissal of officials. I would like to know from the minister if he makes any distinction between a letter written to him by a defeated candidate and a statement made to him by a member of parliament? My own view is that a defeated candidate should produce more definite and clearer proof than a member of parliament. A member of parliament is here, we can confront him with his statement and, if there is anything wrong with it, we can criticise it and he must stand up to it. But, when a defeated candidate a thousand miles away writes a letter reflecting upon some official and secures his dismissal, it strikes me that that is too much like the star chamber style of doing business and that something should be required of him that is not required of a member of parliament. I would like very much to have the view of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) on this question of dismissals. I regret that he is not in his place. The Prime Minister during the last fifteen years, has been the champion of Civil Service reform. The first speech he made in this chamber was on that question and it was a very able and exhaustive speech. He quoted from such great writers as 'Leckie on Democracy and Liberty' and he laid down the principle that a civil servant might not only vote against the government that employed him but that he was entitled to speak in public against the policy of that government provided he did it in a gentlemanly manner. The different manifestos that he has issued since that time have all contained a declaration in favour of civil service reform. In the Halifax platform this question had a prominent place and in the platform issued at the last election in September the Prime Minister declared in favour of civil service reform. We are told that the government is going to adopt the old policy of 1896. Then, what is the meaning of his civil service reform? Is there nothing in it at all? Is it just empty talk and wind? I presume that the people believed him when they voted for his party on this question because it is a very important question. It is up to the Prime Minister to lay down some principle and to show that he, as the Prime Minister, is willing to take a forward step and to justify the numerous manifestos that he has issued during the last fifteen years on this important question. I find that his own newspapers do not support him in the attitude that his government is taking on this question. If there is any newspaper in Canada that can be looked upon as the organ of the Prime Minister it is the Halifax 'Herald' and that paper has been speaking out pretty strongly on the question of the dismissal of civil servants. It says:

> Mr. Borden should, moreover, lose no time in introducing such reforms into the civil service as will put a prompt and complete end to the scandal of the hungry horde of party heelers, who apparently think the sole business of the government is to provide them with an opportunity to feed at the public trough—a humiliating example of which is furnished in Halifax to-day. This horde of political dervishes seems under the impression that it is the sole business of the government to drive away the present occupants of the public trough to make room for themselves, without regard to consequences.

That is the editorial statement of the organ of the Prime Minister. Evidently the Halifax 'Herald' is not satisfied with the policy which has been adopted on the other side of the House with regard to this matter. Then, I find that the Toronto 'Telegram,' another paper that gives, I understand, an independent support to the Conservative party, has come out very strongly condemning the government on the policy they are pursuing with regard to the dismissal of officials. I wish to call attention to an item which appeared a few days ago in the Montreal 'Star,' and I submit that the Montreal 'Star' is a newspaper that is supposed to give fair-play to the government. I am glad to see that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes) is in the House just now, because I want to draw his attention to this matter. The Montreal 'Star' refers to the case of Mr. Eugene O. Baldwin, a customs employee of Coaticook. This is a case that I think has not been mentioned this afternoon. I know nothing about the case except what I have read in the Montreal 'Star.' The 'Star' states that this gentleman has been suspended from the service of the government and it gives as a reason for his suspension that he issued a manifesto about the time of the election. Mr. Baldwin says that he took no part in the election, but he admits that he did issue a manifesto in which he protested against the Nationalists and their press indulging in such expressions as 'Imperialistic Virus'; 'We have had enough of England and the English'; 'We will not be made to forget that in 1837 it was necessary to bore holes in the British Flag in order to breathe the atmosphere of liberty.' It appears that Mr. Baldwin had courage enough to denounce the Nationalists for making statements of that kind at the last election and that for that reason he has been dismissed from the customs service. This is the statement which I find in the Montreal 'Star.' I would like to know what the Minister of Militia thinks of it. Is he in accord with that kind of policy? Has it come to this, Sir, that a man who complains, who enters a loyal protest against expressions of this kind, is to be condemned?

Mr. Baldwin protested against the use of such language during the recent elec-

tion and the Montreal 'Star' states that Mr. Baldwin was suspended from the service on account of these protests of his. I would like to hear the view of the Minister of Militia on a civil servant being dismissed for protesting against such language.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Except in one or two cases, I have insisted upon an investigation. In the case of Mr. Baldwin I was told that he was a very active partisan in the last campaign and there was placed before me a newspaper the whole front page of which was spread with an article written by Mr. Baldwin and adorned with his photograph, and that article contained some harsh language. If the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) himself had read that article, he would have to agree that it was actively interfering in politics. The moment a man leaves his office and enters the political arena, it makes no difference to me to whom he refers, he will not occupy his position longer, if I have the power to dismiss him.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I cannot understand why the minister does not grant an investigation in the case of Mr. Brian of Windsor. The hon. member (Mr. Wilcox) says that he was guilty of political partisanship, and the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) who knows him just as well, and whose word will be as readily accepted in this House or outside of it as the word of the hon. member (Mr. Wilcox) states that Mr. Brian was not a political partisan and has not taken part in politics since his appointment to office. In view of that, the minister has no right to constitute himself the sole judge and to refuse an investigation before his commissioner whom he is to appoint for the province of Ontario. What is the use of his appointing a commissioner at all if the minister is going to act this way in some cases and not in others?

Mr. REID (Grenville). It amuses me to see the change of mind that has come over the hon. member (Mr. A. K. Maclean) within the last few months. The leader of the opposition, when he came into power in 1896, would grant no investigation, and the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) sustained him. Take the case of Mr. Milner, of Sackville, N.B. He was accused, in 1896, of being an active partisan and a commissioner was appointed to inquire and the commissioner went around taking evidence, and he refused Mr. Milner an opportunity of appearing before him and defending himself, and Mr. Milner was dismissed. He never had a chance of stating his case, and when he asked for the evidence, even that was refused to him. So far as I am concerned I believe that no man was more unjustly treated than Mr. Milner and I believe he should be put back in his office

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). You don't know him.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The late government never gave him the slightest possible chance to defend himself.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). And you contended that was wrong and why do you do now what you condemned?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The minister has incorrectly stated the policy laid down by the late government. That policy was that no man should be dismissed without there being an investigation, the only exception being that if a member stated on his responsibility, that of his own knowledge he knew the facts charged against the official, we would take that without further evidence. And there is reason for that, because when a member of this House charges an official of his own knowledge with offensive partisanship the member can be called to account in this House and we can debate his recommendation and investigate it also.

We can take knowledge of what he says, we can debate it and we can investigate it under oath. I presume a man would tell the truth under such circumstances, but at all events he may be mistaken and his word can be controverted. Unless a member did so, under the late government an investigation was always held and the very case cited by my hon. friend proves it. A charge was made against a man in Sackville, a commissioner was appointed, and an investigation took place. What we complain of in this matter is that Mr. Bryan was dismissed without any investigation and so far as I have been able to follow the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox), he has not stated that he made a charge of his own knowledge that Mr. Bryan had been guilty of offensive partisanship.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the case of Mr. W. C. Milner, sub-collector of customs at Sackville, which is in the county I now represent, Mr. Milner was the owner, proprietor and editor, of the 'Chignecto Post,' published at Sackville. He was also sub-collector of the port of Sackville. The 'Chignecto Post' is a very strong and ardent supporter of the Conservative party and week by week it contained articles naturally supporting that party and condemnatory of the Liberal party. A change of government occurred in 1896, and charges were made, I believe, against Mr. Milner, because of what was claimed to be offensive partisanship. I was not a member of the House at that time and therefore had nothing to do with the transaction, but

an investigation was held, evidence was taken and the commissioner made a report upon which action was taken by the government. No one will claim, not even Mr. Milner, although he has certain peculiarities, that he was not a strong partisan. He was recognized as such, and no complaint was made as to his dismissal, it being the policy of the government to dismiss, after investigation in cases where the charges were sustained. I know personally that Mr. Milner, during all the years previous to 1896, and while he held the office of collector of customs at Sackville, and was editor and proprietor of the 'Chignecto Post,' was a very strong supporter of the Conservative party, openly, publicly, and I admired him for the courage of his convictions. I do not think that Mr. Milner made any serious complaint at the time as to his dismissal, he recognized that it was part of the fortunes of war. He went down with his party and certainly that case is quite different from those that have been cited here.

Mr. REID (Grenville): Mr. Milner was not allowed to appear before the commissioner at many places he sat holding his investigation.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know the commissioner sat at Sackville and took evidence.

Mr. REID (Grenville). On January 19, 1897, he received a notice from Mr. McAlpine that he had been directed to investigate charges of partisanship. On January 20, Mr. Milner wrote to Mr. McAlpine asking for a copy of the charges, but received no reply. He then asked him verbally, but he never received a copy. Mr. McAlpine sat at Sackville on February 5, Mr. Milner was present. The commissioner adjourned from time to time and Mr. McAlpine received evidence in other places when Mr. Milner was not present. As to the statement that Mr. Milner was proprietor of this paper, Mr. Milner furnished evidence that in 1895, two years before the investigation, he had ceased owning that paper, it had been turned over to a company and he was really not the owner, and then, owing to this paper criticising the action of the Liberal party, he was promptly dismissed. When he asked for a copy of the evidence, he received this reply:

Ottawa, Oct. 5, 1897.

Mr. W. C. Milner,
Sackville, N.B.

Sir,—I am directed by the Hon. the Minister of Customs to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 28th ult., with reference to your dismissal from the position of collector of customs at Sackville. The minister desires me to say to you that the reason for your dismissal was that it appeared on investigation by Mr. McAlpine that you had taken an active partisan part in politics.

The minister does not deem it advisable to comply with your request for a copy of the report of the commissioner.

The question of granting you an allowance in lieu of sums paid in by you to the superannuation fund is under consideration.

Yours very truly,
JOHN BAIN,
Private secretary.

He was denied the evidence in that case.

With reference to the statement of the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the policy was laid down by him in 1896, that he would only accept the statement of a member of the House of Commons when it was of his own personal knowledge, I may say that in the Customs Department that policy was violated in every possible way. Members were not required to state in every case that the matter was of their own personal knowledge. The right hon. leader of the opposition knows that it would be impossible for a member to know of all cases of his own personal knowledge, of every case. There are constituencies in Canada several hundred miles long and an official might take an active part, he might attend a meeting at a distance, and the member might have information from reliable men of the official taking an active part in the campaign, but how could the member have personal knowledge of all such cases. If information has been given him from people in whom he has confidence and he is prepared to assume the responsibility in this House there is no reason why I, as Minister of Customs, should not accept the statement of that member, and see that the man is dismissed. That was the policy carried out by the present leader of the opposition from 1896, on.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The minister has not yet stated what his department will require from a defeated candidate who asks for the dismissal of an official.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When a defeated candidate makes charges against an official of active partisanship I have so far sent those charges as given to me to the commissioner appointed for the purpose of investigating and he is advised to notify whoever makes the charges and the official against whom the charges are made.

Mr. EMMERSON. Are copies of the charges conveyed to him?

Mr. REID (Grenville). All of the papers are sent to the commissioner.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does the party accused receive them?

Mr. REID (Grenville). He hears the evidence put up against him, which is

the evidence we act on, and is contained in the commissioner's report. The official, therefore, is notified. No doubt he will be present and hear what is said against him. But we have to go by the evidence obtained by the commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. Apparently there is no improvement with regard to the procedure judging by what the hon. minister has just said. He made a complaint that Mr. Milner had not received a copy of the charges, but the hon. minister does not now propose to furnish the accused with a copy of the charges preferred against him. With respect to Mr. Milner, who is a personal friend of mine, I want to say this. I have understood that Mr. Milner—and I am not condemning him for looking after his own interests—feels that perhaps his friends who are now in power will consider a claim by him for a return to him of all the moneys paid by him as annuity and perhaps some other consideration. I am informed that such a claim has been presented to this government and that he is seeking to get consideration from the government by reason of the course which was pursued in 1897.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have not heard anything of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is spoken of locally, but whether it is true or not I am not in a position to say. I would be only too glad if Mr. Milner could get any money due him, if there be any due him.

Mr. REID (Grenville). So far as I can remember, Mr. Milner has not made any application such as stated by the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson).

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. minister made a statement which I think is a fair one, namely, that in the case of a complaint against an official by a member supporting the government, he would act on the recommendation but on the charge of one who ran as a government candidate and was defeated, that official is entitled to an investigation. The minister has told us that he instructed the commissioner to hold such an investigation, but I want to point out to him a case acted upon the very opposite of what he says is the rule in his department. It is the case of a gentleman living in my town who was first suspended and then dismissed without investigation, although he asked for one

Mr. CURRIE. Was it a permanent appointment?

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes, he was an under official in the Customs House. It was alleged that he was a partisan. I could explain what he did which was considered partisan, but I do not think that is necessary. But what I claim is that he did not receive the treatment which the minister says an official was entitled to.

An hon. MEMBER. What is his name?

Mr. LOGGIE. Mr. Gaynor, in the Customs House at Chatham.

Mr. EMMERSON. Was that since this government came in?

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes. I could tell hon. gentlemen that there are many officials who worked energetically against me in my election in 1904, and I was pressed by my friends to ask for their removal, but not one official in the county of Northumberland was dismissed by the Liberal government. Mr. Gaynor was treated very harshly.

Mr. CLARE. When was he appointed?

Mr. LOGGIE. He was appointed by the Liberal government on my recommendation in 1904 or 1905. Some of the allegations made against him I know to be untrue.

Mr. CLARE. What were the facts?

Mr. LOGGIE. I do not know that I need here give the facts. All I can say is that I hope I may be favoured with the papers; and if an injustice has been done Mr. Gaynor, I trust the hon. minister will carry out the principle he has laid down and grant an investigation. Mr. Gaynor asked for one during the time of his suspension, before he was dismissed. Had an investigation been granted, I believe that Mr. Gaynor would have retained his position in the Customs House at Chatham.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If I remember rightly, the charge made against him was that he went to a political meeting and tried to interfere with the speakers.

Mr. EMMERSON. Why should that not be investigated?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). From the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, one would think they were the most innocent lambs in the world and that they would not remove any one from office without investigation, but I happen to have run across an old return which I intend putting on 'Hansard' if the House will allow me. In the Senate, nine months after the late government had obtained office in 1896, a return was asked for and brought down. It contained 35 pages, and I propose to read it and put it on 'Hansard' so that when hon. gentlemen opposite deny that any one was removed from office without

due time by the late government he can turn up the facts. This is not a full return. It will be found in the Sessional Papers number, 517 19. 1897a:

PARTIAL RETURN.

To an address of the Senate dated the 9th April, 1897, for a statement showing, for each department of the civil service, the names, ages, offices and salaries of such persons employed either in the inside or outside divisions thereof; and of such persons not in the civil service employed by the government in any department since the 13th July, 1896, and in cases where no commission of investigation was appointed, as have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation or otherwise, specifying in each case the manner of, and grounds for such removal, and the length of notice given to the persons removed, and the amount of superannuation or gratuity granted, if any; also showing the name, age, office and salary or remuneration of any and every person appointed to the civil service in the place of, or as a consequence of any such removal.

By order,
R. W. SCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Department of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa, 15th April, 1897.

Joseph Pope, Esq.,
Under-Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In answer to the address of the Senate for information respecting persons who have been removed from this office by dismissal, superannuation, or otherwise, since July 13th, 1896, or who have been appointed to fill the vacancies thus created, I have the honour to state that in so far as the Department of Trade and Commerce is concerned, there have been no dismissals, superannuations, removals or appointments.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
WM. G. PARMELEE,
Deputy Minister.

Department of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, 22nd April, 1897.

The Under-Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In reply to the address of the Senate dated the 9th instant, I have the honour to state that the only retirement in this department was that of Lieut. F. W. White, Assistant Architect, resigned 30th September, 1896; and the appointment of Mr. Paul Weatherbe as architect, by order in council of the 22nd February, 1897.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. EUG. PANET, Colonel,
Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

Ottawa, 22nd April, 1897.

Answer to address of the Senate respecting persons who have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation, or otherwise, since the 13th July, 1896:

Mr. W. Howard, a temporary clerk in the Department of Public Printing and Stationary, left on 1st October, 1896, of his own accord. Position not filled. This is the only case to report.

S. E. DAWSON,
Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery.

Auditor General's Office, Canada,
Ottawa, 15th April, 1897.

Mr. Joseph Pope,
Under-Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your reference No. 1, dated 13th instant, asking for information respecting persons who have been removed from office, by dismissal, superannuation or otherwise, since 13th July, 1896, as per address to the Senate dated 9th instant.

In reply I have to inform you that, so far as this office is concerned, no person has been removed either by dismissal, superannuation or otherwise since 13th July, 1896.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. L. McDOUGALL,
Auditor General.

Department of Finance,
Ottawa, 24 April, 1897.

The Under-Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Sir,—Referring to the address of the Senate of 9th instant asking for information respecting persons who have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation, or otherwise, since 13th July, 1896, or who have been appointed to fill the positions thus vacated, I have the honour to state that so far as this department is concerned, three persons have been removed from office by dismissal since 13th July, 1896, namely, C. B. Deacon, clerk in the office of the assistant receiver general, at Winnipeg, under authority of an order in council of 30th November, 1896; John Cameron, agent of the Government Savings Bank at New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, and W. M. DeBlois, agent of the Government Savings Bank at Annapolis, Nova Scotia, under authority of an order in council of 22nd February, 1897, the cause in each case being that the gentlemen in question took active part in the recent general elections for the House of Commons.

In the case of Mr. Deacon the dismissal took effect from 1st January, 1897, and the assistant receiver general at Winnipeg was notified by letter dated 2nd December, 1896, that the dismissal was to take place, and he notified Mr. Deacon on the 7th of same month.

In the cases of Messrs. Cameron and DeBlois the dismissal took effect from 1st April, 1897, and these gentlemen were so notified by letters from the Finance Department, dated 25th February, 1897.

No superannuation allowance or gratuity was granted in either case, and no persons have been appointed to fill the position thus vacated.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. M. COURTNEY,
Deputy Minister of Finance

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY DEPARTMENT.

INFORMATION respecting Persons who have been removed from Office by Dismissal, Superannuation, or otherwise, since the 13th July, 1896, or who have been appointed to fill the Positions thus vacated.

Name.	Age.	Office.	Salary.	Grounds for Removal.	Vacancy Filled by	Date.	Salary.	Remarks.
			$ cts.				$ cts.	
N. I. Giroux	37	Geologist	1,300 00 Per day.	Died 30th November, 1896	R. W. Brock	May 1, 1897.	1,000 00	Permanent staff.
D. I. V. Eaton	27	Surveyor and explorer	2 25	Resigned to accept an appointment in the Royal Canadian Infantry.				Temporary Staff.
E. G. Baldwin	31	Type-writer	1 50	Resigned	E. F. Goodman	Oct. 5, 1896.	450 00	do
L. L. Brophy	34	Assistant, Division Mining Statistics.	2 25	Left service to engage in outside business.				do

GEORGE M. DAWSON,
Deputy Head and Director.

OTTAWA, 15th April, 1897.

INDIAN DEPARTMENT.

Information respecting persons who have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation, or otherwise, since the 13th July, 1896, or who have been appointed to fill the position thereby vacated.

R. M. Fisher, M.D., medical attendant at Cape Croker, salary $500 per annum; dismissed on a resolution of Indian council of date 3rd August, 1896; agent notified 22nd September that department had decided to comply with request of Indians, to replace Dr. Fisher by Dr. J. H. Gimby, at same salary as was received by Dr. Fisher; ages not known of either of above doctors.

D. McMurphy, constable, Rainy River District; services dispensed with by department 13th August, 1896, as there were no funds to pay his salary, $300 per annum; no successor appointed.

A. A. Mondou, Indian agent, Pierreville, P.Q., age 24 years; salary $200 per annum; dismissed for political partisanship 13th October, 1896, by order in council; notified of same 26th October; succeeded by W. C. Boucher, age 49 years; at same salary.

L. E. Otis, Indian agent, Pointe Bleue, age 59 years; salary $400 per annum; dismissed for active political partisanship by order in council of 13th October; notified 26th; succeeded by P. L. Marcotte, age 59 years; at same salary.

J. A. Langrill, M.D., physician to Six Nations Indians, age, 51 years, salary $2,000 per annum; services dispensed with by order in council of 13th October, 1896, at request of Indians on account of removal to Hamilton; notified 17th October, 1896, paid salary to 31st October; succeeded by Dr. L. Secord at same salary, age 43 years.

A. G. Smith, clerk Indian office, Brantford, salary $900 per annum; service dispensed with by order in council of 24th October, 1896, for offensively interfering during elections; notified 30th October; age, 47 years; succeeded by David S. Hill at same salary, age not krown.

Josiah Hill, secretary of Six Nations, and inspector of works, salary $600 per annum; dismissed by department for offensively interfering during elections; notified 24 October, 1896; no successor appointed. Hill is still acting.

William Reep, interpreter, Six Nations, salary $500 per annum; dismissed by department 24th October, 1896, for offensively interfering during election; no successor appointed. He is still acting.

William C. Chisholm, Indian agent, Heatherton, N.S., dsmissed by order in council of 7th November, for offensive partisanship; salary $100 per annum; age, 40 years; replaced by John R. McDonald at same salary, age, 41 years.

John Yahnodt, forest bailiff, Walpole Island, was by resolution of Indian council of 27th November, 1896, for incompetency, deposed, and James Williams and Charles Altiman appointed to act in his stead. The salary, as formerly, $1.50 per day while on duty; change to take effect 1st January, 1897.

Mr. Jarvis, farming instructor, Brandon industrial school, was, by instruction sent to Indian commissioner on 9th December, 1896, replaced by Mr. Lauson whose salary is same as predecessor, $40 per month, age not known. Mr. Lauson, is a practical and competent farmer, and Mr. Jarvis possessed no qualifications for the work.

Dr. H. Howie, medical attendant, Whitefish Lake Indians, $300 per annum, services dispensed with at request of Indians for neglect of duties 20th January, 1897. H. H. Mulligan appointed temporarily to succeed him at same salary; age not known.

P. E. Jones, Indian agent, Hagersville, age, 53 years; salary $600 per annum; dismissed by order in council of 25th January, 1897, at request of Indians for neglect of duty; notified 13th February, 1897, succeeded by Hugh Stewart, age, 64 years; at same salary.

J. W. Jermyn, Indian agent, Cape Croker, age, 51 years; salary $500 per annum; dismissed by order in council of 9th February, 1896, for disobeying instructions of department and for general unfitness for position; notified 13th February, 1897; succeeded by John McIvor, age, 45 years; same salary.

John Crowe, Indian agent, Saugeen Reserve; salary $500; age, 59 years; dismissed by order in council of 9th February, 1897, on account of irregularities; notified 12th February; succeeded by John Scoffield, age, 44 years; at same salary.

Geo. T. Orton, medical officer, Clandeboye agency, age, 60 years; salary $800 per annum; dismissed by order in council of 12th February 1897; notified 18th February; succeeded by Dr. J. R. Steep at same salary.

Wiliam Bateman, Indian agent, Scugog, age, 61 years; salary $100 per annum; was by order in council of 9th February, dismissed by department for active partisanship in elections; notified 13th February; succeeded by Albert Williams, age 48 years; at same salary.

James Martin, Indian agent, Maniwaki, age, 52 years; dismissed by order in council of 9th March for irregularities in connection with land transactions; salary $600 per annum; notified 12th February; succeeded by W. J. McCaffery, age, 45 years; at same salary.

John Carney, storekeeper, Indian agency Battleford, age, 65 years; salary $720 per annum; dismissed by order in council of 11th March for intemperance: commissioner notified 17th March; no successor appointed.

W. M. Birdsall, M.D., medical attendant on Indians of Fort Francis; salary $100, with an allowance of $150 for travelling expenses; left the locality; inspector of agencies notified 19th March. Robert Muir, M.D., appointed with same remuneration.

William McGirr, first-class clerk, age, 41 years; salary $1,800; office abolished; granted superannuation allowance $540 per annum; order in council dated 26th March; notified 1st April.

William Peart, age 31; temporary messenger; salary $300 per annum; services dispensed with by order in council 29th March, 1897, to promote economy; no successor appointed.

William Simpson, Indian agent, Wiarton, age 74; paid commission of 5 per cent on collections on sales of land and timber, dismissed by order in council of 5th April, 1897, for irregularities in connection with transaction of duties of his office; notified 20th April, 1897; G. L. Chitty, of department, acting temporarily as agent.

Wentworth F. Wood, Indian agent, Kamloops, B.C., age, 43 years; salary $1,200; dismissed by order in council of 5th April,

1897, for offensive partisanship; notified 30th April, 1897 succeeded by J. B. Leighton at same salary.

P. J. Williams, Indian agent, Battleford, age, 55 years; salary $100; dismissed by order in council of the 9th April, 1897, for neglect of cattle of agency; succeeded by Charles M. Dunais at $900 per annum; age not known.

Freeman McDormand, Indian agent, Digby and Yarmouth, N.S.; salary $50 per annum; dismissed by order in council of 9th April, 1897, for political partisanship; notified 22nd April; succeeded by Rev. J. J. Sullivan at same salary.

Angus MacKay, Indian agent, Beren's River, Man., age, 60 years; salary $1,000 per annum; dismissed for immorality by order in council of 22nd February, 1897; inspector notified 27th February; no successor appointed; J. A. Markle, Indian agent, Birtle, acting temporarily.

DEPARTMENT OF CUSTOMS.

Return to an Address of the Senate, dated 9th April, 1897, showing, for the Customs Department, names, offices, ages and salaries of such persons employed either in the inside or outside divisions thereof, and of such persons not in the civil service employed by the government in said department since the 13th July, 1896, and in cases where no commission of investigation was appointed, as have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation or otherwise, specifying in each case the manner of, and grounds for such removal, and the length of notice given to the persons removed, and the amount of superannuation or gratuity granted, if any; also showing the name, age, office and salary or remuneration of any and every person appointed to the said department in the place of, or as a consequence of any such removal.

Permanent Staff.

Jeremy Allen, preventive officer, Sutton, Que.; age, 73 years; salary, $100 per annum; services dispensed with on 1st October, 1896, on account of inefficiency; notified 29th September, 1896, office filled by employment of Wm. Allen as an acting preventing officer, at a salary of $100 per annum; age — years.

James E. Osborne, preventive officer, Milltown, N.B.; age, 36 years; salary, $600 per annum; services dispensed with 1st October, 1896; no estimate; notified 24th October, 1896.

O. H. E. Webster, preventive officer, Coaticook, Que.; age, 37 years; salary, $400 per annum; services dispensed with 1st October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 26th October, 1896.

Thos. E. Flynn, preventive officer, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; age, 53 years; salary, $500 per annum; services dispensed with 1st October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 26th October, 1896.

Mr. Flynn was re-employed on extra staff 25th November, 1896, as acting tide-waiter, at $500 per annum.

D. F. McDonald, preventive officer, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; age, 44 years; salary, $75 per annum; services dispensed with 1st October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 26th October, 1896.

James Ross, preventive officer, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; age, 68 years; salary, $75 per annum; services dispensed with 1st October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 26th October, 1896.

Mr. CURRIE.

That was their favourite way of doing this thing—' no estimate for salary.'

David Dunn, sub-collector, Barrie, Ont.; age, 51 years; salary, $600 per annum; services dispensed with 1st October, 1896; is now employed at Chatham, Ont.; notified 26th October, 1896.

Mr. Alexander Brownlee, age 44 years; was appointed sub-collector at Barrie, vice D. Dunn, at $600 per annum on 14th November, 1896.

G. M. Elliott, collector, Napanee, Ont.; age, 44 years; salary, $900 per annum; services dispensed with 23rd October, 1896, defaulted; notified 21st November, 1896.

Thomas Edwin Anderson was appointed collector vice Elliott, on 10th December, 1896; age, 41 years; salary, $800 per annum.

R. Rayburn, collector, Deseronto, Ont.; age, 56 years; salary, $700 per annum; services dispensed with 1st December, 1896, because he was engaged in other business which interfered with proper discharge of his official duties; notified 30th November, 1896.

Allanson S. Valleau, age, 48 years; was appointed collector vice Rayburn, 14th December, 1896, salary, $700 per annum.

S. Aucoin, preventive officer, Cheticamp, N.S.; age, 55 years; salary, $150 per annum; services dispensed with 1st January, 1897, on account of inefficiency and neglect of duty; notified 24th December, 1896.

Charles E. Aucoin, age, 29 years; appointed preventive officer vice S. Aucoin, 1st January, 1897; salary, $150 per annum.

Montague Stephen, sub-collector, Orwell, P.E.I.; age, 38 years; salary, $75 per annum; services dispensed with 1st December, 1896; office abolished; notified 1st December, 1896.

Walter Graves, sub-collector, Port Lorne, N.S.; age, 69 years; salary, $150 per annum; services dispensed with 1st January, 1897; office abolished; notified 13th November, 1896.

D. J. Seymour, sub-collector, Hagersville, Ont.; age, years; salary, $350 per annum; retired on gratuity, $58.33 on 1st January, 1897; office abolished; notified 17th November, 1897.

Henry Foster, sub-collector, Wellington Square, Ont.; age, 73 years; salary, $400 per annum; services dispensed with 1st January, 1897; office abolished; notified 17th November, 1896. This officer died 2nd January, 1897.

H. K. Dunn, preventive officer, Huntingdon, B.C.; age, 50 years; salary, $900 per annum; services dispensed with 10th December, 1896; incivility and offensive political partisanship; notified 10th December, 1896.

Thos. A. O'Leary, preventive officer, Salmon River, N.S.; age, 48 years; salary, $60 per annum; services dispensed with 31st December, 1896, on account of absence from office; notified 10th December, 1896.

Jas. A. Mitchell, tide waiter, Halifax, N.S.; age, 33 years; salary, $550 per annum; services dispensed with 31st December, 1896, for active political partisanship; notified 24th December, 1896.

John N. Jenks, preventive officer, Coaticook, Quebec.; age, 46 years; salary, $800 per annum; retired 1st January, 1897, on gratuity of $200; services not required; notified 24th December, 1896.

W. A. Ostrom, clerk and landing waiter, Sarnia, Ont.; age, 43 years; salary, $700 per annum; services dispensed with 8th January,

1897; intemperance; notified 11th January, 1897.

Jas. Morin, sub-collector, Beauce, Que.; age, 45 years; salary, $300 per annum; services dispensed with 1st January, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified 12th January, 1897.

Eusèbe O. Lemieux, age 46 years; was appointed sub-collector at Beauce vice Morin, on 8th January, 1897, at $300 per annum.

Walter Shears, appraiser, Victoria, B.C.; age, 44 years; salary, $1,800 per annum; services dispensed with December, 1896, for intemperance; notified 16th January, 1897. Office filled by the employment of acting appraiser Wm. Marchand, at salary of $1,400 per annum; age, 42 years.

Henry Hall, preventive officer, Port Dover, Ont.; age, 34 years; salary, $600 per annum; services dispensed with 8th January, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified 19th January, 1897. Office filled by the appointment of Nathaniel Porter; age, 36 years; salary, $600 per annum on 1st February, 1897.

Charles Kearney, preventive officer at Florenceville, N.B.; are, 60 years; salary, $200 per annum; superannuated at $60 per annum, 1st February, 1897; office abolished; notified 19th January, 1897.

William Allard, landing waiter at Carleton, Que.; age, 59 years; salary, $400; superannuated 1st February, 1897, at $176 per annum; office abolished; notified 19th January, 1897.

W. H. McLean, landing waiter at Milford, Ont.; age, 54 years; salary, $250 per annum; superannuated 1st February, 1897, at $160 per annum; office abolished; notified 19th January, 1897.

John Prinyer, preventive officer at Prinyer, Ont.; age, 77 years; salary, $200 per annum; superannuated 1st February, 1897, at $120 per annum; office abolished; notified 19th January, 1897.

George J. Chadd, preventive officer at Weller's Bay, Ont.; age, 59 years; salary, $400; superannuated at $88 per annum on 1st February, 1897; office abolished; notified 19th January, 1897.

S. P. Niles, preventive officer at Wellington, Ont.; age, 72 years; salary, $200 per annum; retired on a gratuity of $84 on the 1st February, 1897; office abolished; notified 19th January, 1897.

John Shannon, preventive officer at Black River Bridge, Ont.; age, 57 years; salary, $200; retired on a gratuity of $163.89; office abolished; notified on 19th January, 1897.

Patrick O'Toole, sub-collector at Louisbourg, N.S.; age, 58 years; salary, $150 per annum; services dispensed with on 19th January, 1897; for political partisanship in by-elections; notified 22nd January, 1897.

Samuel Plant, preventive officer at North Sydney, C.B.; age, 68 years; salary, $100 per annum; services dispensed with on 19th January, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified on 22nd January, 1897. Office filled by the employment of acting preventive officer Joseph Day, at $150 per annum on 13th May, 1897.

Donald Campbell, sub-collector at Great Bras d'Or, N.S.; age, 64 years; salary, $160 per annum; dismissed on 9th February, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified on 19th February, 1897. Office filled by the employment of George Livingstone as acting sub-collector on 19th February, 1897, at $160 per annum.

William Cameron, sub-collector at Guysborough, N.S.; age, 44 years; salary, $400 per annum; dismissed on the 9th February, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified on 25th February, 1897. Office filled by appointment of Wm. Godfrey Scott; age, 64 years; at a salary of $400 per annum from 9th February, 1897.

W. C. Henley, preventive officer at Spry Bay, N.S.; age, 43 years; salary, $60 per annum; dismissed on 1st March, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified on 5th March, 1897. Office filled by the employment of acting officer James Walsh on 5th March, 1897.

F. B. McCormick, sub-collector at Southport, Ont.; age, 57 years; salary, $500 per annum; services dispensed with for active political partisanship; notified on 3rd April, 1897. Office filled by the appointment of J. H. C. Atkinson; age, 42 years; at a salary of $500 per annum, on 1st April, 1897.

James McCurdy, sub-collector at Clifton, N.S.; age, 63 years; salary, $200 per annum; superannuated on 1st May, 1897; office abolished 5th April, 1897; notified 1st May, 1897.

M. Harper, appraiser at Pictou, N.S.; age, 67 years; salary, $700 per annum; superannuated on 1st April, 1897. Duty performed by Officer J. A. Russell, whose salary was increased $100. Harper notified on 3rd April, 1897.

A. D. Danis, sub-collector at Valleyfield, Que.; age, 58 years; salary, $500 per annum; dismissed on 1st April, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified on 17th April, 1897. Office filled by employment of acting sub-collector S. A. Brodeur, at $500, on 13th April, 1897.

Arthur Fiset, sub-collector at St. Jérôme, Que.; age, 42 years; salary, $300 per annum; dismissed on 1st April, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified on 1st April, 1897. Office filled by appointment of F. X. Michel, age, 46 years, at $300 per annum from 13th April, 1897.

Brenton, St. C. Jones, preventive officer at Weymouth, N.S.; age, 29 years; salary, $400; dismissed on 9th April, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified on 17th April, 1897. Office filled by the employment of Forbes Jones, as acting preventive officer, at $400 per annum, on 17th April, 1897.

Mr. BEST. Did all these removals take place without investigation?

Mr. CURRIE. Certainly.

Removals of Extra Staff.

Arthur Guay, acting preventive officer at Ottawa; salary, $45 per month; services dispensed with 14th September, 1896, for incompetency; notified 13th September, 1896. Office filled by employment of P. A. Berubé on 14th September, 1896, at a salary of $45 per month.

Hugh Boyd, acting prventive officer, Antigonish, N.S.; salary, $50 per annum; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896, on account of there being no estimate; notified 1st October, 1896.

Donald Morrison, acting appraiser at Newcastle, N.B.; salary, $500 per annum; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 1st October, 1896.

Allan McBeath, acting appraiser, St. John, N.B.; salary, $56 per month; service dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 1st October, 1896.

Alex. Price, acting preventing officer at Brockville, Ont.; salary, $50 per month; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 1st October, 1896.

Miss Mary S.V. Shepherd, female searcher at Brockville, Ont.; salary, $30 per month; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate, notified 1st October, 1896.

Peter Robert, acting preventive officer, Chatham, Ont.; salary, $50 per month; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate; notified 1st October, 1896.

George House, acting preventive officer, Fort Erie, Ont.; salary, $33.33 per month; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate; notified 1st October, 1896.

Jas. Jones, acting preventive officer at Fort Erie, Ont.; salary, $50 per month; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate; notified 1st October, 1896.

R. N. Flett, acting preventive officer at Winnipeg, Man.; salary, $2 per day; services dispenses with 15th October, 1896; no estimate notified 1st October, 1896.

George Mitchell, acting preventive officer at Winnipeg, Man.; salary, $2 per day; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate; notified 1st October, 1896.

J. H. Rathon, acting preventive officer, Fort Erie, Ont.; salary $50 per month; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 1st October, 1896.

R. Delano Pew, acting preventive officer, Niagara Falls, Ont.; salary $50 per month; services dispensed with 15th October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 1st October, 1896.

James G. Nunn, acting landing waiter, St. Thomas, Ont.; salary $25 per month, services dispensed with 31st October, 1896; no estimate for salary; notified 23rd October, 1896.

W. J. Findlay, acting preventive officer, Windsor, Ont.; salary $50 per month; services dispensed with 31st October, 1896; office unnecessary; notified 30th October, 1896.

Albert Little, acting clerk, Wallaceburg, Ont.; salary $20 per month; services dispensed with 30th November, 1896, upon appointment of new collector; notified 24th November, 1896.

Geo. A. Boulter, acting preventive officer at Northport, Ont.; salary $100 per annum; services dispensed with 1st January, 1897; office unnecessary; notified 25th November, 1896.

George J. Waddell, acting preventive officer, Consecon, Ont.; salary $100 per annum; services dispensed with 1st January, 1897; office unnecessary; notified 25th November, 1896.

John V. Cooper, acting preventive officer, Westport, Ont.; salary $100 per annum; services dispensed with 1st January, 1897; office unnecessary; notified 25th November, 1896.

James Berney, cheese inspector at Montreal, Que.; salary $900 per annum; services dispensed with 30th November, 1896, on the grounds of active political partisanship.

Mr. CURRIE.

Duties of this office assumed by officer W. H. Richardson of the Montreal staff; notified 30th November, 1896.

P. A. Abbey, acting sub-collector, Port Robinson, Ont.; salary $500 per annum; services dispensed with 31st December, 1896; office abolished; notified 14th December, 1896

W. D. Logan, engineer on str. 'Argus' at Halifax, N.S., salary $55 per month; services dispensed with for active political partizanship 23rd December, 1896; notified 23rd December, 1896. Office filled by employment of Wm. Case as engineer, at $55 per month.

George Byron, acting preventive officer, Colchester, Ont.; salary $50 per annum; services dispensed with 14th January, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified 14th January, 1897.

B. Andrews, acting preventive officer, Coaticook, Que.; salary $200 per annum; services dispensed with 26th February, 1897; office unnecessary; notified 26th February, 1897.

Wm. McArthur, acting preventive officer, Fenelon Falls, Ont.; salary $100 per annum; services dispensed with 28th February, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified 26th February, 1897; office filled by employment of William Thomas Junkin at $100 per annum from 1st March, 1897.

Samuel Graham, acting preventive officer, North Dock, Pelee Island; salary $50 per annum; services dispensed with 28th February, 1897; staff reorganized; notified 24th February, 1897.

John S. Kinnee, acting preventive officer on special staff, Toronto, Ont.; salary $50, services dispensed with 6th March, 1897; not required; notified 6th March 1897.

P. Potvin, acting preventive officer, Byng Inlet; salary $300 per annum; services dispensed with 12th March, 1897; dereliction of duty; notified 12th March, 1897.

Dennis Smith, acting preventive officer, East Chezzetcook, N.S.; salary $60 per annum; services dispensed with 16th March, for active political partisanship; notified 16th March, 1897.

Thos. E. Earl, acting landing waiter, Berlin, Ont.; salary $50 per month; services dispensed with 30th March, 1897; did not possess requisite qualifications; notified 30th March, 1897.

John Rankin, acting collector of customs, Bowmanville, Ont.; salary $54 per month; services dispensed with 8th April, 1897. This officer was on superannuated staff and the salary paid him as acting collector was the difference between superannuation allowance and former salary as collector; he is now returned to the retired list. Office filled by appointment of James Beith as collector, at $1,000 per annum.

Jas. McKay, acting preventive officer, Tiverton, N.S.; salary $60 per annum; services dispensed with 7th April, 1897, for active political partisanship notified 7th April 1897.

Jas. K. Tobin, acting tide waiter, Digby, N.S., salary $1.50 per day; services dispensed with 7th April, 1897, for active political partisanship; notified 7th April, 1897.

Robert Little, acting preventive officer, West Dock, Pelee Island, Ont.; salary $50 per annum; services dispensed with 7th April, 1897. Reorganization of staff; notified 7th April, 1897.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

NON-PERMANENT STAFF.

Name.	Age.	Office.	Salary.	Removed on	Date of Notification.	Grounds for Removal.
			$ cts.			
Edouard Aubé	47	Correspondent	2 00 p.d.	July 31, '96	July 28, '96	Reduction of staff.
J. B. H. Benard		Copyist	1 00 "	" 31, '96	" 28, '96	"
H. J. Friel		"	3 00 "	" 31, '96	" 28, '96	"
H. A. McMillan		"	40 00 p.m.	" 31, '96	" 28, '96	"
Chas. Leduc		Paymaster, Ottawa River Works	100 00 "	" 31, '96	" 28, '96	"
J Delaney		Copyist	1 50 p. d.	Aug. 31, '96	Aug. 19, '96	"
H. Girard		"	1 50 "	" 31, '96	" 19, '96	"
Godfroi Marsan		"	1 50 "	" 31, '96	" 19, '96	"
H. D. Lyons		"	1 75 "	" 31, '96	" 20, '96	"
John V. Woolsey		"	2 50 "	" 31, '96	" 20, '96	"
Joseph Aubé		Draughtsman	3 00 "	" 31, '96	" 17, '96	"
H. F. Perley		Engineer	215 00 p.m.	" 31, '96	" 17, '96	"
J. U. Bray		Clerk	1 50 p.d.	" 31, '96	" 19, '96	"
E. A. Mara		Copyist	95 00 p.m.	" 31, '96	" 19, '96	"
T. P. Morin		"	55 00 "	" 31, '96	" 19, '96	"
Edgar Pelletier		"	45 00 "	" 31, '96	" 19, '96	"
C. Laframboise		Storekeeper	2 25 p.d.	Oct. 31, '96	Oct. 29, '96	"
J. D. Gareau		Shop. Acct	2 75 "	Dec. 31, '96	Dec. 29, '96	"
J. E. Desjardins		Mail clerk	2 00 "	Apr. 30, '97	Mar. 29, '97	"
Maurice Panet		Copyist	2 00 "	" 30, '97	" 29, '97	"
J. P. Prudhomme		"	1 75 "	" 30, '96	" 29, '97	"
F. X. Lavigueur		Messenger	1 50 "	" 30, '96	" 29, '97	"
D. Ladoucer		"	41 66 p.m.	" 30, '96	" 29, '97	"
J. S. King		Clerk	60 00 "	" 30, '96	" 29, '97	"
J. B. L. Benard		Copyist	2 00 p.d.	" 30, '96	" 29, '97	"

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Names.	Office.	Where Employed.	Salary.	Removed on	Date of Notification.	Replaced by
Nova Scotia.						
George Robson	Caretaker	Pictou Custom House	$ 400 per annum	Dec. 31, 1896.	Dec. 24, 1896.	Jas. Arbuckle.
W. Bishop	Clerk of Works	Halifax Drill Hall	90 per month	do 12, 1896.	Nov. 20, 1896.	D. Hatey.
Prince Edward Island.						
D. F. Macdonald	Watchman	Charlottetown Dominion Building	400 per annum.	Oct. 31, 1896.	Oct. 22, 1896.	Angus McKenzie.
New Brunswick.						
Thos. Asbill	Caretaker	Sussex Post Office	400 "	Jan. 15, 1897.	Jan. 12, 1897.	S. Dryden.
Wm. Kennedy	do	Woodstock Post Office	400 "	April 30, 1897.	April 27, 1897.	Chas. Trafton.
H. W. Bourne	Attending clock	" "	48 "	do 30, 1897.	do 27, 1897.	H. V. Dalling.
Quebec.						
A. Daudelin	Fireman	Montreal Examining Warehouse	540 "	April 15, 1897.	April 17, 1897.	B. Lajeunesse.
A. Filiatrault	Caretaker	" Post Office	540 "	Oct. 31, 1896.	Oct. 15, 1896.	
James Mathews	Engineer	Quebec Examining Warehouse	900 "	Feb. 3, 1897.	Feb. 1, 1897.	D. P. Kennedy.
A. P. Lépine	Superintendent	" Dominion Buildings	1,100 "	Aug. 31, 1896.	Aug. 5, 1896.	Phillip Béland.
Geo. McLeod	Messenger	Three Rivers Custom House	300 "	Sept. 30, 1896.	Sept. 1, 1896.	
M. Grignon	Caretaker	St. Jérome Post Office	400 "	Oct. 31, 1896.	Nov. 2, 1896.	A. Beaudry.
Elzéar Dagneault	Clerk of Works	St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary	1,000 "	June 30, 1897.	May 6, 1897.	
John Bourgeois	Draughtsman	St. Maurice Works	720 "	May 6, 1897.	do 6, 1897.	
H. Lamontagne	Foreman	Lévis Graving Dock	1,000 "	Aug. 31, 1896.	Aug. 15, 1896.	
Paul Raymond	Clerk of Works	Rimouski Post Office	600 "	July 20, 1896.	July 20, 1896.	Chas. Parent.
A. E. Piette	Attending clock	Sorel "	50 "	Jan. 11, 1897.	Jan. 12, 1896.	J. L. Wright.
Ontario.						
John Lovegrove	Caretaker	Amherstburg Post Office	400 "	May 4, 1897.	May 7, 1897.	Richard Elliott.
B. V. Stafford	Clerk of Works	Arnprior "	900 "	Oct. 15, 1896.	Oct. 7, 1896.	J. W. Tierney.
Gilbert Campbell	Caretaker	Clifton "	400 "	Jan. 15, 1897.	Jan. 8, 1896.	W. J. Shephard.
Thomas Murphy	do	Cornwall "	400 "	Mar. 31, 1897.	Mar. 26, 1897.	Robert Conroy.

A. F. Milliken	Attending clock	Cornwall Post Office	75	per annum.	April 27, 1897.	April 29, 1897.	L. E. Bailey.
James Wilson	Dockmaster	Kingston Graving Dock	1,400	do	Mar. 31, 1897.	Mar. 31, 1897.	F. S. Rees.
S. Baskerville	Caretaker	Orillia Post Office	350	do	April 30, 1897.	May 3, 1897.	Thos. Goffatt.
Augustin Gagnon	Foreman	Ottawa City Roads, &c.	900	do	Dec. 31, 1896.	Dec. 29, 1896.	Cyprien Leblanc.
George McGookin	Asst. caretaker	Prescott Post Office	100	do	Feb. 1, 1897.	Jan. 28, 1897.	
Wm. Bryson	Caretaker	St. Catharines Post Office	400	do	do 27, 1897	Feb. 27, 1897.	Lewis, Reno.
F. Parker	Engineer	Windsor do	600	do	April 30, 1897.	April 22, 1897.	
Manitoba.							
Jos. Tassé	Clerk of Works	Winnipeg do	1,200	do	Mar. 31, 1897.	Mar. 11, 1897.	
Northwest Territories.							
A. G. Hamilton	Caretaker	Moosomin Court House	540	do	April 29, 1397.	April 29, 1897.	J. C. Japp.
J. R. Lambert	Fireman	Regina Public Buildings	600	do	Aug. 31, 1896.	Aug. 21, 1896.	L. Rankin.
S. A. Clark	Clerk of Works	do do	1,200	do	Dec. 31, 1896.	Dec. 7, 1896.	Wm. Henderson.
Generally.							
J. A. Tremblay	Engineer	Surveyors, &c., Quebec	4	per day	Aug. 12, 1896.	Aug. 12, 1896.	

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

STATEMENT showing the Names and Ages of officers in the Inside Service who were removed from office by dismissal or superannuation from 13th July, 1896, as called for per Order of the Senate dated 9th April, 1897.

Names.	Age.	Office.	Salary.	Removed on	Date of Notification.	Amount of Superannuation Allowance.	Amount of Retiring Gratuity.	Grounds for Removal.	Replaced by
			$	1897.	1897.	$	$ cts.		
Jules Edouard Verault (superannuated).	48	Copyist	1,000	April 1	Mar. 18	150	.....	To promote efficiency	William Charles De Brisay, transferred from Privy Council at $1,000.
Joseph Ernest Marion	31	do	550	May 1	April 1	....	114 56	Reduction of staff	
Maxime Belliveau	28	do	550	do 1	do 1	.....	52 07	do	
Olivier Durocher	30	do	550	do 1	do 1	.....	171 83	do	
Isidore Champagne	29	Messenger	360	do 1	do 1	....	95 00	do	

Mr. CURRIE.

DEPARTMENT INLAND REVENUE.

Statement in answer to a return of the honourable the Senate calling for the names, ages, offices, and salaries of persons employed, either in the inside or outside divisions of the civil service, who, since the 13th July, 1896, have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation, or otherwise, specifying in each case the manner of and grounds for such removal and the length of notice given to the persons removed and the amount of superannuation or gratuity granted (if any); also, showing the name, age, office, and salary or remuneration of any and every person appointed to the Civil Service in the place of, or as a consequence of any such removal.

Dismissed for Partisanship.

Maxime Dubé, temporary preventive officer, without salary, Montmagny; age, unknown; dismissed by departmental letter on charge brought by member of the House of Commons from his own personal knowledge; removed on 26th August, 1896, upon a day's notice.

J. B. Ryan, inspector of weights and measures, Halifax, N.S.; age, 60 years; salary, $1,000 per annum; dismissed by order in council upon charge brought by member of the House of Commons from his own personal knowledge, and removed on 1st December, 1896, after 5 weeks' notice.

E. Kelly, assistant inspector of weights and measures, and also food inspector, Halifax, N.S.; age, 53 years; salary as assistant inspector of weights and measures, $600 and as food inspector, $300 per annum; dismissed by order in council, upon charge brought by member of the House of Commons, from his own personal knowledge, and removed on 1st December, 1896, after a notice of 5 weeks as assistant inspector weights and measures, and as food inspector on 1st January, 1897, after 20 days' notice.

John Levden, temporary preventive officer, Tracadie, N. S., age, unknown; salary, $200 per annum; dismissed by departmental letter upon charge brought by member of the House of Commons, from his own personal knowledge, and removed on 11th December, 1896, after 4 days' notice.

A. Fiset, deputy collector of inland revenue, Terrebonne, P.Q.; age, 42 years; salary, $200 per annum; dismissed by order in council after due notification of charges and inquiry; removed on 1st October, 1896; notified 7th October, 1896.

J. Cosgrove, assistant inspector of weights and measures, Ottawa district; age, 60 years; salary, $700 per annum; dismissed by order in council after due notification of charges and inquiry, and removed on 11th November, 1896, after 2 days' notice.

J. U. Richard, assistant inspector weights and measures, Montreal district; age, 45 years; salary, $700 per annum; dismissed by order in council after due notification of charges and inquiry; removed 1st March, 1897, after 12 days' notice.

M. J. Harty, deputy collector, class 'B,' Arnprior, Ont.; age, 40 years; salary $400 per annum; dismissed by order in council after due notification of charges and inquiry; 4 day's notice given; removed 27th March, 1897.

Thomas Todd, assistant inspector weights and measures, Toronto; age, 65 years salary, $600 per annum; dismissed by order in council after due notification of charge and inquiry; notice given; removed.

U. H. McKimm, deputy collector of inland revenue, Pembroke, Ont.; age, 51 years; salary, $800; dismissed after due notification of charges and inquiry; dismissed by order in council after notice of six days, and removed 1st June, 1897.

W. K. Leighton, deputy collector of inland revenue and assistant inspector of weights and measures at Nanaimo, B.C.; age, 43 years; salary as deputy collector, $300, and as assistant inspector weights and measures, $350 per annum; dismissed from both offices by order in council after due notification of charges and inquiry; notice given 2nd June, 1897; removed 1st June, 1897.

Customs Officers collecting Excise Duties on Commission.

A. D. Danis, customs officer, acting for Inland Revenue Department at Valleyfield; age, 58 years; salary, commission on collections; reasons for removal—because by departmental regulations he ceased to be entitled to commission when his services were dispensed with by the Customs Department; 10 days' notice; removed 1st May, 1897.

R. Rayburn, customs officer, acting for Inland Revenue Department at Deseronto, Ont.; age, 56 years; salary, commission on collections; reasons of removal similar to those of Danis; 17 days' notice; removed 8th May, 1897.

G. M. Elliott, customs officer, acting for Inland Revenue Department, and inspector of gas at Napanee, Ont.; salary, commission on excise collections, and $100 per annum as inspector of gas; resigned 1st December, 1896, age 44 years.

Owing to Exhaustion of Vote for Contingencies.

A. F. Belliveau, temporary preventive officer, St. John, N.B., division; age, unknown; salary, $150 per annum; 26 days' notice; removed 1st April, 1897, by letter. Not replaced.

John Cochrane, temporary Inland Revenue officer, St. John, N.B.; age, 60 years; salary, $150 per annum; 26 days' notice; removed by letter; 1st April, 1897; not replaced.

G. W. Gridlestone, temporary exciseman, Winnipeg, Manitoba; age, unknown; salary, $500 per annum; 26 days' notice, 1st April, 1897; not replaced.

A. A. L. Desaulniers, temporary exciseman, Montreal division; age, unknown; salary, $500 per annum; 25 days' notice; removed by letter 1st April, 1897; not replaced.

M. Doheny, temporary exciseman, Montreal division; age, unknown; salary, $500 per annum; 25 days' notice; removed 1st April by letter; not replaced.

Fred. S. Spain, temporary preventive officer, Victoria, B.C., division; age, unknown; salary, $100 per annum; 25 days' notice; removed 1st April by letter; not replaced.

Hugh Macdonald, temporary preventive officer, Pictou, N.S.; age, unknown; salary, $200 per annum; 25 days' notice; removed by letter; not replaced.

J. B. Bishop, temporary exciseman, Hamilton, Ont.; age, unknown; salary, $500 per annum; 26 days' notice; removed 1st April by letter; not replaced.

Retirements by Superannuation.

A. F. McPherson, accountant, Inland Revenue Department, Hamilton, Ont.; age, 57 years; salary, $1,400 per annum; retired on account of ill-health; not replaced; order in council awarding him annual allowance of $700 from 1st February, 1897; 12 days' notice; replaced by promotion; no new appointment.

L. A. Perkins, deputy collector, Sherbrooke division; age, 72 years; salary, $440 per annum; retired on account of age by order in council with superannuation allowance of $225.25 a year, 1st February, 1897; 11 days' notice; not replaced.

James Reddin, inspector of weights and measures, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; age, 74 years; salary, $1,200; retired by order in council on ground of age with an annual superannuation allowance of $432, 15th May, 1897; 33 days' notice.

R. A. Lawlor, collector of inland revenue and inspector of gas at Chatham, N.B., also inspector of gas for Moncton, N.B.; combined salary, $1,500; retired on an annual allowance of $420 from 1st May, 1897, after 19 days' notice, on grounds of efficiency and economy by order in council; not replaced; age, 44 years.

W. B. Scovil, inspector of weights and measures, Sussex, N.B.; age, 72 years; salary, $800; retired by order in council, 1st May, 1897, on grounds of efficiency and economy with a superannuation allowance of $288; 27 days' notice; not replaced.

James Egan, inspector of weights and measures, London, Ont.; age, 66 years; salary, $1,200; retired by order in council, 1st May, 1897, with an annual allowance of $432, upon grounds of efficiency and economy; 27 days' notice; no new appointment.

A. Code, inspector of weights and measures, Ottawa, age, 67 years; salary, $1,300 per annum; retired 1st May, 1897, by order in council on annual allowance of $468; 27 days' notice; not replaced by new appointment; cause—efficiency and economy.

G. J. Bolster, inspector of weights and measures, Orillia, Ont.; age, 61 years; salary, $1,000; retired 1st May, 1897, on annual allowance of $360 by order in council; 27 days' notice; not replaced; cause—efficiency and economy.

R. T. Huggard, inspector of weights and measures, Winnipeg, and inspector of gas, same centre; age 62 years; salary $1,400 per annum; retired upon grounds of efficiency by order in council giving him annual superannuation allowance of $560, 1st May, 1897; 27 days' notice; no new appointment.

A. Hudon, exciseman, Montreal; age, 54 years; salary, $1,000 per annum; retired on grounds of ill-health by order in council on annual allowance of $400, 1st May, 1897, notice; not replaced.

R. Nettle first class clerk inside service Department of Inland Revenue; Ottawa; age, 81 years; salary, $1,650 per annum; retired on account of age by order in council from 1st February, 1897, with annual allowance of $1140.41; replaced by promotion in department.

Retirement with Gratuity.

C. J. Redden, 3rd class exciseman, Toronto; age, 29 years; salary, $750 per annum; retired by order in council on account of ill-health, 1st December, 1896, after 14 days' notice; gratuity awarded, $546,88; not replaced.

Other Retirements.

C. Mongeon, assistant inspector of weights and measures, Three Rivers division, age, 48 years; salary, $500; retired by order in council on grounds of economy and not replaced, 1st April, 1897; notice; not replaced.

John Looby, assistant inspector of weights and measures, Manitoba division; age, 48 years; salary, $500; retired by order in council on grounds of economy and not replaced, 1st April, 1897; notice, 5th April, 1897, not replaced.

H. E. Ross, deputy collector of inland revenue and assistant inspector of weights and measures, Prince Albert, N. W. T.; age, 41 years; salary, $700; retired on grounds of economy by order in council, 1st April, 1897.

Deaths.

B. H. Unger, temporary exciseman, Guelph, Ont.; age unknown, salary, $400 per annum; 1st September, 1896; not replaced.

L. E. Tremaine, inspector of weights and measures, Sydney, C. B.; age 66 years; salary, $800 per annum; 1st November, 1896; not replaced.

L. Theriault, assistant inspector of weights and measures, Edmundston, N.B.; age, 62 years; salary, $600 per annum; 1st January, 1897; not replaced.

M. Gorman, assistant inspector weights and measures, Ottawa division; age, 71 years; salary $700 per annum; 1st January, 1897.

J. P. McCarthy, 2nd class clerk, inside service, Inland Revenue Department Ottawa; age, 35 years; salary, $1,400; 1st March, 1897.

A. M. Williamson, collector of customs, acting for Inland Revenue Department, Kincardine, Ont.; age, 60 years; salary, commission on his collections; 26th April, 1897.

G. T. Dorion, assistant inspector weights and measures, Montreal; age, 51 years; salary, $800; 1st May, 1897; not replaced.

Miscellaneous.

P. Devine, deputy collector of Inland Revenue, Renfrew, Ont.; age, 39 years; salary, $400; resigned.

John Giblin, temporary exciseman, Montreal, age unknown, salary, $600 per annum; dismissed for absence without leave; 29th August, 1896.

P. E. Bourassa, inspector of weights and measures, Quebec; age, 43 years; salary $1,200; dismissed for irregularities in his accounts upon 4 days' notice; 1st November, 1896.

P. E. Reicheldt, assistant inspector of weights and measures, Hamilton district; age unknown; salary, $500; resigned, 6th October, 1896.

James Clarke, temporary preventive officer, Brockville, Ont.; age unknown; salary, $1,000 per annum; services dispensed with on grounds of economy after 40 days' notice, 30th November, 1896; not replaced.

J. Huntley temporary preventive officer Toronto, age unknown; salary, $600 per annum; services dispensed with on economic grounds after 10 days' notice, 1st November, 1896; not replaced.

A. G. Plunkett, temporary exciseman, Guelph, Ont.; age unknown; salary, $600 per annum; services dispensed with on economic grounds after 25 days' notice, 1st December, 1896; not replaced.

C. Astley, temporary exciseman, Owen Sound Ont.; age unknown; salary $500 per annum; dismissed for irregularities, 14 days' notice; 1st March, 1897; no new appointment.

Thos. Westwick, temporary messenger, Inland Revenue Office, Ottawa district; age unknown; salary $273; services dispensed with on grounds of economy; 25 day's notice; 1st April, 1897; not replaced.

Appointments.

Henry Jarvis, temporary assistant inspector of weights and measures, St. Catharines, Ont.; age not given; salary $500 appointed vice P. E. Riecheldt; resigned, 6th October, 189.

Michael Hughes, temporary exciseman, Montreal; age not given; salary $500; appointed in place of John Giblin; dismissed for absence without leave, 29th August, 1896.

G. N. Guay, inspector of weights and measures, Quebec; age, 41 years; salary, $1,000; appointed in place of P. E. Bourassa, dismissed for irregularities in his accounts, 1st November, 1896.

A. Frame, Inspector of weights and measures, Halifax, N.S., age, 64 years; salary, $1,000; appointed in place of J. B. Ryan, dismissed for partisanship, 1st December, 1896.

D. Chisholm, temporary preventive officer, Tracadie, N.S.; age, not given; salary, $200 per annum; appointed vice John Leyden, dismissed for partisanship, 11th December, 1896.

F. X. St. Michel, deputy collector, class 'B,' St. Jerome, P.Q.; age, 46 years; salary, $200; appointed in place of A. Fiset, dismissed for partisanship, 1st October, 1896.

Thos. E. Anderson, temporary acting collector of inland revenue, Napanee, Ont.; age not given; salary, commission on excise collections; appointed in place of G. M. Elliott, resigned 1st December, 1896.

Richard J. Waugh, assistant inspector of weights and measures, and food inspector, Halifax, N.S.; age, 28 years; salary, as assistant inspector weights and measures, $600, and as inspector of food, $300; appointed in place of E. Kelly, dismissed for partisanship, 1st December, 1896.

V. Dessert, temporary probationary inspector of weights and measures, Montreal; age, not given; salary, $600 per annum; appointed in place of J. U. Richard dismissed for partisanship, 1st March, 1897.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 11) respecting the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company, and to change its name to The Canadian Mortgage Investment Company.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Vancouver Life Insurance Company, of Vancouver, B.C.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Jameson.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Harbour of Hamilton.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. White (Renfrew).

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. CURRIE. Continuing the list of dismissals by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1896, I shall now read:

M. J. McPherson, acting collector of inland revenue (temporary); age, not given; salary, commission on excise collections; appointed in place of A. M. Williamson, deceased, 26th April, 1897.

William E. Rowan, deputy collector, class 'B.' Arnprior, Ont.; age, 34 years; salary, $400 per annum; appointed in place of M. J. Harty, dismissed for partisanship, 27th March, 1897.

John Winsor, assistant inspector of weights and measures, Ottawa district; age, 45 years; salary, $500 per annum; appointed in place of J. Cosgrove, dismissed for partisanship, 11th November, 1896.

Edward Davy, inspector of weights and measures, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; age, not given; salary, $900 per annum; appointed in place of J. Reddin, superannuated 15th May, 1897.

Jos. A. W. LeBel, second class clerk, Department of Inland Revenue, Ottawa; age, 30 years; salary, $1,100 per annum; appointed in place of late John P. McCarthy, deceased, 1st March, 1897.

C. A. Brodeur, acting collector of inland revenue (temporary), Valleyfield, P.Q.; age, not given; salary, commission of excise collections; appointed in place of A. D. Danis, whose serces were dispensed with on his ceasing to act as customs officer, 1st May, 1897.

A. S. Valleau, acting collector of inland reveneue (temporary), Deseronto, Ont.; age, not given; salary, commission on excise collections; appointed in place of R. Rayburn, whose services were dispensed with on his ceasing to act as a customs officer, 8th December, 1896.

A. Clement, second class clerk, Department of Inland Revenue, Ottawa; age, 28 years; salary, $1,100; appointed in place of J. A. Doyon, promoted, vice R. Nettle, superannuated, 1st February, 1897.

H. E. Ross, temporary inland revenue officer, Prince Albert, Sask.; age, not given; salary, $500. Re-employed temporarily.

John Breen, assistant inspector of weights and measures, Ottawa district; age, 56 years; salary, $500 per annum; appointed in place of M. Gorman, deceased, 1st January, 1897.

H. E. Ross, temporary inland revenue officer, Prince Albert, Sask:; age, 41 years; salary, $500 per annum; re-employed.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Ottawa, 18th May, 1897.

Return to an address of the Honourable Senate, dated 9th April, 1897, for statement giving information respecting persons who have been removed form office by dismissal, superannuation or otherwise, since the 13th July, 1896, or who have been appointed to fill the positions thus vacated in so far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned.

By command.

F. GOURDEAU,

Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

IN CASE where no Investigation was appointed List of Persons removed from or appointed to Office in the Inside or Outside Service, since the 13th of July, 1896.

Date of Removal.	Date of Appointment.	Name.	Age	Office.	Salary or Remuneration.	Manner of Removal.	Superannuation or Allowance.	Grounds of Removal.
Dec. 10, '96	.....	Alexander Thompson	61	Harbour master, Port of Malpeque, P.E.I.	$200 of fees and dues.	Dismissed ..	. . . . .	Performance of duties in a very unsatisfactory manner.
	Dec. 10, '96	John Champion.....	56	do do	$200 do			
do 10, '96	.....	John N. Sanders . .	59	Wharfinger at Port Maitland, N.S.	25 per cent of fees and tolls.	do ..	....	It was deemed advisable in the public interest that the positions of wharfinger and harbour master be combined.
	Dec. 10, '96	Josiah Ellis.....	...	do do	do ..			
do 12, '96	.....	George L. Pelletier..	.....	Harbour master for Port of Matane, Que.	$200 of fees collected.	do ..	.....	Offensive partisanship during late Dominion election.
	Dec. 12, '96	L. J. Levasseur.....	46	do do	do ..			
Jan. 8, '97	....	Sidney Roscoe.....	.....	Wharfinger, Hall's Harbour, King's Co , N.S.	25 per cent of fees and dues.	do ..	.....	Neglect of duty and being absent without leave.
	Jan. 8, '97	T. A. Neville.....	.....	do do	do ..			
do 14, '97	.....	Murray Thaine	62	Harbour master at Port of Vancouver and port warden for Vancouver and Burrard Inlet, B.C.	$400 per an of fees collected, and fees as per Act.	do ..	....	Strong and offensive political partisanship at late Dominion election.
	Jan. 14, '97	Capt. Malcolm McLeod.	57	do do	do ..			
14, '97	....	Telesphore Turbide.	48	Light-keeper at Bird Rocks, Magdalen Islands.	$1,300 per an., out of which he has to pay two assistants.	Superannuated.	$180 per an..	On account of injuries which unfitted him for the discharge of his duties.
	Jan. 14, '97	Peter Bourque.....	.....	do do	do ..			
97	....	A. Groulx.....	43	Light-keeper at Isle Perrot, Que.	$100 per annum.	Dismissed ..	.....	Active and offensive partisanship at late Dominion elections.
	Jan. 25 '97	Honoré Robillard..	68	do do	$100 do ..			

Feb.	, '97	.....	Joseph Brodeur.....	....	Light-keeper. Lower Range Lights, Isle Ste. Thérèse,	$130	do ..	do ..	.....	Left the locality and placed the lights in charge of his brother who did not give the proper attention to the duties required.
	Feb.	1, '97	Joseph Malo.....	36	do do	$130	do ..			
do	1, '97	....	Samuel E. Oldfield..	53	Light-keeper at Pte. au Baril, Georgian Bay.	$300	do ..	do ..	.....	Having been engaged in illegal fishing and conniving at illegal fishing by his sons, he being a fishery officer.
	Mar.	1, '97	Chas- McDevitt.....	44-48	do do	$300	do ..			
do	1, '97	....	Joseph Dorion	73	Light-keeper at N. Rustico, P.E.I.	$100	do ..	do ..	.....	Did not give proper attention to his light, and by his negligence contributed to a shipping disaster.
	Feb.	1, '97	Joseph N. Pino.....	40	....	$100	do ..			
do	8, '97	.....	A. R. Beaton.....	74	Light-keeper at East Point, P.E.I.	$600	do ..	Superan n u-ated.	$150 per an..	Retirement in the public interest on grounds of old age and infirmity at his own request.
	Feb.	23, '97	Lauchlin McDonald.	52	Keeper of light and fog-whistle, East Point, P.E.I.	$500	do ..			
Jan.	19, '97	.....	Edward Quennell...	50	Port warden and harbour master, Port of Nanaimo, B.C.	Fees of office....		Dismissed...	.....	Offensive political partisanship.
	Jan.	19, '97	Harry Cooper.....	56	Port warden, Port of Nanaimo, B.C.	do ...				
	Feb.	25, '97	do	56	Harbour master, Port of Nanaimo, B.C.	$500 of the fees..				
Feb.	18, '96	..... .	François Galipeau...	61	Light-keeper, Point aux Trembles, Que.	$130 per annum.		do ..	....	Farming out the light.
	Feb.	18, '97	Hector Dubreuil....	22	do do	$130	do ..			
Mar.	2, '97	.....	Trefflé Delisle.	42	Keeper of Red Island light-ship, Lower St. Lawrence.	$500	do ..	do ..	.....	Absenting himself at different times from the lightship and addicted to the use of intoxicating liquor.
	April	14, '97	John Irvine..	.....	do do	$500	do ..			
do	1, '97	....	Jeremiah Donovan..	35	Light-keeper, South Bay, Ingonish, N.S.	$140 per annum.		do ..	. .....	Subletting the light in contravention of the rules of the service.
	May	13, '97	Mathew Hawley. ...	.....	do do	do ..				
do	2, '97	....	W. Charles Henly..	....	Receiver of wreck, District of Spry Bay, N.S.	Fees.....		do ..	.....	Political partisanship.
	Mar	2, '97	James E. Conrad....	.....	do do	do				
do	6, '97	....	Alexander McCuish.	.....	Port warden for the port of Louisburg, N.S.	do		do ..	.....	Neglect of duty and failure to answer letters addressed to him by the department.
do	20, '97	.....	A. Pinsonneault	.....	Harbour master in the port of St. Johns, P.Q.	$500 of the fees..		do ..	....	On account of ill-health, for a long time not being able to discharge the duties of the office.
	Mar.	20, '97	G. H. Farrar.....	.....	do do	$500	do ..			
do	25, '97	.....	W. H. McLeod.....	.....	Port warden for port of Richibucto, N.B.	Fees.....		do ..	... .	Offensive partisanship.
		.....	James Jardine.....	.....	do do	do				

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

IN CASE where no Investigation was appointed, List of Persons removed from or appointed to Office in the Inside or Outside Service, since the 13th July, 1896—*Concluded.*

Date of Removal.	Date of Appointment.	Name.	Age.	Office.	Salary or Remuneration.	Manner of Removal.	Superannuation or Allowance.	Grounds of Removal.
Feb. 23, '97	.....	Geo. B. Pickett.....	38	Light-keeper, Oak Point, King's Co., N.S.	$80 per annum..	Dismissed...	.. ..	Active political partisanship.
	Feb. 23, '97	Lebaron Lacy.....	.....	do do	$80 do ..			
July 28, '96	.....	Noonan & Davis....	.....	Sub-agents, Pictou, N.S.....	$450 do ..	do ..	.....	do partisans.
	July 28, '96	R. W. Oliver.....	.....	do do	$450 do ..			
Aug. 19, '96	.....	Donald McLean	.....	Keeper of life boat, Pictou Island, N.S	$75 do ..	do ..	.....	Nearly 70 years old and political partisan.
	Aug. 19. '96	Alexander Currie...	.....	do do	$75 do ..			
Feb. 27, '97	.....	Joseph R. Macdonald	.....	Sub-agent, Georgetown, P.E.I	$100 do ..	do ..	.....	None given.
	Feb. 27, '97	Malcolm McDonald	.....	do do	$100 do ..			
Dec. 22, '96	.....	William Baskin	.....	Light-keeper, Baskin's Wharf, Lake Deschênes.	$130 do ..	do ..	.....	Repeated neglect of his duties.
	Dec. 22, '96	Silas Sullivan.....	.....	do do	$130 do ..			
Oct. 26, '96	.....	William Hayes.....	63	Light-keeper at Port George, N.S.	$100 do ..	do ..	.....	Twenty-three years over the age provided by the regulations when appointed.
	Oct. 25, '96	James P. Foster....	.....	Temporary light-keeper at Port George, N.S.	$100 do ..			
do 16, '96	.....	Cornelius Morrison..	.....	Light-keeper, range light, Darnley, P.E.I.	$80 do ..	do ..	.....	Living too far from light.
	Oct. 16, '96	Geo. W. J. Wiggins.	.....	do do	$80 do ..			
Sept 14, '96	....	Samuel Coulter.....	40	Light-keeper, Fox Island Lake, Simcoe, Ont.	$250 do ..	do ..	.....	Violation lighthouse regulations by subletting the keeping of the light.
	Sept. 14, '96	John Prosser.....	60	do do	$250 do .			

do	21, '96	.....	Henry Hawbolt.....	62	Light-keeper, Beaver Point, N.S.	$150	do ..	.....	Neglecting duty, allowing light to burn out and applying government property to his own use.
	Sept. 29, '96	John Cameron.....	.....	do do ..		$150	do ..		
do	26, '96	.....	Charles Langlois...	43	Light-keeper and wharfinger at St. Jean, Island Orleans, Que.	$300 per annum and 25 p.c. of wharf tolls.	do ..	.....	Not obeying orders and failing to account for money collected by him as wharfinger.
	Sept. 29, '96	Louis Lachance.....	.....	do do ..		$300 per annum and 25 p.c. of tolls.			
Aug.	25, '96	.....	Lemuel Sims.....	57	Harbour master, New London, P.E.I.	$200 per annum of fees collected	do ..	.....	
	Aug. 25, '96	Captain William Bell		60	do do ..	do ..			
Oct	7, '96	.....	John R. Thompson,.	41	Light-keeper, Manitoulin Island at Cape Robert.	$350 per annum.	.....	.....	Neglect of duty.
	Oct. 7, '96	Norman Matheson..		39	do do ..	$350	do .		
do	13, '96	.....	A. M. McRae.....	60	Wharfinger at Pownal Wharf, P.E.I.	25 p. c. of tolls and dues.	Dismissed ..	.....	
	Oct. 13, '96	Michael Haley.....		46	do do ..	do ..			

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

IN CASE where no Investigation was appointed, List of Persons removed from or appointed to office in the Inside or Outside Service since 13th July, 1896.

Date of Removal.	Date of Appointment.	Name.	Age.	Office.	Salary or Remuneration.	Manner of Removal.	Superannuation or Allowance.	Grounds of Removal.
Feb. 9, '97	.....	P. C. Burke.....	.....	Overseer Lakes Trout, William, Black and St. Joseph, and inland waters of Megantic County.	75 per annum..	Dismissed ..	.....	Nearly 80 years of age and does not perform his duties satisfactorily.
	Feb. 9, '97	David Lemay.....	....	do do ..	$75 do ..			
Nov. 6, '96	.....	Joseph Lemieux....	.....	Overseer River St. Lawrence from Mount Louis to Cap Rosier.	$100 do ..	do	.....	Active partisan in general elections 1896.
	Nov. 6, '96	L. Letourneux.....	.....	Overseer River St. Lawrence from Duchesney township line to Fame Point, Co. of Gaspé.	$100 do ..			
16, '96	.....	John L. Smith.....	.....	Overseer portion Baie des Chaleurs from Duthie to to Paspebiae.	.....	do	.....	Large number of fishermen could only speak French and Mr. Smith could not.
	Nov. 19, '96	George Forest.....	.. ..	do do ..	$100 do ..			
6, '96	.....	George T. Annette..	....	Overseer, portion of the Co. of Gaspé from Cape Rosier to corner of Beach, including Dartmouth, York, St. John and Malbaie Rivers.	$200 do ..	do	.....	Offensive partisanship during election 1896.
	Nov. 6, '96	Godfrey Boulet.....	...	do do ..	$150 do ..			
do 6, '96	.....	Henry Jones.....	.....	Overseer, portion of the Co. of Gaspé from corner of Beach to Point Maquereau, including Bonaventure Island, Little and Grand Pabos and Grand Rivers.	$150 do ..	do	.....	do do
	Nov. 6, '96	John Keays.....	.....	do do ..	$150 do ..			
Oct. 22, '96	.....	Horace Green	.....	Overseer, western shore of Memphremagog, in County Brome, extending to middle of said lake.	$125 do ..	do	.....	Taking active partisan part in general elections of 1896.
	Nov. 16, '96	Hugel Ball.....	....	do do ..	$125 do ..			

Nov. 6, '96			Pierre Theriault	Overseer, sea shore, Co. of Gaspé from Fame Point, not including Cap Rosier	$5	do	do	Offensive partisanship during election of 1896.
	Nov. 6, '96		Prosper Belanger	do do	$50	do		
do 27, '96			Gideon Magnan	Overseer St. Lawrence fronting on Counties of L'Assomption and Vercheres, also inland waters of said counties	$75	do	do	Being an ineffective and unsatisfactory officer.
	Nov. 27, '96		Chas. Robitaille	do do	$75	do		
do 16, '96			Walter C. Ross	Overseer, water of Baie des Chaleurs from Paspebiac to Point Maquereau.	$100	do	do	Taking an active part in the general elections of 1896.
	Nov. 19, '97		F. X. Chapados	do do	$100	do		
Oct. 22, '96.			M. D. Clairoux	Overseer, Co. of Ottawa and portion of Ottawa River fronting on counties Prescott and Russell.	$200	do	do	Taking active partisan part in general election of 1896.
	Nov. 11, '96		Dosithe Chenier	do do	$200	do		
Nov. 16, '96.			John T. Dagneau	Overseer, Baie des Chaleurs from Maquasha Point, to Grand Cascapedia River, including the estuary thereof in Co. of Bonaventure.	$100	do	do	do do
	Nov. 19, '96		James Green	do do	$100	do		
do 6, '96			Alphonse Sasseville	Overseer, River St. Lawrence fronting on the parishes of Cape Chatte, Tourville, Christie and Duchesney in Co. Gaspé, together with inland waters of said parishes, and Ste. Anne des Monts and Cap. Chatte.	$75	do	do	Offensive partisanship during general elections of 1896.
	Nov. 6, '96		Didace Bouchard	do do	$75	do		
Jan. 25, '97			Samuel H. Courtney	Brome Lake, Co. of Brome	$150	do	do	Is an inefficient officer.
	Jan. 27, '97		Sidney Sturtevant	do do	$150	do		
Oct. 22, '96			Orra Bishop	Overseer, north branch of Sydenham River, Ont.	$50	do	do	In order to promote economy in the service.
Nov. 27, '96			Chas. W. Evans	Overseer, Grand River, between Caledonia and Brantford, Ont.	$100	do	do	To promote efficiency in the service, he not being an efficient or useful officer.
	Nov. 27, '96		John Farrell	do do	$100	do		
do 16, '96			David W. Edgar	Overseer, Lower Beverley Lake and Tributaries to Martin and Lindhurst and Griffin Lake, Ont.	$40	do	do	Ceased to reside in the district.
	Nov. 27, '96		A. J. Flood	do do	$40	do		
do 27, '96			Henry Lindley	Overseer, Lake Erie fronting on the Co. of Kent, including the inland waters thereof.	$125	do	do	Admitted being an active political partisan.

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT—*Continued.*

IN CASE where no Investigation was appointed, List of Persons removed from or appointed to office, &c.—*Continued.*

Date of Removal.	Date of Appointment.	Name.	Age.	Office.	Salary or Remuneration.	Manner of Removal.	Superannuation or Allowance.	Grounds of Removal.
	Nov. 26, '95	J. K. Laird		Overseer, Lake Erie fronting on the Co. of Kent, including the inland waters thereof.	$125 per annum.	Dismissed		
Feb. 22, '97		Everett Wigle		Overseer, Lake Erie fronting on the Co. of Essex, Ont.	$100 do	do		Incompetency and neglect of duty.
	Feb. 22, '97	Peter Lamarche		do do	$100 do	do		
Oct. 22, '96		Chas. H. McCrae		Overseer, certain portions of waters of Lake Erie, Ont.	$100 do			Failing to account for money received by him for the government, also has left the district.
	Dec. 24, '96	A. Cooper		do do	$100 do			
do 22, '96		Chas. W. Chadwick		Overseer, Lake of the Woods and other inland water of the district of Rainy River, Ont.	$800 do	do		In the interest of the public service and for want of efficiency.
	Oct. 22, '96	M. Kyle		do do	$700 do			
Nov. 16, '96		John Watson		Overseer of the inland waters of the counties of Durham and Ontario, Ont.	$150 do	do		Left his district and went to reside in New York without authority of department.
Feb. 1, '97		S. E. Oldfield		Overseer, Georgian Bay, extending from Alexandria Inlet to McCoy Islands, including the inland waters connecting with Shawanaga Bay, Ont.	No pay	do		Having been engaged in illicit fishing.
Nov. 16, '96		J. A. Verge		Overseer, River Restigouche and tributaries in Restigouche, Victoria, Rimouski and Bonaventure, also the Baie des Chaleurs.	$300 per annum.	do		Took an active partisan part in the election of 1896.
		Charles Brown		do do	$300 do			
Feb. 9, '97	Nov. 19, '96	J. F. Picatin		St. Francis River from its mouth to Richmond.	$150 do	do		For inefficiency, on report of the commissioner of fisheries.
	Feb. 9, '97	L. N. Picher		do do	$150 do			
Jan. 14, '97		John Kelly		Overseer, part of St. Lawrence river fronting on Co. Beau-	$175 do	do		Took an active partisan part in the general elections.

				harnois and electoral district of Chateauguay to the C.P.R. bridge, also part of the River Chateauguay to the Co. line of Huntingdon.						
	Nov. 16, '96	J. D. McMillan		Overseer, part of St. Lawrence known as Lake St. Fran is fronting on Co. of Huntingdon, together with inland waters of county.	$50	do	..			
Feb. 1, '97		Arthur Matte		Overseer, St. Lawrence, fronting on electoral district, Chateauguay, eastward from the C.P.R. bridge and on electoral district of Laprairie and Napierville.	$100 per annum.			Dismissed		Report of officers department that he was an unsatisfactory official.
Nov. 16, '96		Chas. A. Stayner		Fishery officer, province of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, with special reference to lobster fishing.	$700	do	..	* do	Allowed 3 mos. salary.	Office abolished.
Oct. 22, '96		Wm. Cameron		Overseer, Co. of Guysboro'	$150	do	..	do		Active and offensive partisanship.
	Jan. 25, '96	Joseph Davis		do do	$150	do	..			
do 22, '96		Henry Shatford		Overseer, Co. of Halifax				do		Services no longer required.
do 22, '96		Jas. Croucher		do do				do		do do
do 22, '96		Jas. E. Shatford		do do				do		do do
Nov. 10, '96		John Snide		Overseer, Co. Hants, Shubenacadie River.	$75 per annum			do		In the interest of economy in the public service.
do 16, '96		Joseph Deveaux		Overseer, No. 6 portion of sea coast from Big Pond lobster factory northward, including Chaticamp, Eastern Harbour, Little River, Pleasant Bay and Poulet Cove.	$100	do	..	do		For having induced people to engage in illegal fishing.
	Nov. 16, '96	Wm. Aucoin		do do	$100	do	..			
Dec. 24, '96		Jos. K. Rogers		Overseer, Co. of Yarmouth	$50	do	..	do		Taking active partisan part in the general elections of 1896.
	Dec. 24, '96	A. M. Hatfield		do do	$50	do	..			
Nov. 16, '96		Kinnear T. Wilbur		Overseer, Germantown Lake and Shepody River.	$40	do	.	Office abl'sd		Office abolished.
Aug. 18, '96		Michael McCormack		Overseer, Prince Edward Island.	$200	do	..	Dismissed		With a view to increase the efficiency of the public service.
do 18, '96		Patrick McBride		Overseer, Prince Co., P.E.I.	$125	do	..	do		do do
	Sept. 21. '96	John Davison		do do	$125	do	..			
Nov. 11, '96		Morrison Sutherland		Overseer, Province Manitoba	$600	do	..	do		Office not necessary.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

IN CASE where no Investigation was appointed, List of Persons removed from or appointed to Office, &c.

Date of Removal.	Date of Appointment.	Name.	Age.	Office.	Salary or Remuneration.	Manner of Removal.	Superannuation or allowance.	Grounds of Removal.
Oct. 7, '96	.....	J. R. Rogers.....	....	Shipping master, Yarmouth, N.S.	Fees.....	Dismissed ..	.....	Active and offensive political partisan
	Nov. 11, '96	Norman L. Trefry..	.....	do do	do			
do 22, '96	.....	John Smith.....	46	Wharfinger, Hickey's pier, P.E.I.	25 per cent of tolls.	do ..	.....	Active political partisan.
	Oct. 22, '96	Mark Webster.....	46	do do	do ..			
do 22, '96	.....	Telesphore Gendreau	.....	Harbour master and wharfinger, St. Thomas, Montmagny, P.Q.	$200 of fees collected, 25 per cent of toll and dues.	do ..	.....	Conduct rendered him unfit to hold office.
	do 22, '96	Louise Dionne.....	22	do do	do ..			
do 27, '96	.....	Thomas A. Baudin..	63	Light-keeper, Grand River, Gaspe, P.Q.	$150 per annum and $30 for fog alarm.	do ..	.....	Active and offensive partisan.
	do 27, '96	William Bisson.. ...	53	do do	do ..			
do 22, '96	.....	Thomas D. Bond....	37	Light-keeper, Plateau Rock-Gaspé Co., P.Q.	$400 per annum.	do ..	.....	do do
	do 22, '96	George St. Croix..	53	do do	$400 do ..			
do 14, '96	.....	David Lewis.....	33	Wharfinger of wharf at Lewis Point, P.E.I.	25 per cent of tolls and dues.	do ..	.....	None given.
	do 14, '96	John G. Scrimigeour	54	do do	do ..			
do 22, '96	.....	Nectaire Arsenault..	59	Light-keeper at Etang du Nord, Magdalen Island.	$350 per annum.	do ..	.....	Active and offensive partisan.
	do 22, '96	Edward Chiasson...	.....	do do	$350 do ..			
do 22, '96	.....	Frances X. Smith...	30	Light-keeper at Cape Gaspe, P.Q.	$650 do ..	do ..	.....	Active partisan, canvassing and speaking publicly.
	do 22, '96	Francois Le Huguet.	42	do do	$650 do ..			
do 22, '96	.....	Damasse Brisette...	.....	Wharfinger, government wharf, Longueil, P.Q.	25 per cent of toll and dues..	do ..	.....	Active and offensive partisan.
	dc 22, '96	Charles Poirier.	58	do do	do ..			
Nov. 11, '96	.....	John Thomas Munn.	33	Light-keeper at Cape Bear, P.E.I.	$300 per annum.	do ..	.....	Farming out keeping of the light in violation of regulations of service.
	Nov. 11, '96	William Harris.....	48	do do	$300 do ..			

do	1	'96	.....	Hilaire Boucher.....	30	Light-keeper at McTavish Point, Ottawa river.	$100	do ..	do ..	In the public interest as he lived too far from the light.
		do 18, '96	John Campbell.....		33	do do ..	$100	do ..		
do	11,	'96	.....	Honore Grenier.....		Wharfinger, government wharf, Beauport, P.Q.	25 per cent fees and dues.	do ..	.....	Collecting wharfage and using money for his own purposes.
		do 11, '96	David Giroux..			do do ..	do ..			
do	1	'96	.....	John Carberry	45	Wharfinger, government wharf, Grand River, P.Q.	do ..	do ..	.....	Active and offensive partisan.
		do 16, '96	George Beaudin.....		39	do do ..	do ..			
do	27,	'96	... .	John Rae.....	61	Light-keeper at Point Clark, Bruce Co., Ont.	$400 per annum.	do ..	.....	Owing to drinking habits did not give proper attention to the care of the light.
		Jan. 8, '97	Murdock McDonald.		39	do do .	$350	do ..		
do	27,	'96	.....	W. Alonzo Chesley..	.....	Inspector of cattle pen fittings at St. John, N.B.	$600	do ..	do ..	Economy, as it was found that the agent of Marine and Fisheries could do the work without any increased pay.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

RETURN to an Address of the Senate, dated 9th April, 1897, regarding Dismissals, Superannuations and Appointments since 13th July, 1896.

Names.	Age.	Officers.	Salaries per Annum.	How Removed.	Grounds for Removal.	Length of Notice given.	Gratuity given.	Names of Persons appointed.	Age.	Office.	Salaries per Annum.
			$ cts.				$ cts.				$ cts.
F. Perchard, sen	47	Temporary Messenger.	400 00	Dismissal.	None stated	1 month	None.	F. J. R. Stringer	19	Temporary Messenger.	300 00
F. Perchard, jun	17	do ..	210 00	do ..	do	do ..	do .	G. R. Cleland	42	do ..	300 00
Penitentiaries.											
Kingston—											
L. Cameron	..	Guard	500 00	do ..	Being asleep on duty	None...	do .		..		....
St. Vincent de Paul—											
J. Leonard	..	do	500 00	do ..	Bringing liquor into prison.	do ...	do .		..		....
R. Clapperton	47	do	460 00	do ..	Intemperance	do ...	do .		..		....
H. Boyer	61	do	500 00	Resigned..	Age and infirmity		471 21	H. Sigouin	24	Guard	400 00
Dorchester—											
P. F. Melanson	52	Teamster	500 00	do ..	Resignation		None.	F. Walsh	..	Teamster	500 00
British Columbia—											
Rev. J. H. Whelan	33	Catholic Chaplain	600 00	do ..	do		do .	Rev. F. Fayard	..	Catholic Chaplain	800 00
Rev. H. Gowan	33	Protestant do	600 00	do .	do		do .	Rev. F. Scouler	..	Protestant do	800 00
Regina Jail—											
R. Bradner	29	Turnkey	500 00	do ..	do		do .	A. McDougall	..	Turnkey	500 00
Alex. J. Prudhomme	29	Dominion Policeman	602 25	do ..	Illhealth and physical unfitness, according to surgeon's report.	None...	439 25	Thos. H. Charlebois.	28	Dominion Policeman.	456 25

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

RETURN from the Department of Agriculture to an address to His Excellency the Governor General, under date the 9th April, 1897, praying that His Excellency cause to be laid before the Senate a statement showing, for each department of the civil service, the names, ages, offices and salaries of such persons employed either in the inside or outside divisions thereof; and of such persons not in the civil service, employed by the government in any department since the 13th July, 1896, and in cases where no commission of Investigation was appointed, as have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation or otherwise, specifying in each case the manner of, and grounds for such removal, and the length of notice given to the persons removed, and the amount of superannuation or gratuity granted, if any; also, showing the name, age, office and salary or remuneration of any and every person appointed to the civil service in the place of, or as a consequence of any such removal.

REMOVALS—INSIDE SERVICE.

Name.	Age	Office.	Salary.	Dismissed or Superannuated.	Manner of Removal.	Grounds for Removal.	Length of Notice Given.	Amount of superannuation or gratuity granted	Remarks.
Dostaler, L. J. H.	24	Messenger	$330 per year	Dismissed	Order in Council	Gross misconduct	.....	.....	No new appointment.
Seed, D. H.	....	Extra Clerk.	50 per month	do	Verbal notification	No more work	On day of dismissal.	.....	do
Hill, L. D.	....	do	50 do	do	do	do	do	.....	do
Drummond, F. S.	....	do	60 do	do	By letter	do	One month	.....	do
Lee, F. W	....	do	50 do	do	do	do	Eleven days	.....	do
Desjardins, A.	....	do	50 do	do	do	do	One month	.....	do
Martineau, Miss.	....	do	45 do	do	do	do	do	.....	Re-engaged temporarily, 26th April, 1897.
Mason, W. T.	....	do	65 do	do	do	do	Forty days.	.....	No new appointment.
Chateauvert, E.	....	do	65 do	do	do	do	do	.....	do
McDermott, E. S.	....	do	50 do	do	Verbal notification	do	On day of dismissal.	.....	do
Isbester, C. J.	....	do	40 do	do	do	do	do	.....	do
Armstrong R. E.	....	do	1.25 per day.	do	By letter.	do	Forty days.	.....	Re-engaged temporarily.
Morency, Mrs. E.	....	do	1.25 do	do	do	do	One month	.....	do
Hurteau, J. N.	....	do	400 per year	do	do	do	Three months	.....	do

REMOVALS—INSIDE SERVICE.

Name.	Age	Office.	Salary.	Dismissed or Superannuated.	Manner of Removal.	Grounds of Removal.	Length of notice given.	Amount of Superannuation or Gratuity granted.	
			$ cts.				Days.	$ cts.	
Allen, T. A., V.S ..	47	Veterinary Inspector of stock in transit	1,200 00	Dismissed	By letter.	Office abolished.....	10	100 00	Gratuity.
Devlin, Wm.. ...	....	Steward, Halifax Quarantine station...	500 00	do	O. in C..	Interference in politics	6	.....	
Duncan, G. H., M.D.	38	Act'g. Supt. of Brit. Col. Quarantine ..	2,500 00	do	do	Public interest.....	8	.....	
Duncan, G. H., M.D.	38	Quarantine Officer, Victoria.	400 00	do	do	do	8	.....	
Evans, R., V.S. ...	52	Veterinary Inspector	1,400 00	do	By letter.	Office abolished.....	9	116 66	do
Forcier, Jos... ...	....	Caretaker Emerson Castle Quarantine.	1 50	do .. .	do	Partisanship.....	16	46 50	do
Golden, R. F., V.S..	33	Veterinary Inspector of stock in transit	1,150 00	do	do	Office abolished.	10	95 83	do
Hyde, F.....	48	Caretaker Halifax Cattle Quarantine...	400 00	do	do	do	15	.....	
McFadden, D. H. V.S	41	Cattle Quarantine Inspector, Emerson..	1,000 00	do	do	Partisanship.....	17	83 32	do
O'Doherty, Mrs. C..	60	Matron, St. John, N.B., Quarantine...	300 00	Superannuated..	O. in C.	Office abolished	..	132 00	Superan'tn.
Slater, Luke.....	57	Inspector of stock and cars in transit...	540 00	Dismissed	By letter.	do	10	45 00	Gratuity.
Westell, E. P., V.S.		Cattle Quarantine Inspector, P.E.I....	600 00	do	do	Re-arrang't of service..	5	.....	
Westell, E. P., V.S.		Veterinary Inspector, transit stock.....	1,200 00	do	do	Office abolished.	10	100 00	do
Jones, F. A..	....	Veterinary Inspector of stock in transit	1,100 00	do	do	do	10	91 66	do
Gauvreau, Dr. P. A.	39	Inspecting Physician, Rimouski.....	$15 per inspection..	do	do	Interference in politics.	5	.....	
Chalmers, T., V.S..	....	Vet. Inspector, Pictou, cattle diseases..	$8 a day when employed.....	do	do	Office abolished. . ..	3	.....	
Orchard, G. W., V.S.	....	Veterinary Inspector transit stock.....	$3 per day do	do	do	do	10	84 00	do
Hoag, H. G	....	Guardian Cattle yards, Lyn.	180 00	do	do	do	10	15 00	do
Cunningham, W. J.	....	Ast'g Vet. Insp'rs Pictou cattle disease.	$2 per day when employed.	do	do	do	3	.....	

NEW OFFICIALS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Himelman, Jos.....	....	Steward, Halifax Quarantine Station...	$1 per day.
Watt, A. P., M.D. .	....	Supt. British Columbia Quarantine	$2,500 per annum.
Fraser, R. L., M.D..	....	Quarantine Officer at Victoria, B. C....	$400, since reduced to $200 per annum
Abbott, H	....	Caretaker, Emerson Cattle Quarantine..	$1 per day.
Robinson, P. A., V.S	....	Cattle Quarantine Inspector	$500 per year.
Brown, A., V.S.....	....	do do	do
Ross, A., M.D.....	....	Inspecting Physician, Rimouski	$15 per inspection.
Orchard, G. W., V.S	....	Cattle Quarantine Inspector.....	$500 per year.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

RETURN to an Order of the Senate asking for a statement showing, for each deparment of the civil service the names, ages, offices and salaries of such persons employed either in the inside or outside divisions thereof, and of such persons not in the civil service employed by the government in any department since the 13th July, 1896, and in cases where no commission of investigation was appointed, as have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation or otherwise, specifying in each case the manner of and grounds for such removal, and the length of notice given tc the persons removed and the amount of superannuation or gratuity granted, if any; also showing the name, age, office and salary or remuneration of any and every person appointed to the civil service in the place of or as a consequence any such removal. Order dated 9th April, 1897.

Name.	Age.	Office.	Salary.	Remarks.
			$ cts.	
H. H. Smith.....	50	Commissioner of Dominion Lands, Winnipeg.	4,000 00	Retired by Order in Council, 30th March, 1897. Retiring allowance, $1,590 per annum. Mr. A. M. Burgess, late Deputy Minister of the Interior, appointed to the position at a salary of $3,200 per annum. Grounds, efficiency and economy.
B. L. Baldwinson....	39	Icelandic agent, Immigration Office, Winnipeg.	1,00 00	On the 12th August, 1896, Mr. Baldwinson was notified that his services would not be required after 31st August, 1896. Grounds, active political partisanship.
W. L. Orde.....	46	Clerk, Dominion Lands Office, Brandon.	1,095 00	Notified 28th December, 1896, Services dispensed with 31st January, 1897. Grounds, economy and active political partisanship. Mr. R. L. Kennedy appointed in his place 1st February, 1897, at $900 per annum.
Joseph Kildahl.....	54	Acting agent, Dominion Lands, Beaver Lake.	$2 per day.	Services dispensed with owing to the closing of the Beaver Lake Agency 10th October, 1896. Mr. Kildahl was paid salary up to the 10th November, 1896.
C. F. Herbert.....	35	Caretaker, Immigration Building, Calgary,	800 00	Notified 23rd December, 1896. Services dispenses with 1st Febuary, 1897. John Cushing appointed to the position 1st February, 1897. Salary, $600 per annum. Grounds for Mr. Herbert's dismissal, active political partisanship.
J. T. Stanshorn.....	40	Caretaker, Immigration Building, Regina.	800 00	Notified 28th December, 1896. Services dispedsed with 1st February, 1897. Office abolished.
P. F. Daly.....	.....	Immigration agent, Chicago.	100 00 per month.	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 31st March, 1897. Office abolished.
H. Hurteau.....	59	Clerk, Immigration Office, Montreal.	600 00	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st March, 1897. Grounds, economy. Mr. Joseph Daigle appointed at $800 per annum to perform Mr. Hurteau's duties in addition to those of Mr. Charlebois. See following entry.
A. J. Charlébois....	.....	Assistant, Immigration Office, Montreal.	480 00	Kept on for four months after notification. See remarks in preceding entry.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

RETURN to an Order of the Senate asking for a Statement showing, for each Department of the Civil Service, &c.—*Concluded.*

Name.	Age.	Office.	Salary.	Remarks.
			$ cts.	
Hugo Carsteno.....	30	Interpreter, Immigration Office, Winnipeg.	900 00	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st March, 1897. Grounds, active political partisanship.
J. J. Arsenault.....	50	Homestead Inspector, Oak Lake, Man.	1,200 00	Notified 5th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st March, 1897, on the ground of partisanship at the late general elections. James E. Gibson appointed to the position at the same salary on 1st March, 1897.
W. C. Hamilton.....	.....	Legal adviser to His Honour the Lieut. Governor of the Northwest Territories.	600 00	Order in Council 7th January, 1897, retires Mr. Hamilton and appoints Mr. Reginald Rimmer to the position on the same date and at the same salary.
Dr. J. S. Gray.....	.....	Medical officer to the Immigration Station, Winnipeg.	600 00	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st March, 1897. Dr. S. S. Corbett appointed to the position same date and same rate of salary.
James Reid.....	35	Caretaker, Immigration Buildings, Winnipeg.	600 00	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st March, 1897. Mr. C. Hislop, clerk, is performing the duties of caretaker as well. Grounds, economy.
G. P. Clouthier.....	41	French interpreter, Immigration Building, Calgary.	900 00	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st March, 1897. Léon Roy appointed to the position 1st April, 1897, at same salary.
R. L. Alexander....	52	Intelligence officer, Immigration Building, Calgary.	800 00	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st April, 1897. No one appointed to the position. Grounds, economy.
Benjamin Hogg.....	34	Caretaker, Immigration Office, Brandon.	547 50	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st March, 1897. Grounds, economy. Mr. W. Braun, clerk, is performing the services of caretaker as well.
Adelard Hamel.....	21	Temporary guardians, Immigration Sheds, Quebec.	$1.25 per day	Notified 9th February, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st March, 1897. Messrs. T. M. Dechêne, E. Galarneau and Marc Lessard appointed to the positions on 1st March, 1897. Same rate of pay.
Joseph Lepine.....	73			
John Mullin.....	74			
Joseph Turenne. ...	50	Clerk, Dominion Lands Office, Winnipeg.	1,200 00	Notified 2nd March, 1897. Services dispensed with 31st March, 1897. No one appointed to the position. Grounds active political partisanship.
W. J. O. Bourchier.	44	Assistant, Dominion Lands Office, Calgary.	1,000 00	Notified 10th March, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st April, 1897. No one appointed to the position. Mr. Bourchier was appointed on the 23rd June, 1896. Office abolished.
Christopher Young..	.....	Caretaker of the Military and Naval Reserves, St. Joseph's Island.	$20 p.annum	Notified 26th March, 1897. Services dispensed with 1st April, 1897. Mr. Young lived too far from place of work. James Bolt appointed to the position 1st April, 1897, at same pay.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those are only a few of the dismissals during the first nine months of the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. It would take me two days and nights to read the names of all those civil servants who were slaughtered immediately after the elections of 1896. The proscription lists of Marius and Sulla the tyrants of ancient Rome, were not to be compared with the lists prepared after the elections of 1896. Hundreds of men were thrown out of office without any reason being given for their dismissal. The members of the late government never for a moment, ceased to make the open boast that they believed in and always practised the spoils system, and that they were going to practice it. Now, Sir, it is an old principle of British law, adopted now by all civilized countries, that when a man comes into court demanding justice, or crying for mercy, his own hands must be clean. For that reason I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite have any reason to complain if a few heads have been cut off in view of what they did themselves. In addition, we all know that the present leader of the oppositon always was the high priest of the spoils system. We know that throughout his whole political life he practised those principles, and endeavoured to set up in this country a system of partisanship. His regime reminds us of the old days of the Gulephs and the Chibellines when one party had to wear a buckle on one side of their cap and the other party wore it on the other side of their cap; one party had to cut their bread up and down, and the other party to cut it crossways; one party would only drink wine out of a cut glass cup and the other side would only drink it out of a clear glass. That principle of partisanship was followed clear through during the late election. Everybody in the civil service of the government was notified that they must get out and work from morning until night to help re-elect the government of the day. Some of these civil servants in my riding came to me and told me the orders were, roughly speaking, that they were to get out and holler for the government candidate, and if they didn't holler, their heads would go into the basket. Now, Sir, I am not a believer in the spoils system, but we cannot have an efficient civil service in this Dominion unless there is some balance obtained between the numbers of Conservatives and the number of Liberals holding offices. When that time comes I will be the first person in this House to support a movement for civil service reform in the outside service. What do we find in the permanent service to-day? I have the figures here to show the relationship in some of the departments between the adherents of the two political parties. A mere hasty glance over the civil service list shows me that in the Printing Department, for instance, the Liberal apointees numbered 68, there was only one old Liberal of the Mackenzie regime, and 16 Conservatives left in the department. We find in the Interior Department, leaving out the Northwest Mounted Police, 750 Liberal appointees, 2 old Liberals and 90 Conservatives. That policy was carried throught from beginning to end, and it has made it very difficult for those who desire to see a good and efficient service to let things go on, and drift as they have been doing. Take the case of those departments that are now under the Civil Service Act. We all know that when the previous government began to investigate any department, and the lid was raised, immediately there were runaways, a scrambling to Patagonia or the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, on the part of some of the officials, and some of them often suicided. And still we are asked here to keep on a service of that kind, to keep it intact, and retain men of that description, without going into their characters or ascertaining whether they are efficient for the position they hold or not. I think it is an insult to more than fifty per cent of the people of this country to say that not more than fifteen per cent of all the offices should be held by Conservatives.

Let justice be done, let no man be injured who has served his country and who has attended to his business. But, how can the active political partisan, the man who has persisted for years in being an active political partisan, expect immunity from those on the Conservative side against whom he has directed his efforts?

You might as well try to rob a grizzly she-bear of her cubs as try to take an office from a Grit. At the first move there will be a yell. In my own case three postmasters out of about fifty in my riding made themselves actually impossible by their actions and they unfortunately compelled me to dismiss them. I find the 'Globe' newspaper publishing sermonettes at my expense making me out a Herod who has gone up and down the country slaughtering the innocents. You will find the same thing in the 'Star.' I am quite prepared to defend the case of every one of these officials that I ordered to be dismissed. We have heard so much from hon. gentlemen opposite upon this question that it is only fair that we should put the case from our side before the public and that we should remind the public of the great bloody assize that was held by the Liberal party in 1896.

Mr. LOGGIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to reply to a few words that the minister uttered before recess. In referring to the case of Mr. Gaynor he said he understood that he had interrupted a meeting of Mr.

Sifton's, I think, at Chatham, N.B., Mr. Sifton did address a meeting at Chatham. He is a statesman of wide repute, the people of my county had never heard him and a very large gathering was the result. The meeting was widely advertised, the largest meeting ever held in the county took place on that occasion, and Mr. Sifton was the principal speaker. He invited any gentleman in the audience to ask him any question relative to the matter under discussion. I was not present myself, but I believe the information I am giving the committee is accurate. Mr. Sifton in discussing reciprocity, alluded to the arrangement as a treaty. Mr. Gaynor, having been invited by Mr. Sifton as one of the audience to ask any question, arose and asked a civil question. The question was this: Is it a treaty or only a trade arrangement? Mr. Sifton being somewhat deaf was not able to hear, in articulate words at any rate, what the question was and this caused some confusion. He asked what the question was, the chairman of the meeting said who it was that had asked the question and a request was made to put it in writing. Mr. Gaynor did not put the question in writing, but he immediately left the meeting. That is what took place regarding Mr. Sifton's meeting. He invited any gentleman to ask any question on the matter under discussion, when discussing the question he alluded to the arrangement as a treaty and Mr. Gaynor asked the civil question: Was it a treaty or only a trade arrangement? Because of that civil question and because of Mr. Sifton being unable to catch articulate words a little confusion came about.

Mr. CURRIE. What about the question?

Mr. LOGGIE. The question was: Is it a treaty or only a trade arrangement?

Mr. CURRIE. Well, he ought to be in the asylum.

Mr. LOGGIE. Well then if he ought to be a great many more ought to be.

Mr. CURRIE. That is right.

Mr. LOGGIE. Mr. Sifton, as I said, being deaf, did not hear the question, and, therefore, he did not give any answer, or, any direct answer, to Mr. Gaynor, as I understand the matter. I appeal to the minister in all fairness, does he consider that sufficiently partisan conduct to justify the injury which has been done to this man? The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Currie) said that we should not injure any man. I claim that this officer in question has been injured. I do not think the case as presented justifies his being dismissed without being heard. It is the doctrine of the minister that where the Conservative candidate was not elected and where a member is not in the House to present his case the matter should be investigated. Mr. Gaynor asked for an investigation, he was refused an investigation and he has been dismissed. I claim that he has been injured. He is a man somewhat up in years. He was for ten years in this position prior to which he was town clerk. But another gentleman has now the position of town clerk and Mr Gaynor is walking around town doing nothing at the present time. He has a family to support. It is a case of hardship that ought to have some consideration at the hands of the governement. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat stated that the Liberals went to the officials in the several counties and said to them that they must get out and work for the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGGIE. I want to say to these hon. gentleman that that is not what goes on in some of the counties at any rate. I think that as far as my county is concerned the Conservative party could very well have afforded to treat Mr. Gaynor in a more liberal manner than he has been treated, and I would suggest that even now, although Mr. Gaynor has been dismissed, an investigation should take place, and if the case is such that Mr. Gaynor cannot be retained then I have nothing more to say. But, until an investigation has been held I claim that it is not fair to dismiss him it is not in accordance with that high standard of politics that we all seek for, it is simply the spoils system carried out to perfection. I said before recess that after I was elected in 1904 the first man nominated for office in my county, I believe, was a Conservative and in the 1908 election he was out canvassing against me. Still, he was not dismissed.

Mr. BRADBURY. What relation was he?

Mr LOGGIE. Relation of whom?

Mr. BRADBURY. Yourself.

Mr. LOGGIE. Not any. Anything else?

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman knows that so-called commissioners were appointed in 1896 to go around and try these officials.

Can he tell me of one single case where a man came before that commission on a charge and got off?

Mr. LOGGIE. That is not the point, my complaint is that we did not get the commission according to the minister's promise and the request of the party in Quebec. The hon. gentleman refers to cases where a commission was given and the circumtances were investigated. What I want

and what I think is fair, is that this case should be investigated. I think, under the circumstances, after what the minister said this afternoon, he should reconsider the matter, and see if nothing can be done to meet the case, because it is a hard one. I am sure that unless he does so he will not be carrying out the doctrine of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Currie), that no man will be injured. I consider that Mr. Gaynor has been injured, because the matter was not investigated. The government are simply inviting another party when they come into power to repeat this same doctrine of the spoils system. The hon. gentleman repudiates the doctrine, and yet he preaches it, and the minister and the government of the day are, to my mind, perpetuating it or doing their share in perpetuating it.

Mr. CURRIE. Why didn't you start a year ago?

Mr. EMMERSON. In connection with the distribution of increases, I wish to point out to the minister what I consider has been a hardship in the past. The increases to officials in customs ports have been made dependent upon the amount of revenue from these ports. While that may be a principle to be taken into consideration, it should not be a governing principle, at least to the extent to which it has been made a governing principle in the past. There are many ports where largely for export business it is necessary for the officers to devote all their time to the duties of the office yet where the revenue is very small. Men may be employed in such ports for years without receiving any increase while others in ports producing larger revenue receive increases. This has been a rule of the department under both the late government and its predecessors, and I think it is an injustice which should be remedied.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have not yet been able to take up the question of how these advances shall be made, and I agree that there are places were there is little revenue and that the men employed in them should receive an increase, so long as they are performing active service. There is another point which I am sorry to have to admit. Quite a number of cases have been brought to my attention where those employed before 1896, have not received the increase they should have received in the last 15 years, in other words men have been appointed at salaries higher than these officials and have received increases from year to year, while quite a number have received no increases whatever.

Mr. EMMERSON. And I can show you quite reverse conditions.

Mr. REID (Greenville). I feel that all the officials in the service who are doing good work should receive a fair increase each year and I shall try to give every one who is deserving an increase. Quite a few cases have been brought to my attention in which I think men have been unfairly treated. These will certainly receive my attention at the earliest possible moment. I want to be fair with all officials and to give them increases, and I agree that men in the outside service should receive fair treatment.

I cannot understand how some of these men in the outside service can manage to live on the salaries they receive. After they have been in the service for a time and can do their work efficiently, I beleive they should receive the same comparative recompense as those in the inside service. I shall try and treat the officials in my department from one end of the country to the other impartially and justly.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can say that, under the late government the officials in my county and in the adjoining county of Albert have been treated on equal terms, regardless of their political views. In my own case, when applications were made to me for such favours by strong political and personal friends, my answer from the department was that they could not accede to the request because the revenue of the ports concerned had not grown sufficiently to warrant it. I only ask for a businesslike application of common sense in the treatment of these officials. No doubt a great many have been overlooked but the minister will find amongst that number many political friends of the Liberal party as well as opponents.

Mr. McKENZIE. I trust that the minister in establishing these courts of inquiry will remember that their decisions may effect the property and civil rights of the officials charged, and doubtless in many cases their means of living. These courts are to be appointed under the authority of the minister as representative of the King to deal with subjects of His Majesty and we trust that they will be fair in their operations, and guided by the same high principles which guide the courts of justice in this country. I hope the minister will be careful as to the character of the men he will appoint and that he will make inquiry as to their standing in their different communities. In 1896, when a somewhat similar court was established by the late government in my part of the country, it was not a Liberal who was appointed but a good old substantial Tory official, Captain Douglas, an old English military officer, a gentleman who was not much affiliated one way or the other with party lines, and every one knew that Captain Douglas would

give a fair trial. I understand that the men appointed by the Minister of Customs in my part of the county, so far as I can learn, are extreme partisans. In my own county he could not appoint a more extreme partisan than the one he has appointed. He is a good lawyer, a good fellow, a man of good education and standing but he met me on every hustings in the county and to give a fair trial to a political partisan is the last position on earth to which he should be appointed. I hope the minister will warn him that the public eye is upon him and that it will hold the minister responsible for his conduct. If the inquiry to be promoted by the minister is to be a mere pretext for dismissal, then it would be more manly for the minister to take the bull by the horns and make these dismissals direct rather than go through the screaming farce of an unfair trial. The minister should insist upon a specific charge being made in each case, and a copy of that charge, giving the date and the nature of the offence alleged, should be given to the accused official so that he may have an opportunity to defend himself in a fair way. If the official cannot defend himself and the evidence against him is explicit then I for one have no fault to find, but I most emphatically protest against any farcial trial. The minister should have the evidence before him and decide on that evidence himself and not leave it to such partisan officials as I know have been appointed. In the old days, and especially in the Public Accounts Committee, where he was the hero of the opposition, the Minister of Customs always insisted upon going to the bottom of every matter and I trust that in the present circumstances he will act in that spirit of searching for truth which so characterized him before he entered office.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The gentleman appointed in Halifax is Mr. McDonald but I do not now remember who was appointed in the district in which my hon. friend lives.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman to whom I refer is Mr. Duschman.

Mr. REID (Grenville). His name was recommended to me. As far as I am concerned, I have no desire to have any investigation for the purpose of dismisssing a man who is innocent. Certainly I shall expect Mr. Duschman to conduct the inquiry in a fair and reasonable way into the case he has to investigate in the Customs Department, and shall expect him to submit to me at Ottawa the evidence. The decision does not rest with him to dismiss or keep in office an official, but I shall take his report and assume the full responsibility of acting on it myself; and unless there is evidence that I consider justifies the dismissal, I shall not dismiss. The hon. member has referred to investigations held in 1896 by Captain Douglas. I may say that Captain Douglas reported on some cases in Nova Scotia at that time, and officials were dismissed who, I am satisfied, the hon. gentleman, if he were to look into the evidence, would admit were dismissed unfairly. There was another commisssion which made investigations in Nova Scotia. I think there was a man named O'Connor, at Halifax, who was very unfairly treated. A man named McLellan swore that he had been an active partisan and on that evidence O'Connor was dismissed, and McLellan who testified against him, was appointed to his place. Does my hon. friend think that that was a fair investigation. Mr. McLellan is, I believe, still employed in the customs service at Halifax.

Mr. McKENZIE. That would depend largely whether it was known that the man who gave the evidence was looking for the job. If I knew that the man who gave the evidence against an official was looking for a job, I would not accept his evidence. It is possible that was not known.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The person who called for an investigation at the time knew well enough whom he was going to recommend for the position, and no doubt the commissioner had some little idea of that himself. At all events, there is a sample of the kind of evidence taken in Nova Scotia in 1896. I am only citing a couple of cases that come to my memory at present, so that the hon. member will see that in Nova Scotia in 1896 everything was not carried on as fairly as he is trying to show such investigation should be carried on. I consider that we should have fairer investigation than we had in 1896, and I believe that any one I may dismiss as the result of an inquiry and investigation will be properly dismissed, and there will be no dispute on either side of the House that my judgment was right.

Mr. EMMERSON. Notwithstanding that my hon. friend has not fixed any particular age limit for the outside service, he is desirous of appointing younger men. During the past few years, so far as my experience of the department is concerned, in the appointment of sub-collectors, the department has insisted on my nominating to vacancies men who were under the age of 36. I know that some months ago when a vacancy was created by the death of a sub-collector, I was called upon to nominate a gentleman to succeed him and the department insisted on the age limit. I am not going so far as to say that the department should be restricted to any particular age limit as long as men retain their youthful vigour, because sometimes it

is impossible in many communities to find men properly qualified as young as the department desires. I know I had a case in which a man was 60 years of age and they said he was too old for the appointment. I got one who was certainly under 40, but I do not know whether he was under the 36 year limit. If the department is going to continue the rule laid down by the predecessor of my hon. friend, I think it is but fair the House and country should know.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may say that since I have been at the head of the department I have adopted this rule. Take our large ports such as Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and Winnipeg, in the case of any new appointment, the nominees have all been under 36 years of age, and in addition they have been subjected to an examination by the officers of the department. The examination is a very simple one. I think the hon. member will agree with me that the questions we ask are so simple that any young man capable of doing clerical work should be able to pass the examination. The Customs Department is one in which the work is principally clerical. In almost every case we have not appointed an official over 36 years of age, but I may say that you cannot always confine your choice to that age in these large ports when making certain appointments. Take the positions of collectors and appraisers. You have to take men of some experience. In the case of appraisers, you have to take men who have had actual experience in the particular lines of goods they are to appraise. You may have to take a man of 50 years or much older than the 36 year limit, because he is appointed for a special purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite concur in that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then there are other positions in these large ports in which you cannot always find competent men under 36 years of age, but I admit that when you can, it is much better for the service to choose such men. Then there are appointments in the smaller outports where there is not much clerical work to do. There of course you must allow the age to be much more than the 36 years limit, but the chief places where the age limit should be observed are the very large ports where the main amount of revenue is collected. Take a port like the city of Montreal, where $20,000,000 is collected in duties in a year. If you have there a lot of men appointed after they attained the age of sixty or sixty-five, or even seventy, you can hardly expect them, in the rush of the work there, to be capable of doing their work right.

Mr. EMMERSON. And they cannot readily adapt themselves to it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No. It would probably take any man a year or two to get the knowledge of the work to be done. In a large port like that, I claim, it is necessary to start a man in when he is young. He should be given a fair salary at the start, and an increase each year to make him feel that he is being justly treated and to encourage him to do his work well. In a large office like that, there are many chances for promotion. That is the way, I believe, in which large offices like those of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Calgary, Vancouver and others must be handled. I have had to retire some men. In doing so, I have given them six months' leave with salary. In Montreal, for instance, I know cases of men who were appointed at sixty years of age. Suppose such a man filling a position in a customs post office, probably having charge of the mail coming from some foreign country—say from the United States. It is his duty to take these parcels and put on the customs stamps and forward them to the officers in the places to which they are to go. If the man is not able to do the work, he probably lets the parcels go without putting on the stamps. And I believe from what I have learned from inquiring, that we are losing a very large revenue on account of not having proper officials in positions of that kind. So, I have had to retire a few men—very few indeed—who, I felt, were not qualified for the position. I think I have answered the hon. member all that he has asked as to my ideas of how positions in the customs service should be filled.

Mr. CARROLL. We have had statements as to the policy of the government with respect to the dismissal of partisan officials. I did not quite understand what conclusion the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) wished the House to arrive at from the reading with which he favoured us. I suppose he intended to illustrate the policy of the late administration in regard to partisan officials. But I do not see that the late government is very much to blame if they dismissed officials even without an investigation. For I think it is correct to say that the leaders of the late government made no promise in their platform of 1893 or down to 1897, of any great civil service reforms. If they made no such promise, nothing very much was expected of them. But what can we think of a party and a leader of that party who for fifteen years have declared to the people that they stood for civil service reform both in the inside and the outside service, when we see that leader approving the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr

Wilcox)—approving if not in words, at least by his nod and smile of approval? As early as August, 1896, we find the right hon. Premier of the present day giving utterances to these expressions in this House of Commons:

It is not the money of the Liberal party or of the Conservative party which is paid to these gentlemen for their services; it is the money of the country, and the fact that these gentlemen worked for either party, so long as they worked openly, honourably and fairly, ought not to weigh against them if, at the same time, they do not neglect their duty as public officers. It seems to me that those gentlemen who are in the civil service of this country ought to have the same right, as other electors, not only to vote, but to work during elections, subject to certain limitations which I shall endeavour to submit to the House. In the first place, I entirely agree that if any such official is guilty of any corrupt or dishonourable conduct in any election contest while working for one party or the other, such conduct ought to have only one result. In the second place, if, for the purpose of supporting one party or the other he neglects his duty in any way, as a public servant, and employs the time for which his country has paid him in furthering the interests of either party, it seems to me that such conduct is reprehensible and ought to be punished. I would be willing to go a little further than some of the honourable gentlemen of the opposition and have a further limitation, namely, that if an officer is in confidential relation with a minister of with a superior officer, he ought not to take such part in an election as would interfere with the discipline of the office which he holds.

What a change has come over the right hon. gentleman in these fifteen years! I have no doubt that when, a year ago, visiting the island of Cape Breton, he made his promise and pledge to the electors to that part of the country as to the manner in which he was going to reform the civil service, he meant to fulfil his pledge should he come into power. Yet we find hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House saying, why should the opposition kick or howl over this matter to-day because, forsooth, a political partisan is having his head chopped off? Personally I am not howling if my friends lose their political jobs. But what will strike with disappointment the people of this country, especially in the province of Nova Scotia, is that the policy which the right hon. Premier of this country has been promising the people for fifteen years past, he is not going to carry into effect now that he has the chance.

Now the Minister of Customs (Mr Reid, Grenville) has given us the general outline of what he will probably do and what he has been doing with reference to political partisans. He has told us that if a member of this House of Commons recommends the dismissal of any official for partisanship, the official will be dismissed after notice. But what I would like to ask the minister is this: After receiving such a recommendation from a member of this House and after giving such notice to the charged official of the charge that is made against him, will he give that official an opportunity to send for example, a sworn declaration that he has not been a party politician since his appointment?

Now I would like to ask the minister a question, and I want a specific answer to this case. Suppose that a member from one of the Nova Scotia constituencies laid a charge against a certain official and that official was notified and made his answer by a sworn declaration; who is the Minister of Customs going to believe? Is he going to believe the man who has the courage of his convictions, and who states on oath that he has not taken the slightest part in politics either for or against the government, or is he going to believe the written or verbal statement of the member of parliament? Such cases as this will undoubtedly arise. Now I do not think that the Minister of Customs followed closely the speech of the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) to-day, when he brought to the notice of the government the fact that these pledges and promises of civil service reform have been made time and again by the right hon. leader of this government, and by the various ministers of the government and their followers, during the past fifteen years. Why has this sudden change come about? Is it because there is a hungry horde of office seekers, as described by the Halifax 'Herald,' the government organ in Nova Scotia, who are waiting to step into the positions of men who are to be dismissed? This is what the Halifax 'Herald' says:

In every ward there is a group of soreheads vowing all sorts of 'vengeance' on Premier Borden and A. B. Crosby because, forsooth, the government has neglected to make 'a clean sweep of the Liberals' in government positions and hand over said positions to the 'workers' of the Conservative party... The disgruntled heelers of ward 6 are, to quote the statement of one of the most ignorant of them, 'out for blood,' and are 'going to get' Borden and Crosby,—the animus of the heelers' spleen against these gentlemen being the fact that certain of the alleged 'workers' have not yet attained to the dignity of feeding at he public crib.

Are the right hon. gentleman and his ministers afraid of these men described in the Halifax 'Herald,' who are 'out for blood,' and who are 'going to get,' Borden and Crosby, unless they are put into the offices of dismissed Liberals. Is that one of the reasons of this sudden change of policy on the part of these gentlemen opposite, who have been preaching civil service reform for the last fifteen years? The only answer they make is 'You have been do-

ing these things for the past fifteen years. Why, Sir the Liberals never promised anything else. On no public platform, from 1893 down until the present, I defy any member of this parliament to show that the present leader of the opposition ever promised the people of this country civil service reform. He never made any such promise, and, therefore, he had no promise to fulfil, in that respect at least. But the case regarding the present leader of the government is not at all the same, as we all know that he has made all sorts of promises of civil service reform. I want to say to him that the people of Nova Scotia, both his political friends and opponents, will be grieved indeed to learn of this sudden change of policy on the part of his government. The people of Nova Scotia who have much confidence in his integrity as a politician and a statesman, will be grieved to find that up to the present time he has given no indication whatever of his intention to fulfil these pledges ; they will be grieved when they learn through the press that he had endorsed the sentiments, as I said, with nods and smiles of approval, of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) that we have heard this evening. I have not very much fault to find with the Minister of Customs for, beheading a man who has taken a too prominent part in party politics. But I do say that it is incumbent upon the government to give us some indication, some intimation of what they really mean by political partisanship. If we examine the records of the House of Commons since 1896 until last September, we would be justified in inferring that political partisanship did not mean a man going out and voting Liberal or Conservative, and expressing his honest opinion on public questions. I think in a question which involves the wages of perhaps 10,000 citizens of this country, the ministers of the Crown should state publicly and unequivocably what they really mean when they speak of political partisanship. For example, I am a customs official in a certain port, and my idea of political partisanship may be, not that I may go out and speak on a public platform on behalf of a political candidate, but that I may let my friends know in a quiet way how I am going to vote. I think that is the idea of political partisanship expressed by the Prime Minister. Therefore, I say it is unfair to the civil service, and still more unfair to the public, that we should be left any longer in doubt as to the policy proposed to be followed by this government. Once more I would ask the Minister of Customs to give an answer to the question I asked him a little while ago. I have no doubt that he wants to be fair in these matters, he has expressed himself so in this House to-day, and at other times.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I want to say in answer to the hon. member that he is supposing a case. I do not know what he has in mind, I cannot give him an answer about something that he is supposing. If any officials have been dismissed in his constituency, if there are any charges made against them, if he will state the name of the official, I will be able to answer.

Mr. CARROLL. Give a general outline of the policy to be pursued by the government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think I have done that several times to-day, at least I have tried to do it, and if the hon. gentleman cannot understand my meaning, I am very sorry. I do not think I can put it any plainer. If he will take an hour or two to-morrow and read over 'Hansard,' he will understand the policy of the government, at least of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. CARVELL. I think the minister has tried to meet this discussion fairly this afternoon. Perhaps he will be willing to go one step further and tell the committee whether he will be willing to give the officials a copy of the charge they are called upon to answer.

At this very day investigations are going on in the maritime provinces against officials who have not the faintest idea in the world what they are being called upon to answer. I do not think this is in harmony with the minister's ideas of justice and fairplay. I think that if an officer is to be investigated it is only reasonable that he should have three or four days notice of what the charges are. What we fear—and I am afraid the minister fears it too—is that in many cases these investigations are merely fishing expeditions, that they are merely sending men around in order to see if it is not possible to obtain some evidence rather than to give officials a fair trial on a charge which has been properly made. I hope my hon. friend will keep this principle before him, and see if it is not possible to acquaint an official with the charge before he is called upon to answer it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether he does not think the case presented by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) is one which ought to receive reconsideration. The Minister of Customs has stated that the rule by which he has intended to be guided is that, in the case of a county which is not represented by a Conservative, he will always require that charges shall be laid, and that there shall be an investigation before action. But, in the case of Mr. Gaynor that rule has been absolutely violated. It is all very well for the Minister of Customs to say that he will be guided by such prin-

ciples, that he wants to act fairly, that he is going to have an investigation held where there is not a member of this House who is able to give his personal assurance that the official has been guilty of partisanship. But, we have the absolute fact that a worthy, deserving officer, who has been for some ten years in the service, has been turned out into the street, confronted with all the difficulties that necessarily confront a man who holds a public office, and who has, after several years of public service to seek for some other livelihood; we find that man—a man with a considerable family and very little means—turned out on the street without any investigation, without any opportunity of defending himself, and without there being any member on the floor of this House able to take the responsibility of making a charge of partisanship against him. How does my hon. friend think that squares with the profession that he has made that it is his determination that every man shall have an investigation, and a fair trial? Upon whose assurance is the hon. gentleman acting in turning Mr. Gaynor out of office? I understand that he has been informed that Mr. Gaynor interrupted Mr. Sifton at a public meeting which he held in Chatham. Has my hon. friend investigated the circumstances? Has any charge been made against Mr. Gaynor, and has he had an opportunity of stating exactly what took place? My hon. friend from Northumberland is here to-night, and he says that all that Mr. Gaynor was guilty of was that he attended Mr. Sifton's meeting, that Mr. Sifton invited anybody in the audience to ask any question which he thought proper, that Mr. Sifton made the assertion that what had taken place between this government and the government of the United States was a treaty, and that Mr. Gaynor asked Mr. Sifton, in a polite and courteous manner, a question which any citizen had the right to ask as to whether it was a treaty or a trade arrangement. I ask my hon. friend what is there in that which would justify him in turning this man out of office, if that is what took place, and we have the assurance of my hon. friend from Northumberland that that is exactly what took place. Is my hon. friend able to say that the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland is not correct? Surely, if my hon. friend is able to do that he ought at least to submit the evidence to this House, but if the statement made by my hon. friend from Northumberland is correct no one can escape the conclusion that a great injustice, a great wrong, has been done to Mr. Gaynor, and that too in face of the public declaration of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government (Mr. Borden), a declaration made upon more than one occasion, that an office holder had the right not only to exercise his privilege of voting for either political party, but even to attend a public meeting, and to make his views publicly known. Notwithstanding that clear declaration of policy of the Liberal Conservative party, without any assurance from a member of the House that this officer has been guilty of partisanship, without any charge being made against him, which he has been called upon to answer, without the slightest opportunity being given to him to answer any charge, he has been ruthlessly turned out of his office and compelled to seek some other means of livelihood. My hon. friend must realize what an unfortunate position that places a man in. When a man is appointed to the public service he gives up the business to which he has been accustomed for years, he gets out of the way of any other business, and if he is turned adrift the case with reference to the great majority of office-holders will necessarily be one of hardship. That is why the late government laid down the rule—a rule which I know has been acted upon during the last four years at all events—that they would not dismiss any official unless a member of this House was prepared to give his own personal assurance that he had a knowledge that the official had been guilty of partisanship or unless in an investigation the office-holder was found to be guilty of partisan conduct.

Just a word or two with regard to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wilcox) in the very interesting and very unique—shall I say—speech which the hon. gentleman made, in which the hon. gentleman seemed to forget that he was not the Minister of Customs, and in which the hon. gentleman seemed to forget that he was not the whole government in so far as the constituency of Essex was concerned. What is the evidence upon which that hon. gentleman said: I cut this man's head off, I had him dismissed, I was not going to allow him to remain in office any longer? It was that some one, two or three of his committee men had told him that this gentleman had been the means of getting two or three names placed on the register of voters, and, as I am just reminded by an hon. gentleman who sits near me, this had been done before this gentleman was appointed to office. Surely partisan conduct on the part of my hon. friend from Essex could not possibly go farther when simply upon the statement of one or two members of the committee that this gentleman had, before he was appointed to office, been the means of putting two or three names on the voters' list, the hon. gentleman would regard that as a sufficient reason to raise the axe and cut that man's head off without any investigation or charge. I think my hon. friend can see that in assuming for a moment the duties of Minister of Customs and making the

Minister of Customs the means of carrying out his will in cutting this man's head off he has not been acting in accordance with those principles which have been laid down by the right hon. the leader of the government, and by many other members of the Conservative party, as well as by members upon this side of the House in recent years when we have all been striving as far as possible to give permanency to the civil service, and to keep as near as possible to the idea that the outside members should be treated the same as the inside service.

Mr. WILCOX. It always gives me pleasure to listen to the sympathetic appeals of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), but I always have great difficutly in discerning whether he is serious or not. However, in the observations he has just addressed us it is self-evident that he cannot be serious. This afternoon, as my reasons for recommending the dismissal of Brian, I stated that I had the word of a number of reliable men in Windsor, that this young man had taken a partisan part, and that on three different occasions he had been pointed out to me as having been engaged most actively in the election. These statements together with the circumstances that surrounded his transfer from the Immigration Department to the Customs Department justifies, to my mind, the recommendation I have made. However, an incident has occurred since his dismissal which, if it be, as would appear on the face of it, has proven to me that this young man was not just what might be expected from one possessing the very high qualities attributed to him by the member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke). After he received his notification from the department, this young man wrote to me asking for an explanation of his dismissal. I dictated a letter telling him that he had received his instructions from the Commissioner of Customs, and that he had better direct his inquiries to that source. I, however, had not mailed that communication when I met the young gentleman in a personal interview, and I explained to him fully why this recommendation had been made. He asked me to write him a letter with a view of using it with other employers in securing a position. I gave him that and he directly took it over to the Liberal paper and it was published with 14 words eliminated. It seems to me that such an act was not very honourable; it must have been a mistake on the part of the press or intentional on the part of this young man.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not read the letter?

Mr. WILCOX. Here it is:

South Woodslee, Ont., Jan. 2, 1912.

Thomas J. Brian, Esq.,
Windsor, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Your communication dated December 30, has been received, and in reply would say that I am unable to understand why those who were entrusted with the administering of the patronage for the North Riding of Essex, previous to the change of government did not give you your appointment.

You being only a temporary assistant in the customs service, and having been asked by the department to make a recommendation, I have felt it my duty to give my recommendation to a political friend. This is clearly my duty by right of system, by right of precedence and by right of law.

Yours very truly,

Now, this is what appeared in the newspapers:

WILCOX EXPLAINS.

By Right of System, Precedent and Law, says was his Duty to Dismiss Officer Brian.

As explanation of the abrupt dismissal of Customs Officer Thomas Brian and as a reply to a communication received from the officer in the form of an inquiry as to the reason for same, Oliver J. Wilcox, M.P., has written Mr. Brian as follows:

South Woodslee, Jan, 3, 1912.

Thomas J. Brian, Esq.,
Windsor, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Your communication dated December 20th has been received, are entrusted with the administering of the patronage for the North Riding of Essex previous to the change of the government did not give you your appointment.

You being only a temporary assistant in the custom's service and I have been asked by the department to make a recommendation, I have felt it my duty to give my recommendation to a political friend. This is clearly my duty by right of system, by right of precedence and by right of law.

Yours very truly,
O. J. WILCOX.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That is clearly a typographical error; it does not alter the purport of the letter.

Mr. WILCOX. Well, if it is a mistake, there were two communications published in connection with this matter, and the only mistake was in this one he should not have given it to the press under the circumstances. Now, however, that may be I do not know but under the circumstances, he should not have sent it to the press, I concur to the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) with respet to giving a decent living wage to the officers in the outside service. Let me call the attention of these gentlemen opposite, who are so anxious for fair-play, to the following condition of the custos officials in Windsor and these facts I have obtained from the Collector of Customs. For instance, J. M. Beers, has been in the service for 29 years and he to-day receives a permanent salary of $850; Alexander Dench has been in the service for 28 years, and he receives a permanent salary of $800; while P. H. McKeown, who has only been nine years in the ser-

vice, receives a salary of $1,000, and remember that each of these three gentlemen hold the same position as preventive officers.

It seems to me that there is a discrimination. All those who are in the permanent force should receive salaries in proportion to their length of service, and a man who has been in the service only 9 years should not receive $200 more than a man who has been in the service 23 years, when, under the report of the collector of customs, they are both considered expert officers. My hon. friend said that the Liberal party had no policy with respect to dismissals up to 1907. I have here an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Lister, a prominent member of the Liberal party, on August 28, 1896, in which he said:

Sir,—I take it that the principle propounded by my honourable friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the true principle. Every man in this country so long as the law does not deprive him of the right to vote has that right. I would oppose to the very utmost the interference by anybody with that right. But the moment an official goes beyond it, the moment he becomes a partisan, then he takes his official life in his hands, and if the fortunes of war go against him he must have to cease to be a public servant in this country, I say, moreover, that if the government do not do their duty in this regard they will disappoint the Liberal party in this country, and further, they will disappoint certain office-holders because they expected to die officially if we succeeded to power. What is the law on the subject? What are the rights of these people? It is laid down in Todd's Government of the British Colonies: in these words:

But an active interference in political contests in opposition to the existing administration would constitute a sufficient offence to justify the removal of any public officer.

That was clearly the policy of the late government. My hon. friend has referred to the present Prime Minister. But, Sir, on January 26, 1910, the following resolution was moved in this House:

That in making appointments to the public offices and particularly to those of a representative nature party service should not alone be considered but selection should be made with regards to capacity and personal character.

That motion was voted down by the Liberals. Forty-three Conservatives voted yea, and 70 Liberals nay. So, if the policy is not changed the Liberal party have no one to blame but themselves. Under existing conditions in this country those who are in the civil service, who have taken an active part, who have become partisans, have committed offences under the law for which the law provides the penalty of dismissal. That being the policy of the two political parties in Canada, it will be my duty to pursue that policy until that law is changed by the parliament of Canada.

Mr. WILCOX

Mr. CARVELL. Will the Minister now state that he will in future direct that the commissioners shall submit to the officials of the government charged the charges which they are intended to answer before the investigation takes place?

Mr. REID (Grenville). In some cases the charge is made by an individual that an official has been guilty of active partisanship and he asks that an investigation be held. In a case of that kind the commissioner will get the evidence from us to that effect and he must go and see this man and have the person who is charged with being an offensive partisan, present when the evidence is heard.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the minister order investigations without any particulars or charges being furnished?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The charges are made of active partisanship specifying some—

Mr. CARVELL. No details?

Mr. REID (Grenville). If any responsible person makes a charge that a man is guilty or active partisanship and will produce the evidence, if a commissioner is sent, there is no reason why a commissioner should not be sent. The Commission will present the evidence; that is fair to all concerned.

Mr. CARVELL. That is unfair, the person charged should have some information beforehand of what the charge is. I am afraid that in many cases the only charge is active partisanship and even the department has no particulars of what the charge is.

Mr. EDWARDS. Hon. gentlemen opposite might place on file their respective definitions of what they understand as active partisanship. It would be interesting to place those definitions alongside of their policy for the last 15 years.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not know that we are called on to do that; we are not govenrning just now. The Minister of Customs now has the power to say whether or not a man shall be dismissed, and if so, under what conditions, and therefore it is for the minister to state what he considers active partisanship.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member is familiar with what happened in 1896. The Liberal party then had a printed document which they would have some person sign. It was simply filled in and addressed to the minister. It read: I charge So and So with being an active partisan. No charge or information was given, and this was sent to a commissioner and investigated. That was done in 1896 and I can show the hon. member the form used.

I do not think we have had any cases worded in that way, they have expressed more than that. The hon. member will see all the evidence when the return comes down and will be able to judge as to whether there was sufficient evidence or information given to justify the action taken in each case. We have appointed as commissioners men who we believed would be fair in every case. I have had reports from one commissioner, and the reports were such that I felt justified in not dismissing the officials mentioned. We are going to try and be fair and not do as was done in 1896, throw out men against whom there was no evidence. If I had evidence which would justify the dismissal of an official—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was the case of Gaynor investigated?

Mr. REID (Grenville). If I had evidence that would justify the dismissal of a man without investigation, I would dismiss him, but there have only been two cases—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not that imply that my hon. friend is not going to have an investigation in all cases?

Mr. REID (Grenville). There would not be any need for an investigation if I had evidence such as was submitted to me in those two cases. Take the case of Baldwin who wrote a letter last February.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Take the case of Gaynor.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In the Gaynor case the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) himself admits that Gaynor attended this meeting and interrupted the speaker.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He does not admit that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He admits that Mr. Gaynor did ask a question and at all events interrupted the speaker.

Mr. LOGGIE. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If I remember rightly he caused a disturbance at that meeting by his interruptions. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was not at that meeting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Neither was the hon. minister.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But I have had evidence submitted to me which my hon. friend has not. Nor was the hon. member for Northumberland present.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did the hon. minister notify Gaynor of the charge made and give him an opportunity to reply?

Mr. REID (Grenville). If I remember correctly, Gaynor admitted that he was present and did interrupt the speaker.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did he say?

Mr. REID (Grenville). If my hon. friend wants the particulars, he will have them when the papers come down. I am not going into the details without having the papers before me, but I am prepared to discuss the facts any time my hon. friend desires a discussion. An order has been made for all these reports and they will be brought down and we can discuss this matter when we have the facts before us. But I cannot possibly remember all the particulars now. But what I do say is that sufficient has been admitted by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) here to-day to justify my action. The very fact that this official came to this public meeting and there interrupted the speaker is sufficient.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All he did was ask a polite question.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He interrupted the speaker for the purpose of embarrassing him and doing something to break up the meeting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the speaker requested those present to ask him any questions he chose.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As far as I am concerned, I am free to admit that if any government official attends a public meeting and takes part in it by asking questions and interrupting the speaker, that would justify his dismissal. The evidence shows that Gaynor went to that meeting, and I believe he went there with the intention of interrupting and trying to break it up. When Gaynor admits that he went to that meeting and interrupted Mr. Sifton or whoever it was, he committed an offence and I believe deserved to be dismissed and there was no need of an investigation.

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. minister has surely forgotten what I said. I said that Mr. Sifton invited any one present to ask any questions they wished, and Gaynor asked whether the reciprocity agreement, which Mr. Sifton had alluded to as a treaty, was a treaty or only a trade arrangement. Surely, the minister will not say that Mr. Gaynor was not within his rights, especially in view of Mr. Sifton's invitation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If Gaynor went to that meeting, he had a perfect right to be a politician and ask questions or take what part he chose, but he was bound to take the consequences. If he went to that meeting, I believe he went there for the purpose of conducting himself as a party politician.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is very unfair. How can the hon. gentleman assume that?

What proof has the hon. gentleman for his belief that Gaynor went there for the purpose of interrupting the meeting? It was a public meeting on a public question in which the people took a deep interest, because every one was interested in reciprocity. Mr. Sifton was there, not as a Conservative but professedly as a Liberal who felt that on this great question, on which he differed from his party, he should address the people, and he invited any one present to ask any question he desired. Mr. Sifton referred to reciprocity as a treaty, and Mr. Gaynor asked him whether it was a treaty or a trade arrangement. That was all he did. He asked the question in a courteous manner in response to Mr. Sifton's invitation. Does not my hon. friend think he is most unfair, simply with that information before him, in believing that Mr. Gaynor went to that meeting for the purpose of interrupting Mr. Sifton? But here is the point I make. The hon. gentleman has said that he wants the country to understand that he will only dismiss in one of two cases. In the one case, when a member of this House takes the responsibility of giving his personal assurance that an official has been guilty of partisanship, or in the other case where a charge has been made and the official has been given an opportunity of answering the charge. But in the case of Gaynor, my hon. friend has gone outside those two cases. He has simply taken the statement of a man who is not a member of this House and chosen to dismiss him without giving him the slightest opportunity to defend himself, and he has done that, although his leader has declared over and over again, in this parliament and outside, that a civil servant has not only the right to exercise his privilege as a citizen of going to the poll and casting his vote, but also to express his opinion regarding public questions. Yet because this particular official, holding a minor office, goes to this public meeting and asks a civil question which he and every other man present understood Mr. Sifton would be glad to answer, my hon. friend has chosen to dismiss this man without giving him an opportunity to present his side of the case.

Mr. BORDEN. It is a great pity that the right hon. leader of the opposition is not here to-night so that my hon. friend would have the opportunity of denouncing him for having dismissed an inspector of Inland Revenue at Halifax simply for having asked a question at a public meeting regarding the Manitoba school question.

That meeting was held in the town of Dartmouth. The man in question interrupted one of the candidates who was elected. And that man was dismissed without an investigation and without an opportunity of defending himself in respect of the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And did not my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) condemn that action?

Mr. BORDEN. I am not aware whether I did or not, but I know that the fact is as I have stated; and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) is sincere in what he says, he should attack his own leader for having made that dismissal.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The leader of the government (Mr. Borden) made a similar statement before the recess. I made inquiry concerning the matter while at my home in Halifax during the recess, and was told by many persons, one of whom was present at the meeting, that the facts are not as they have been stated by the right hon. gentleman. He says that this man asked one of the speakers of that evening a question. I understand that he uttered very offensive words to the one who was addressing the meeting, and not only that, but endeavoured to break up the meeting by creating a disturbance at the end of the hall. Of course I speak from information given me by others. It may be that the right hon. gentleman was present at this meeting, and if so, I would not pretend to put my information against his.

Mr. BORDEN. If I am not entirely mistaken that was the joint meeting in the town of Dartmouth at which I was present. If so, I can say that no such incident took place at the meeting. It may be that it was some other meeting; it was a long time ago, and I am not absolutely sure. Still, my recollection is that that was the meeting alluded to. And knowing the official as I did a very quiet civil man—I would not believe, in the absence of very convincing evidence, that he should attempt to do any thing of the kind. He assured me over and over again, that the only incident complained of with regard to him was his asking the question at that meeting.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I suppose it would not impress my right hon. friend very greatly at the time, because a few months afterwards he took the ground that it was not objectionable for an official to attend a meeting and ask a question of one of the speakers.

Mr. BORDEN. Quite so. And afterwards this House, by unanimous vote decided that active participation in political affairs should not be permitted to any civil servant. Every one in this country has had six years' notice of that.

Mr. TURRIFF. A good deal of stress is being laid by the Minister of Customs and other speakers on that side on the idea that

in 1896 the late government dismissed a number of officials for offensive partisanship. I am not going to criticise the present government for making some dismissals. I am well aware that when a government has been in power for a number of years thy are certain to have appointed, especially to the outside service, some men who deserve to be dismissed on a change of government. When the Liberal government came into power in 1896 they did make some dismissals. But I know of three cases myself of civil servants who took an active part in the campaign, yet were not dismissed. I know two men in the city of Ottawa, officials under the previous Conservative government prior to 1896, who for weeks during the election campaign of 1896 held meetings throughout this part of the country. And both of these men are officials in the same department in which they were then engaged and at much higher salaries than they had in 1896. Reports were sent in against them but they are there to-day. One of them who was receiving $600 at that time, is drawing $2,000 to-day—a good official; earning his money; I have nothing to say against him on that ground. I know of a case in the west of a government official who spent the whole of election day 1896 in the same polling division in which I was myself. He arrived there at seven o'clock in the morning though the poll did not open until nine. Reports were made against him by our Liberal friends. But the minister in charge of the department in which this man was employed would not dismiss him because the cabinet minister who complained of him was not able to say of his own knowledge that the man had shown himself an active partisan. And that official is there to-day; has been ever since a good official; I have nothing to say against him as an official since that time.

Mr. RHODES. How has he voted?

Mr. TURRIFF. Strong Conservative. He is one of the flat-footed kind that vote and make no bones about it—and I admire him for it. I have given cases coming under my own observation—and I am sure there must have been many others—of officials who were not dismissed by the late administration though they had taken an active part in politics. It seems to me, after listening to this debate all day that either the Liberals did not dismiss many in 1896 or else the party now in power who criticised at that time show to-day that they did not mean anything by what they said because they act in exactly the contrary way. Now, why not call it an even deal and let that part of it go? But the thing to do is to amend the Civil Service Act in the way I shall suggest. I put in six years in the civil service here in Ottawa. In my judgment it would be much better, when a man enters the civil service, that he should drop his franchise and not have a vote at all. I believe that the good men in the civil service would not object to that. If this were done you would do away with much of the inducement to dismiss officials on a change of government. I am quite certain it is not a pleasant duty for the minister, this dismissing of officials. It cannot be a pleasant duty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would almost seem to be when we consider the number of people waiting in the upper corridor.

Mr. TURRIFF. I know there are crowds waiting for office. But it cannot be a pleasant duty for ministers to dismiss officials especially if those officials have been doing their work well. Judging from my experience of three terms in parliament, patronage does not give a member,—nor do I believe it gives a minister—any particular satisfaction. And I do not know that it is any particular source of strength to a member or minister to be obliged to administer patronage. So, I say, it would be better, instead of going on harping on one side and on the other of this subject, to take away the vote from the civil servants. Then when in the future, there is a change of government there would not be the difficulty we have to-day and the hardship because it must be more or less a hardship for a man to be summarily dismissed after he has been in government employment.

That was my view of the question, that you will never get over the difficulty as long as you keep the present system of dealing with the civil service.

Mr. BURNHAM. I wish to enter a protest against the statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Turriff). He proposed to obliterate the Conservative party in this country by appointing them to office and then depriving them of their votes. But he has gone further, and suggested that there should be a deal in this House of Commons with respect to the matter. Speaking for myself as a new member, I am not bound by any precedents or customs, or by anything that may have been said in this parliament in the past of this description. There are other people to be considered besides the members of this House, there is the great mass of the people of this country, who expect us to do our duty here. My view is that if a man administering a public office takes part in political struggles then I would endorse the statement of the right hon. leader of the opposition who is reported to have said that if such a man wished to be a politician he would give him every opportunity, that meant that he

would put him out of office in order to give him full opportunity to exercise his talents as a politician. Now if the argument advanced by members of the opposition to-night is reasonable and cogent then the whole system of law with regard to testimony in a court on a question of the veracity character of a witness goes to the wall. We know that when a man desires to impeach the testimony of a witness he may do so by bringing other witnesses into court to show that the general reputation of that witness for veracity is bad, but he is expressly debarred by law from giving any particular instances, unless given a particular opportunity of doing so. Surely if the Liberal argument holds good that particular instances must be given in order to justify a case, then the system has prevailed in courts of law for so many years with regard to character, to veracity and other qualities, should pass out of existence. It is apparent that public opinion however is the final judge of such matters. When an office-holder has so little sense as to go to a public meeting and get up and ask a question he deserved to be dismissed. Then if he has a right to ask one question, he has a right to ask two, and if he has a right to ask two, he has a right to ask thirty-two and if he may do that in a public meeting, he may do it in the street. So if you follow out the doctrine of these gentlemen of the opposition, you make a perfect farce of the whole system from beginning to end.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not agree with the view expressed a moment ago that civil servants should be deprived of their franchise. It seems to me that both parties have come to a pretty good understanding with regard to the civil service, and the course it should pursue in elections. The principle has been well laid down by both parties in this country, particularly by the present leader of the opposition, who says that if a man is a political partisan he should be deprived of his office, and be given full opportunity to devote all his time to politics. It seems to me that when a member of this House, on this side of the House, makes a charge of partisanship against an official, staking his reputation on the correctness of the charge, that a minister is perfectly justified in accepting his statement, and in removing the official. I say that in my estimation a minister is justified in taking that statement from a member on this side of the House, and I deliberately make a distinction between members on that side and members on this side. In looking over the political history of this country for the last 15 years, I am forced to doubt whether any minister of this government would be justified in taking a statement from a member on the other side of the House as to what would constitute a case of political partisanship. I am certain in my own mind that it would be impossible for any minister of the Crown, in this government, to satisfy a member on the other side of the House that one of their pet officials had been guilty of political partisanship. I have reasons for coming to that conclusion. For instance, take the case of W. T. R. Preston, known to political history in this country as 'Hug the machine Preston.' There is every evidence that he was grossly partisan, but that never made any difference to his position, except to entitle him to an increased salary. Take the case of J. B. Jackson, a man whose name has come down in a very unsavoury way in the political history of Ontario, a man who endeavoured to unseat an hon. gentleman who is now a member of this Houe and in doing so took a course which brought him the strongest denunciation from the bench that was ever made in any court. Now the Liberal party of this country took up the case of J. B. Jackson, gave him a salary of $3,000 or $4,000 in the old country. A member of the former government, Sir Richard Cartwright, stood up in his place in this House, and defended the course taken by Jackson, a course which the judge declared to be disreputable and a disgrace to the country. Take the case of Philip Wagner, a man who held an official position in the Interior Department in the west, a man who had to do with the immigrants going in to that country, a man who was brought before the courts on charges of defrauding those immigrants, and taking advantage of their lack of knowledge, a man who was consequently sent to prison, and as soon as he came out of the doors of that prison, was rewarded with an increase of salary by the then Minister of the Interior the Hon. Mr. Oliver. That is why I say, in view of these facts, that Liberal members of parliament are not competent to give testimony on a case of political partisanship. Take the case of Captain Sullivan and the 'Minnie M,' the position that Captain Sullivan occupied in the councils of the Liberal party after taking a gang of men on the 'Minnie M' to control an election in a certain district. Would the ministers of the Crown be justified in view of all these facts in regarding members of the opposition as competent to say what is and what is not political partisanship? For my part I do not think they are competent. From 1896 down to the present time we have seen dismissals made by the previous government without the shadow of a trial, without the semblance of an investigation. Take the case of the Souris postmaster. Was there anything against the reputation of that man? In the very year he was dismissed from his

office, at twenty-four hours' notice, he was elected mayor of his town by acclamation, showing the appreciation in which he was held by his fellow citizens. What was the excuse given by the former Postmaster General when that case was brought to his notice in the House?

The only reason that he gave us then was that: The member for Brandon asked for his dismissal and I dismissed him; that was sufficient for me. The wish of the member for Brandon was all that was required in order to remove that man.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not the hon. member for Brandon also give his personal assurance that the man had been guilty of offensive political partisanship.

Mr. EDWARDS. No.

Mr. PELLETIER. No, the other night the hon. gentleman who sits near my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) said that the hon. member for Brandon would not come and defend the matter in the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was in the House, but from the former Postmaster General I understood that the hon. member for Brandon gave his personal assurance that the official had been guilty of political partisanship.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is only one illustration of the slippery little side ways that we have been accustomed to in this House in the last three or four years at least, because we have the ex-Minister of Public Works endeavouring to place an interpretation upon the facts in order to convey the idea that something took place which really did not occur at all. The hon. ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) said in his place in this House that the hon. member for Brandon had left him in the lurch, that when the matter came up he avoided being present in the chamber, and had left him to attend to the case himself. The hon. member for Brandon was not in his eyes at that time the white haired boy that he had been some years previously. What is the meaning of all this play on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. They know perfectly well, and no one knows better, I presume, than the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, that there are in probably all the departments, officials upon whom they can rely to do the side work for the Grit party and they are, therefore, anxious to try and stir up a sufficient amount of dust to enable to retain their positions the men upon who they can rely. I see the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) smiling in regard to that. The hon. member for Westmorland, whose name appeared in the Auditor General's Report as having received money for supplies furnished to the recent government contrary to the laws of this country——

Mr. EMMERSON. I was not smiling, nor do I think my name appeared in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. EDWARDS. I mean the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie), not the hon. member for Westmorland.

Mr. LOGGIE. I must tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) that he is entirely wrong. There is not a word of truth in the statement that the hon. gentleman has made. It is not true that I received one dollar in payment for any supplies furnished to the government. There is not a fraction of truth in that statement as a matter of fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. EDWARDS. I venture to say there is not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who says 'take it back' who can tell me what he wants me to take back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. EDWARDS. Do you wish me to withdraw the statement that the hon. gentleman's name appeared in the Auditor General's Report as having received money from the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, we do.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then I am prepared to prove it by the pages of the Auditor General's Report, and I did prove it in this House last year by the pages of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. LOGGIE. This matter was up before. In so far as the name in the book is concerned the hon. gentleman is right, but I think it very unfair and ungentlemanly for the hon. gentleman to refer to it now because at that date I gave him my word that the name was not there accurately, and that I did not sell one dollar's worth of goods to the government. I gave the hon. gentleman that assurance, he was compelled to accept it, and it is very unkind and unfair to refer to the matter on an occasion like this. He is in duty bound to withdraw that statement now.

Mr. EDWARDS. What statement does the hon. gentleman wish me to withdraw?

Mr. LOGGIE. The statement or the insinuation that I sold goods to the government of Canada, and received money in payment therefor. I say the statement is not true, that it is not a fact, that while the name is in the book there was a clerical error, that the correct name is W. S. Loggie, a corporation duly incorporated under the laws of New Brunswick, and of Canada, and entitled to sell goods to any one. Be fair and withdraw it; be a man for once.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understand——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Order.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understand that the hon. gentleman does not take exception to my statement that his name appears in the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. LOGGIE. If you qualify it the way I do.

Mr. EDWARDS. But that he does take exception to the interpretation that may be placed upon these words, and that I am not to withdraw the words, but I am to withdraw the supposed interpretation that may be placed on the words. I do not know in what way I can do that. If his conscience is troubling him I cannot help it; I feel sorry for him but I did not suppose, when he has lauded the Liberal party in appointing men like J. B. Jackson and Philip Wagner, that he would feel annoyed at a reference to a line in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman pardon me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has charged the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) with a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have made the statement that he has charged the hon. member for Northumberland with a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. Not only did he make that statement clearly and forcibly, but he was bold enough to say that he could prove it. The hon. member for Northumberland made a statement very emphatic in a a very frank manner, I think and I assumed that it would be accepted and I think it was accepted by every member in the chamber except the hon. member for Frontenac. I think it is my duty——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Never mind the duty——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I rise to a point of order. The hon. member Mr. Maclean (Halifax) will be good enough to take his seat.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). If I am out of order I will take my seat and if I am not I shall not take my seat.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am rising to a point of order.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think, Mr. Chairman, that points of order are settled one at a time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not at all; a gentleman may be out of order in rising to a point of order.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have the floor.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has risen to a point of order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman is out of order. An hon. mem- is not permitted——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). An hon. member is not——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) is just stating his point of order. I understand the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence also intends speaking to a point of order. The hon. member for Halifax is stating his point of order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) is not stating a point of order; he is making a speech.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I can complete my statement by saying that I submit to you, Sir, and to the committee that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) should accept the explanation made by the hon. member for Northumberland. I think the hon. member for Frontenac hardly does justice to himself if he does not make some explanation or withdaw the statement that he has made.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. EDWARDS. I presume I have the right to speak on a point of order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am responsible for the words I utter and I do not wish to avoid my responsibility, but I am not responsible, thank Heaven, for the understanding of hon. gentlemen opposite. I did not say what the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) alleges I said, and 'Hansard' will bear me out. What I did say, and what I am prepared to stand by, I shall repeat, and if Mr. Chairman rules that the statement I am about to make, which I believe is identical with the statement I made a moment ago, is out of order, I shall certainly withdraw at once. I said that the Auditor General's Report said that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) had received money

for goods supplied. I did not say he had received that money; I said the Auditor General's Report said so, and the Auditor General's Report does say so and he himself admitted it, but he said that the Auditor General's Report was wrong. It is a quarrel between the Auditor General and the hon. gentleman, not between the hon. gentleman and me. However, there was no correction made of the Auditor General's Report until after the matter was brought up in the House, as is a well known fact. I might ask him several questions as to whether he is a member of the firm and directly interested, but I have no wish to go into that, and I don't care whether he got the money or not. Mr. Chairman is my remark in reference to the Auditor General's Report out of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not consider that the hon. gentleman is out of order; he can proceed.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was probably dozing when I made the statement in the first place, but, having heard the statement in the second place now, no one knows better than he does that I was not out of order although he was. Referring to the dismissal of the Souris postmaster, I quote for the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) the words of the then Postmaster General :

This is the statement I have to make regarding the postmaster at Souris. When a statement is made to me by an honourable gentleman occupying a very prominent position in the House and who formerly was a member of the cabinet such as the honourable member for Brandon that a certain officer had taken part in the contest against him, my duty was to accept his word and take action against that officer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is almost exactly what I said.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, 'almost exactly' like hundreds of other statements made by the hon. gentleman, with the word 'almost' written in capital letters and underscored. That is the way to take the hon. member's statements—almost exactly—but you can leave the word 'exactly' out altogether and say 'altogether wrong.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did I not say that the Postmaster General had stated he had dismissed this official upon the assurance of the member for Brandon that he had been guilty of offensive political partisanship.

Mr. EDWARDS. But did he say it was to his personal knowledge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To his personal knowledge, yes. How does the report just read by the hon. gentleman differ from the statement I made.

Mr. EDWARDS. I shall be happy to state the difference. The difference lies in this, that my hon. friend said the member for Brandon stated 'on his own personal knowledge,' but the member for Brandon stated nothing of the kind. He simply asked for the dismissal of the official and he did not say he knew of his personal knowledge that the official was guilty of political partisanship.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member just read that the member for Brandon stated this official had taken an active part in the election against him.

Mr. EDWARDS. We are merely taking up time and I might as well take up a piece of it as any one else and so I will read the statement again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is dreadful to obstruct the estimates.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will be perfectly willing to sit down and let the estimates go through if the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) will give the same undertaking.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Read the statement again and then the estimate can go through.

Mr. EDWARDS. This will be the second time I have read it and I have no doubt that after a second reading of it the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley), like the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), will be able to understand it. Here is is :

This is the statement I have to make regarding the postmaster at Souris. When a statement is made to me by an honourable gentleman occupying a very prominent position in the House and who formerly was a member of the cabinet such as the honourable member for Brandon that a certain officer had taken part in the contest against him, my duty was to accept his word and take action against that officer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is not one word in regard to 'his personal knowledge.' How do hon. gentlemen opposite square their position with regard to their 'hear, hears' now with the position they have been taking to-night. They have been endeavouring to impress on the ministers that they should have ironclad and copperplate rules that a member should put it down in writing and state to the minister that he knew of his personal knowledge that such an officer was guilty, before they take action against that officer. Why are they asking members of the present government to adopt a course which they themselves know well is entirely contrary to the course adopted by themselves when in office. Is there anything approaching consistency in that? It sits with very bad grace on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite to attempt to put on an air of right-

eous indignation, because of any dismissals which have occurred in the service since the 21st September last. I can understand some hon. gentlemen taking the position they do, but for the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) to get on his feet in this House and pose as an apostle of political purity is more than I can understand, because it is so entirely contrary to his past record in this House.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I differ so acutely and so frequently with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that it gives me very great pleasure to say that I agree, to the extent of a small vulgar fraction, with what he has uttered to-night. I am in agreement with him as to the undesirability of disfranchising civil servants. In the rest of his speech he has given us another evidence of his unique ability in this House to pour forth vitriolic and partisan rhetoric which will never help any cause in favour of which he speaks. I rose for a very practical purpose. I sympathize sincerely with the Minister of Customs in having to bear the brunt of this wholesale debate upon dismissals. I think the House and the country are indebted to him for the bluff honesty with which he has stated the position of the government so far as he is concerned.

There can be no doubt whatever about what he means. He does not put it quite so crudely as the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox), he has managed to avoid the knife, at least in expression, but he means the knife all the same, and it is a matter of thankfulness whether it is axe or knife or tomahawk, that we know what the ministers and individuals are after.

Having said that word of sympathy, I would add that I had a practical object in rising, and that is that I do not know that we can get much further forward by the prolongation of this discussion. We understand one another and we will have to get on with the business of the country. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite, from the right hon. the Prime Minister downwards, have recourse in such wholesale' fashion to the 'tu quoque argument. I know that this House is very resentful of egotism, but I may say that there is at least one member against whom the (tu quo) argument does not prevail. This is my fourth session in the Canadian parliament and I have yet to make my first recommendation of the dismissal of any one. In the west we are expanding very rapidly and I have recommended the appointment of many postmasters. In the majority of cases I did not know the politics of those I recommended, no great virtue on my part because many of them from below the line did not have any particular politics. In

1908, when I fought my first contest, a gentleman came to a meeting of mine and roared like a bull of Bashan. He was the most virulent Tory in a public meeting I ever met. I could have no doubt as to how his vote and influence were going. Two years later there was a vacancy in a post office caused by this gentleman taking over the store at his place and the old postmaster recommended him for the postmastership. I found it consistent with my view of politics to appoint this bull of Bashan and I recommended his appointment as postmaster. I did it with my eyes open. In referring to him in this way, I have no animus, he would laugh at the matter for we in the west live on broader prairies and breathe freer air, we are not dominated by the prejudices which find a resting place in the bosom of the hon. member for Frontenac. I went to have tea during the last contest with my friend knowing he would oppose me in any way he could. I preferred no charge against him when he opposed the Liberal government nor would I prefer a charge against him for supporting a Conservative government. Canadian public life will be better and the standard of members of parliament and politics will be better when that good old example brought here from England is followed by the whole country.

We had an hour and a half's reading exercise from the hon. member from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) which was only an extended effort at what has been the whole argument on the other side, an argument that the logicians hold in very slight regard, that is the 'tu quoque' argument. We have heard nothing yet, but surely that argument, always weak, is particularly weak in this case. For what do hon. gentlemen say? When they use this 'tu quoque' argument they say: We will follow that for which we condemned you a few years or months ago. Surely that is an impossible position to sustain, a position which we must all want removed from our public life. Just think of the highest intelligence of Canada—we are bound to assume that we have the highest intelligence of Canada on the government benches because they have been returned by the majority of the people of Canada—having nothing better to defend their political action by than the statement in so many words: We are prepared to follow what we condemned in you.

I was surprised beyond measure at my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in his very brief incursion into this debate giving his imprimateur to that line of argument. What did his short incursion into this debate amount to? He said: It is very true that I have expressed certain ideas different from that on which we are acting, but when we proposed to alter the

existing system we were voted down. But we cannot vote him down now. Is his argument that he held those views when he was leading a minority, honestly and sincerely, but that he cannot give force to those views now that he is supported by a majority? I never heard of such a rule for the political conduct of a political party in any civilized country under the sun. What is the ordinary action of a political minority? It is to take logical, sincere, and strong ground in which it believes and to be voted down, but the moment it comes into power, having a majority, surely it is to give effect not to the views which voted it down, but to the views which are now in a majority. That was the position of the Prime Minister. In other words, he has forgotten that he has passed into power, he thinks he is yet in opposition and he is yet criticising the old government, forsooth he fails to recognize that being in power the very first expectation the country has of him is that he will carry into effect the principles for which he contended so long when he was in the minority. What the government failed to recognized is that they will not be expected by the country to follow the example of their predecessors. What the country will expect from them is that they will fulfil their own pledges and live up to their own principles and platforms. That is what the country will look for from them, and I am bound to say I am disappointed and I think that a number of people who formed an honest opinion about my hon. friend the Prime Minister that he was sincere in everything he said about the civil service, will be disappointed at an attitude such as he took here to-night and is allowing his ministers to take. I have said sufficient to indicate where I stand on this question; I do not think we will get any further forward by a further discussion. We are indebted to my hon. friend for stating so honestly where he stands. I think the members of the government realize that it is an immense departure from the passage quoted from the speech of the Prime Minister in the first session he came to the House. We are indebted to our hon. friends for stating so honestly where they stand. I do not think if they reflect on the arguments they have brought forward they will be satisfied with that position. I hope they will proceed at as early a day as possible to put the outside service on the same basis as the inside. When they bring forward a fair measure of that kind, embodying a fair and honest endeavour to put the whole civil service of Canada on the same basis as the civil service of the old country, I, at any rate, will give them most hearty and non-partisan support.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My hon. friend has referred to the system prevailing in the old country. But I would ask him if a civil servant in the old country were to depart from the law as laid down by the Civil Service Commission of the government, and took an active part in politics, what would be his fate. He would be dismissed, would he not?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). The question is a very difficult one to answer because the system in England has been so long in vogue there that when once appointed a civil servant fully understands that he must keep aloof from taking any active part in politics, and I would urge on the government that if they would bring our law into such a shape that a similar result would follow here, we would be saved all these discussions.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does not my hon. friend the Minister of Militia think that if a civil servant in the old country were charged with any political offence, that charge would be submitted to him in specific language, and he would be given the opportunity to defend himself.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am not troubling myself with thinking anything about what does not concern me, particularly in public matters at present.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I appeal to the Minister of Militia to say whether in a case such as happened at Coaticook in the province of Quebec, in which a customs officer had protested publicly against disloyal sentiments that were uttered by politicians in that county, he would for that reason dismiss him from office. I would ask the Minister of Militia to say whether he would approve of such dismissal or not, remembering that all the offence this man committed was simply this that he had seen certain staments in the public press which he considered disloyal, and were read here to-day—my hon. friend knows that they were—such as boring holes in the British flag in order that we might breath the air of liberty—and had protested against such language used by public men on a public platform. For that reason he was dismissed from a position he held in the customs. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Militia to give the expression of his opinion with regard to that incident.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The reference made this afternoon was just as distinct and clear as that which the hon. gentleman has made now, and I challenge any one to show what he really means. I have not read the article in question, and I will require a good deal more evidence than has been presented to me by the hon. gentleman to understand the situation. I do re-

member something about shooting holes in the flag, but I also remember something about the navy being established to bring England to time because she was not doing justice in the boundary award. I have also a distinct recollection of another statement made in 1896 when certain gentlemen, high in the ranks of the Liberal party, declared that the Tory party was voting money to take our dear boys from the side roads of the province of Quebec and other parts of the Dominion to fight Britain's battles all over the world.

An hon. MEMBER. Who were they?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They were the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and every man jack of the great Liberal party in the province of Quebec. I do not know that my hon. friend grew eloquent over the seriousness of that charge. I have not had the privilege of reading up the case to which he refers, but I shall study it at my leisure, and have a better understanding of it than I could gather from my hon. friend's remarks.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The hon. gentleman has made a very long harangue in answer to a very simple question.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have not heard of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Let me suppose a case, without troubling the House with the evidence, which I think will be clear enough even for my hon. friend. Suppose the statement were made that it was necessary to bore holes in the British flag in order to breath the air of liberty, and supposing a public servant, on hearing that statement made on a public platform, or even in the press, protested publicly against it. Would my hon. friend dismiss him from the public service for having made the protest, which he considered it his duty to do as a Canadian citizen? That is a simple question.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have not heard the question yet.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Evidently I cannot extract an answer from my hon. friend. I am glad the right hon. the First Minister (Mr. Borden) is in his place. I do not think he feels very comfortable over the position his ministers are taking as contrasted with the attitude he has taken himself with regard to this very important matter. It has been pointed out over and over again to this House that the First Minister entered parliament as a champion of civil service reform. His first speech was delivered on that question, and at various times since, in his speeches and manifestos, he has declared himself in favour of a forward step in regard to the civil service. Now that he has attained power, the people expect him to keep his word. Is he ready now with a strong majority at his back, to put into force the principles he advocated when in opposition. I have not at present all the manifestos my hon. friend issued to the people of this country, but I have one of them here. It is called the Halifax platform—a Liberal Conservative platform laid down by R. L. Borden, opposition leader at Halifax, August 20, 1907. There can be no doubt about this being his platform because his photograph is on the other side of the leaf, and the very second plank in this platform is in these words: 'The appointment of public officials upon consideration of capacity and personal character, and not of political services alone.' That is a good principle, and I would expect my right hon. friend to honour it. But what happened? You will remember that a jollification was held at Halifax in November last, and a sort of Belshazzar's feast was going on there. During the time this was going on the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) was in Halifax. Certain parties drew his attention to the fact that there was an official, an inspector of a public building that was in course of erection at Stellarton, N.S., in conection with the Railways Department, by the name of Faulkner, who might be dismissed to make room for a heeler. Faulkner was a good officer, no complaint has been made against him, but the Minister of Railways was apparently urged by this hungry horde referred to in the Halifax 'Herald,' to dismiss this man.

The Minister of Railways surrendered to 'the hungry hordes' referred to by the Halifax 'Herald.' By telegram, it appears he dismissed Mr. Faulkner and appointed a man named John Fraser in his place. We have found out from the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) who this Mr. John Fraser is. It was pointed out that Mr. Fraser was formerly in the employ of the Dominion of Canada as postmaster of Stellarton, and was dismissed for a reason which was given in this House by the Postmaster General. The following is the reason:

> Serious irregularities had occurred in conection with the postmaster's accounts which led to his renoval from office.

As a matter of fact this man was dismissed from office at Stellarton for the reason that he could not account for the money he had received in connection with the post office. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has mentioned the case of Philip Wagner. This case is a little like it only more aggravated. The late government was in power for fourteen years, and my hon. friend from Frontenac was able to pick out one case of a man who had misconducted himself in public office and was

put back into office a few years later. But hon. gentlemen opposite were hardly warm in their seats, they had not been in office more than a month, when this appointment of Mr. Fraser was made. We would not expect decay to set in so early. One of the very first acts of the Minister of Railways was to appoint a man who had been dismissed from a public position of trust to another position in which he had control of the expenditure of some $30,000 under the Railway Department. Now, that it strikes me, is not on all-fours with the declaration of my right hon. friend in his Halifax platform:—

The appointment of public officials upon considerations of capacity and personal character and not of party services alone.

This man, Fraser, I admit, was an energetic worker for the Tory party. He was doing everything he could for them, and I have no doubt he voted for them. But I would like my right hon. friend to tell the house how he squares the appointment of Mr. Fraser to the position of inspector at Stellarton with his declaration in his Halifax platform.

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). Will the Minister of Customs, at a future day, furnish me with appointments made at the port of Halifax with the ages of the appointees?

Mr. REID. (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. KYTE. What instructions have been issued to the commissioners appointed to investigate charges of partisanship?

Mr. REID. (Grenville). When we receive a charge against an official of active partisanship, we send the information to the commissioner, who will take it up with those who have made the charge and will notify the official in order that he may be present when the evidence is taken. Everything will be done openly and above board and the official will have every opportunity of hearing the evidence that may be given against him. That evidence will be forwarded to Ottawa where I will look into it, and I shall have to decide upon the evidence whether to take action or not.

Mr. KYTE. Are we to understand that partisanship, according to the minister, relates to conduct in the Dominion political affairs?

Mr. REID. (Grenville). I will take that into consideration in any case submitted. I have to take the evidence that is given.

Mr. KYTE. I would like to know from the minister now if he will be good enough to state it, whether these charges should relate to the conduct of officials with respect to federal elections day.

Mr. REID. (Grenville). So far as I am concerned, if, while a man has occupied an office under the Dominion government, he has taken part in provincial elections, I think he should be dismissed.

Mr. KYTE. The whole scope of the discussion points to the fact that if civil servants have not placed themselves in a position hostile to the present government, they have not forfeited the confidence of the government. The issues pertaining to the provincial and municipal elections are vastly different from those in federal politics. If a civil servant exercises his right in regard to provincial or municipal elections in which the issue are not those of federal politics, I would like to know from the minister if he would dismiss that official.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I will follow the resolution passed in this House, and it covers provincial as well as Dominion elections. The position is clear; an official can be one of two things; he can be an official or he can be a politician. If the evidence shows that he has taken part in a provincial or dominion election, he will be dismissed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Taken part on either one side or the other?

Mr. CARVELL. While it may depart from the present scope of debate I would like to know if the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) would feel like taking the same ground as the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid, Grenville)?

Mr. PELLETIER. I think I have explained pretty well what my views are.

Mr. CARVELL. I may not have been here at the time. Therefore, I would be much obliged if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pelletier) would explain again. Would he take the ground that an official of his department taking part in a provincial election should be dismissed from office?

Mr. PELLETIER. We all move by one light in this matter. We follow the resolution passed by this House, and it covers provincial as well as Dominion elections.

Mr. CARVELL. I am glad to have that declaration from the Postmaster General.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am trying to keep as many postmasters as I can. But many took part in the election knowing that this House had solemnly declared that they should not do so.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) think that when an official wastes time which he is paid to devote to the service of the Crown—wastes it in provincial as well as Dominion elections—there is double ground for dismissing him?

Mr. CARVELL. As a rule work done in elections is done after business hours, and therefore I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) can be serious in putting such a question.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to make another request to the Minister of Customs—to give to the committee the age of the gentleman appointed in Windsor, Ontario, Mr. McHugh—the age furnished by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) in recommending his appointment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Certainly, I will be glad to do so.

Mr. McKENZIE. I trust that the Minister of Customs appreciates the point I made with regard to procedure in these inquiries. I was urging that when inquiry is made into the conduct of an individual, that individual should have fair notice of what the charge is. I am afraid that possibly I did not impress the Minister of Customs, and so I make my statement in the presence of the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who, I am sure, with his vast experience in inquiries of all kinds as one of the leading lawyers of the Dominion, will appreciate the importance of it, that any trial is a farce unless the person tried has the best knowledge that can be given him in advance of the nature of the matter for which he is to be tried.

I, therefore, submit again to the minister that any charges that are made should be specific, and a fair opportunity should be given to the official to answer the charge. I think also that no charge should be made beyond the previous election. My experience has been that the previous government, in making an inquiry, never went back beyond one election. I hope the Minister of Customs will put some limitation to this inquiry, and not go back to the Garden of Eden looking for troubles.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman was once a judge, and may be supposed still to have a judicial mind. He thinks that no inquiry should go back beyond the previous election. But cannot he realize that if the people were right on the 21st of September, then this government ought to have been in power at least eleven years ago; and if a man obstructed them eleven years ago and seven years ago, as well as three years ago, he ought to be trebly dismissed.

Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and preventive service, including salaries and expenses in connection with the Board of Customs, $175,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my right hon. friend will agree that the House might cease its labour now, at half past eleven o'clock.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There are only two or three more items here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will realize that there has been a good deal of speaking on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) thought it necessary to give a great deal of information in a permanent form which he has placed upon the 'Hansard,' where it may be read in the dim and distant future. I am sure that nothing will be gained by going on to-night, because several gentlemen desire to speak on the other items.

Mr. BORDEN. We might go on and finish all the items but one, and then this discussion which my hon. friend refers to can take place upon that one.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the House adjourns, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if it is true, as reported, that the commissioners of the Transcontinental railway have been notified that it is desirable that they should hand in their resignations, and if so, does he intend to make other appointments in their places, pursuant to the statute?

Mr. COCHRANE. They have been asked for their resignations, and it is not intended to make any appointments in their places.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman state how the business of the construction of the railway can be proceeded with without commissioners, under the present state of the law? The law provides as to what shall constitute a quorum.

Mr. COCHRANE. We are going to amend the law.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the resignations take place before the law is amended?

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think it matters much whether they hand in their resignations before or after the Bill is introduced.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I had in mind was that under the present state of the law I did not see how one man could act as commissioner.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.38 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 15, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REVISED STATUTES—FRENCH TRANSLATION.

Mr. DOHERTY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) to correct certain clerical errors in the French version of the Revised Statutes, 1906. He said: The purpose of the Bill is simply to correct a number of errors that have crept into the French translation of the Revised Statues of 1906. As the House will remember, the English version came into force and effect before the French version. Unfortunately there appears to have crept into the French version quite a number of errors, and accordingly as they are discovered we are endeavouring to rectify them, so that the laws may be the same in both versions. We have to go over quite a number of different statutes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BRIDGE AT HIGHLANDS.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to draw the attention, more especially of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), to an article that appeared in the Montreal 'Daily Witness' of Monday last. It is headed 'New $80,000 bridge to be built at Highlands.' It goes on to say that this bridge has been contracted for, that the contracts have been signed recently.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman rising to a question of privilege, or does he propose to introduce a subject that will invite discussion? In the latter case, he would be out of order.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I hope it will not invite discussion. I wish simply to ask the Minister of Railways if it is a fact that this bridge is being built where it is not required.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Order.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Well, I mean to say, not required by the public.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. What I mean to say is that neither the Minister of Public Works nor the Minister of Railways—

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I do not want to interfere with my hon. friend, but we can see that he is going further than to ask a question. He is not only inviting discussion but he is provoking it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Then I will simply ask a question. Are these hon. gentleman aware of the fact that a contract has been let for that bridge, and if so, are they aware of the fact that there are other places where a bridge is far more necessary? If they will say that they are satisfied that this bridge is going to be built in a right and proper place, then I have nothing more to say.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not familiar with the subject the hon. gentleman mentions. If a contract has been let for this bridge, it has been let by my predecessor. I will take note of what the hon. gentleman says and inquire into the matter; and if the bridge has been located in a wrong place, we will put it in the proper place.

CANADIAN MISSIONARIES IN CHINA.

Mr. BOYCE. Before the orders of the day are called, and with a view of asking a question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I would draw attention to an article which appeared on the front page of the Montreal 'Herald' of Saturday last, under the caption 'Missionaries flee 2,500 miles across China in daily peril. Twenty-five Canadians in party harassed and fired on by rebels and imperialists.' The article goes on to give the harrowing experiences of 25 Canadian missionaries in China who are escaping from Cheng Tu under the advice and instruction of the British consul there. The statement to which I wish especially to draw the attention of the minister is found lower down:

> Two miles above Hokiang we reached the British gunboat 'Widgeon,' and experienced a great sense of relief. 'We are safe now,' we thought. To our surprise the captain refused to afford us any protection. He turned a deaf ear to our appeals, and sent us on down the river through a district that for hundreds of miles was infested with marauders and full of perils. Had the gunboat been with us, it is altogether unlikely that we should have been fired upon as we were.

I beg to draw that to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and to ask him if he will cause inquiry to be made to ascertain the truth of that report, and if he finds it so, to take such action as is necessary for the protection of Canadian citizens.

Mr. HAZEN. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) is in error in placing this responsibility upon me. It is a matter relating to external affairs, and external affairs are under the control of the right honourable the Prime Minister. However, I will have great pleasure in calling the attention of the Prime Minister to the matter who no doubt will cause inquiries to be made, and take such steps as may be necessary for the purpose of protecting Canadian citizens.

PAY OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. I am frequently in receipt of letters recently, and I suppose other hon. gentlemen are, from persons engaged during the earlier part of last year as census enumerators, stating that they have not yet received the full amount of compensation due them. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if those payments cannot be expedited in some way. They are long overdue, and can see no good reason why they should not be paid.

Mr. BURRELL. I think my hon. friend could not have been present in the House when I answered a similar question put by the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and I informed him that while there were portions of these sums remaining unpaid, the work of revision was being expedited, and when complete, the payments would all be made.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to invite the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to a subject which was mentioned Friday evening just before adjournment, namely, with regard to the resignation of the members of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. I have understood that two, if not three, of the commissioners have, at the request of the government, resigned as members of that board. I would like to ask the minister if he has taken legal advice from the Minister of Justice as to the status of the board, as to whether that board can now legally transact any business in view of there being only one member of the board remaining. Under the Act two are required to form a quorum and if there is only one member of the board I would take it that the board is not in a position to transact any business whatever. My purpose in directing the minister's attention to this is to ask whether he has taken advice from the law officer of the Crown, the Minister of Justice, in respect to the matter.

Mr. COCHRANE. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) I beg to say that so far only one member of the board has resigned. But I expected to-day to be able to introduce a Bill to amend the Act in the way the hon. gentleman speaks of, so that there shall be only one member of the board.

Mr. EMMERSON. It certainly is not amended yet.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). But there is still a quorum; only one has resigned.

Mr. HAZEN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But all have been asked to resign.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not wish to appear to be dissatisfied with the answer of the Minister of Railways, but the question I aksed was whether he had taken the advice of the Minister of Justice with respect to the legal status of the board providing the commissioners resigned as they had been requested to do.

Mr. COCHRANE. I told the hon. gentleman that we were introducing a Bill amending the Act as he says and, of course, any government Bill must be taken before council, so that the Minister of Justice must be aware of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then I am to understand that the advice of the Minister of Justice has been asked?

UNALIENATED RIGHTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I desire to ask the government a question. In December last in a newspaper published in Halifax, there apeared the following despatch from Ottawa, a portion of which I will read:

> The representations made by Premier McBride, Hon. Mr. Bowser, and other British Columbia ministers, when here recently, in regard to the transfer to that province of unalienated rights in what is known as the railway belt, have, as expected, borne fruit. At to-day's sitting of the cabinet an order in council was approved placing the administration of unalienated rights, including water rights, in the hands of the British Columbia government, subject to such future action as may be taken by the federal government. It was stated that the order in council will contain a provision that the cost of administration by the province is to be paid for out of the revenue and that any surplus revenue is to be turned over to the Dominion treasury.

Mr. ROGERS. I may say in answer to the hon. gentleman that up to the present time there has been no transfer of any of the rights of the Dominion to the province of British Columbia. There has been some discussion upon the question but no decision has yet been arrived at.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 16) An Act respecting Patents of Thomas Wadge.—Mr. Aikins.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Alberta Electric Railway Company and to change its name to 'The Alberta Interurban Railway Company.'—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Boyce.

Bill (No. 36) respecting Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.'—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Canadian Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company and the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company.—Mr. Achim.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Cap de la Magdelene Railway Company.—Mr. Paquet.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Baker.

Bill (No. 45) respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Achim.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Hamilton Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Barker.

BRITISH EMPIRE TRUST COMPANY.

Mr. CROMWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 46) respecting the Dominion Trust Company, and to change its name to 'British Empire Trust Company.'

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The British Empire Trust Company is the name of a very prominent trust company having its head office in London, England and transacting a very large Canadian business so that the giving of the same name to a Canadian company might lead to confusion. I do not know that this is the proper place to raise the question but it should certainly be considered by the committee. I would suggest that the solicitors for the British Empire Trust Company in Canada should be notified and meanwhile the Bill might stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The committee is the proper place to consider that matter.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

PATENTS OF E. F. PIPER.

Mr. FRIPP moved the second reading of Bill (No. 53) respecting certain patents of Edmund F. Piper.

Mr. CURRIE. I take the exception to this Bill that when a renewal of patents is asked for mention should be made in the title as to what the particular patent is, I understand that a great many patents have slipped through this House by private Bills thus being patented by Act of Parliament in this country when they are not patented in any other country in the world. When it is not stated on the order paper what the patent refers to, the public are in ignorance of it and when it goes to the committee no one knows anything about it except those present at the committee. This Bill should go to the Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Committee on Standing Orders has reported the Bill and consequently it appears upon the order paper.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it would be well to let the Bill pass its second reading, and then go to the Committee on Standing Orders, where the objection raised by my hon. friend could be dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER. In my judgment the Committee on Standing Orders would have nothing to do with this question at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that my hon. friend from Simcoe objected to this Bill being further proceeded with on the ground that its title is insufficient and might mislead the public. That may be correct or not. The promoter of the Bill is not here to explain it; perhaps an explanation might satisfy my hon. friend; therefore, I think it should be allowed to stand.

Mr. CURRIE. I am quite willing that the Bill should stand so that an explanation may be made.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would call attention to Order No. 2, which involves the same point, and would ask whether that Bill was sent to the Committee or not. The hon. member who introduced that Bill was not in his seat to make an explanation.

Order allowed to stand.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

BOUNTIES TO VETERANS.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

Does the government intend, during the present session, to introduce any legislation granting any bounty or assistance to the volunteers of 1866 and 1867? If not, why not?

Mr. HUGHES. The matter is under consideration.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION COMMISSION.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. When does the government expect to lay upon the table of the House the report of the Commission on Technical Education?
2. Has any report been received from the said commission?

Mr. CROTHERS. The report of that commission is being prepared, and as soon as it is completed it will be laid on the table. We have received from the commission from time to time interim reports.

COAL FOR GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. What was the average cost per ton of steam coal purchased for the Dominion government steamers during the year 1911 at the ports of St. John, Halifax, Charlottetown, and Pictou, for coal delivered in bunkers and alongside the said steamers, respectively?

2. At what ports in the maritime provinces does the Department of Marine and Fisheries take delivery of coal for steamers alongside their steamers?

3. What is the average cost per ton to the department of putting on board their steamers the coal which is delivered to them alongside of the different ports in the maritime province when coal is purchased alongside?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The coal for Dominion steamers was purchased under agreements at the following rates:

St. John, N.B.	Per long ton.
'Lansdowne' alongside steamer	$4 15
Trimmed in bunkers	4 40
'Stanley' loaded and trimmed in bunkers	4 75

It is much more difficult to coal the 'Stanley' than the 'Lansdowne.'

Halifax, N.S.	
Alongside steamer	$4 10
Trimmed in bunkers	4 35
Charlottetown, P.E.I.	
Delivered in bunkers	4 50
Pictou, N.S.	
Delivered in bunkers at Abercrombie Pier	$3 25
F.o.b. cars at Pictou or Pictou landing	3 75

2. At Pictou, N.S.

3. Cost of conveying coal from cars to bunkers of winter steamers at Pictou.—C.G.S. 'Earl Grey,' per ton, 45c.; C.G.S. 'Minto' forward bunkers, per ton, 55c.; side pockets for reserve supply, per ton, $1.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE ACT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the Act passed in the Imperial Parliament in November or December last, known as the 'Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act'?

2. Does the government intend to make provision for the application of the provisions of said Act to the Canadian Naval Forces?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The governement was advised on December 11 that a Bill amending the Naval Discipline Act had been introduced in the Imperial House of Commons. The governmen is not aware that this Bill has become law.

2. When the government is advised that the Bill has been passed and receives a copy of the Act as amended, it will take the matter into consideration.

GASPE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Who has the mail contract between Petite Magdeleine and Chlorydormes, county of Gaspé?

2. Is or was there a request for the annulment of this contract?

3. Have any complaints been made against the mail carrier?

4. Who has asked for the cancellation of the contract?

Mr. PELLETIER:

There is no contract in existence for the carrying of mails between Petite Magdeleine and Chlorydormes. The question of entering into a contract for this work is under consideration by the department. Mr. J. A. Gagnon is performing this work temporarily at the present time.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any petitions been sent to the Postmaster General with the object of changing the post office at Cap Chat, county of Gaspé?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Postmaster General to make such change?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. Under consideration.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF GOODS.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any order for goods been given by the Department of Public Works since October 1, 1911?

2. If so, have tenders been asked for in each case? If not, what orders for goods have been given without tender, to what firms respectively, and for how much in each instance?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.

2. Tenders have not been asked for in each case. I would like to direct attention to the latter part of question 2, reading as follows:

If not, what orders for goods have been given without tenders, to what firms respectively, and for how much in each instance?

I would submit that this is unreasonable information to ask for, as the department has since October 1 been purchasing all sorts of supplies all over the Dominion for the carrying on of public business, and this question would include every purchase, even so small as a broom bought by the caretaker of a public building anywhere. It would take a long time to prepare a list of all these purchases, ranging from five and ten cents up, stating where they were made and the price. If, however, my hon. friend wishes to put the question in the shape of a motion, I presume the House would order the return to be brought down.

If he has in view some specific purchase in some specific locality, and will put the question pointedly as to that particular locality, we will endeavour to answer it promptly.

Question allowed to stand.

MR. J. E. SEVIGNY.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has Mr. J. E. Sevigny of Valleyfield, Quebec, been appointed immigration agent at Montreal? If so, what is his salary, and what is the nature of his work?
2. Is the government aware that Mr. J. E. Sevigny is the president of the Conservative club of Valleyfield
3. Is Mr. J. E. Sevigny a brother of Mr. Albert Sevigny, M.P.?
4. Who recommended the said J. E. Sevigny for immigration agent?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No. Mr. J. E. Sevigny has been appointed clerk in the office of the immigration agent at Montreal. Salary, $1,500 per annum. He is engaged in clerical work.
2. The government has no knowledge of this matter.
3. The government has no knowledge of this matter.
4. The minister.

PENITENTIARIES EMPLOYEES.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

Is it the intention of the government to increase the salaries of the employees in the several penitentiaries of Canada, and to present to parliament, during the present session, a measure for that purpose?

Mr. DOHERTY. The matter is under consideration.

SOREL INVESTIGATION, PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Has the government paid the law and other expenses connected with the prosecution of the inquiry, during the session of parliament of 1910-11, before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, into the charges of irregularities, abuses and frauds charged to have been committed in the shops and stores of the government of Canada at St. Joseph de Sorel and in the city of Sorel, in the electoral district of Richelieu, and as to the alleged connection therwith of a certain member then of this House?
2. If such payments have not been made, will the government cause inquiry to be made as to the propriety of making the payments at an early date?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. These accounts are not payable by the government, but by the House of Commons.

They had been paid as far as approved.

2. The government is looking into the matter.

NAVAL SERVICE. CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

Having reference to the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, quoted in Hansard of the present session, page 179, as follows:—

That fact is, and I have evidence that cannot be contradicted and which I am prepared to give the House at any time if my statement is challenged, I have evidence that those vessels, under that contract, (referring to the tenders for the construction of cruises and torpedo destroyers), and under the conditions, would not have been completed for six years from the time the contract was awarded, and by the end of the six years those vessels would have been obsolete, entirely unfit for the purpose for which they were designed.

What is the evidence to which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred, and will he give the House such evidence in detail?

Mr. HAZEN:

In the conditions embodied by the late government in their call for tenders for the construction of vessels for the Naval Service it was stipulated that the time allotted for the construction of the vessels would be six years.

In a memorandum from Admiral Kingsmill, dated October 9, 1911, it is stated that 'owing to the rapidity with which designs change it is anticipated that if it takes six years to complete the programme the ships will be out of date before they are completed.'

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAR FERRY.

*Mr. HUGHES (Kings):

1. Is it the intention of the government to establish a car ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland?
2. If so, when will the government commence the construction of the necessary piers and steamers, and at what points on the island and the mainland will the piers be built?
3. In the opinion of the government, how many years will elapse before the car ferry will be established and in working order?
4. Pending the establishment of the car ferry, what steps will the government take to relieve the people of Prince Edward Island from the onerous burden of the three short haul rates?
5. In the event of the said ferry not being a success, would it prejudice in any way the claim of the people of Prince Edward Island for continuous communication by means of a tunnel?
6. Is it the intention of the government to widen the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway to make it correspond with the gauge of the Intercolonial railway? If so, when will the work be commenced?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. The government will at an early date cause surveys and reports to be made in order to determine the points on Prince

Edward Island and the mainland between which the steamers will ply, and also the other works required in connection with the proposed ferry. As soon as the necessary information is obtained, and specifications, &c., prepared, tenders will be invited and the work will be proceeded with, without delay.

3. Within two years.

4. The establishing of the car ferry and the standardizing of the Prince Edward Island railway gauge, is for the purpose of doing away with the short haul rates.

5. No.

6. It is the intention of the government to widen the tracks of the Prince Edward Island railway to correspond with the Intercolonial railway tracks, and this work will be carried on as soon as practicable.

CANSO POSTMASTER.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who was the postmaster at Canso, N.S., prior to October 7, 1911?

2. Has he been dismissed from office?

3. If so, for what reason was he dismissed?

4. Was any petition, letter or request received by the Post Office Department asking for his dismissal?

5. If so, by whom was the same signed?

6. Who was appointed in his place?

7. On whose recommendation was the new postmaster appointed?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Alexander M. Roberts.

2. Yes.

3. It was brought to the attention of the Postmaster General that Mr. J. J. Mackenzie, who was postmaster at Canso, was dismissed without reason or investigation, on January 1, 1897. He has been reinstated.

4-5. Letters were received from Mr. J. J. McKenzie asking to be re-appointed to the office, and from J. A. Rawlings, Esq., recommending same.

6. See answer to No. 3.

7. See answers to Nos. 4 and 5.

OYSTER PONDS PREVENTIVE OFFICER.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the preventive officer of customs at Oyster Ponds, Guysborough, county, N.S., been dismissed? If so, when?

2. For what cause was he dismissed?

3. At whose instance was he dismissed?

4. Has his successor been appointed?

5. If so, on whose recommendation has the appointment been made?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. The services of S. M. Ferguson, Acting Preventive Officer of Customs at Oyster Ponds, Guysborough County, N.S., were dispensed with November 30, 1911.

2. For political partisanship. He admitted acting as agent for a candidate in the polling booth on election day.

Mr. COCHRANE.

3. G. A. R. Rowlings was the complainant.

4. No successor has been appointed.

CHARLOS COVE LIGHTKEEPER.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has Stephen Richard, lightkeeper at Charlos Cove, N.S., been dismissed?

2. At whose instance was this dismissal made?

3. Was there any complaint against this man in reference to the proper performance of his duties as lightkeeper? If so, what was the complaint?

4. Who has been appointed in the place of said Richards?

5. On whose recommendation was the new lightkeeper appointed?

6. Was there an investigation prior to dismissal? If so, with what result?

7. Is it the intention of the department to grant an investigation in this case?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. G. A. Rowlings, Sydney, N.S.

3. The complaint against him was that he took an offensive partisan part in the recent federal elections.

4. Alexander Richard.

5. G. A. Rowlings, Sydney, N.S.

6. No.

7. Not unless a request is made for one.

UNIFORM COPYRIGHT LAW.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

1. Referring to the following despatch published in the 'Montreal Gazette' on the 30th December last, from London, England:

UNIFORM COPYRIGHT LAW.

Imperial Government asks Dominion to submit Amendments.

London, December 29.—(Canadian Associated Press.)—The 'Yorkshire Post' says the Home Government has invited the Dominion governments to submit amending legislation to the Copyright Act, though it is feared it will be impossible to have a uniform Empire law if the new Canadian government takes the same view as its predecessors. Germany and other countries are determined to stand aloof from the convention if Canada persists in its present attitude. Hon. Martin Burrell's recent statements lend hope that Canada will come into line.

Is it correct that the Canadian government has received from the Imperial government an invitation to amend the Copyright Act? If so, what are the terms of this invitation?

2. Has the government considered the alternative of Canada adhering to the International Union, for the protection of literary and artistic works, or of detaching itself from it?

3. If the government has come to any decision whatever, in that regard, what is the nature of that decision?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. The Dominion was invited to the Imperial Copyright Conference, 1910, and

assented to resolutions passed thereat which might involve amendments to the Canadian Copyright Act.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.

THREE RIVERS, INLAND REVENUE.

*Mr. BUREAU:

1. Has any charge been made against C. D. Hebert, collector of inland revenue at Three Rivers, of having been at the last federal elections a most active political partisans?

2. If so, when and by whom was the charge made?

Mr. NANTEL. There is no written charge on file in the department against C. D. Hebert of having been a political partisan. It having been privately stated to the minister that Mr. Hebert had acted as such partisan, the former, early in November instructed the Deputy Minister to write to Mr. Hebert asking him if he had taken an active part in politics. Mr. Hebert has answered in the negative and he is still in possession of the office.

SYRIAN IMMIGRATION.

Mr. LAPOINTE (St. Jacques):

1. Has the honourable the minister of the Interior in his possession one or more petitions or correspondence, &c., of a certain number of Syrians, of Montreal and vicinity, or elsewhere, with the view of suspending or recalling in any matter in which they are concerned, the following order in council:

P.C. 926,

At the Government House at Ottawa,

Monday, the 9th day of May, 1910.

Present:

His Excellency in council.

His Excellency in council is pleased, under the authority of section 37 of the Immigration Act of 9 and 10 Edward VII, to make and doth hereby make the following regulation:

No immigrant of Asiatic origin shall be permitted to enter Canada unless in actual and personal possession in his or her own right of two hundred dollars, unless such person is a native or subject of an Asiatic country in regard to which special statutory regulations are in force, or with which the government of Canada has made a special treaty, agreement or convention.

(Signed): RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to yield to the requests of the signers of the said petitions?

3. From the immigration point of view, does the government classify the Syrians as Asiatics under the terms of sections 37, of chapter 27, 9 and 10, Edward VII, intituled: An Act respecting Immigration?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Such a petition, it appears, was presented to the late Premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, some time in July, 1911, and the official file of correspondence shows that it was refused.

2. The matter is not now before the government.

3. Yes.

NAPOLEON GUILLEMETTE, DISMISSAL.

*Mr. BUREAU:

1. Has Napoleon Guillemette, clerk of works, in connection with the Dominion Public Building at Trois Rivières been dismissed?

2. If so, upon whose recommendation was he dismissed and what was the reason given for his dismissal?

3. How many days' notice was he given before the taking effect of the order of dismissal?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.

2. No special recommendation. The department had no further use for his services as clerk of works.

3. On November 9, 1911, Mr. Guillemette was notified that his services as clerk of works were no longer required by this department.

ST. TITE POSTMASTER.

*Mr. BUREAU:

1. Has the postmaster of the town of St. Tite in the county of Champlain, been dismissed since the 21st of September, 1911?

2. If so, was there any complaint laid against him?

3. What was the nature of the complaint and by whom was it made?

4. Was there any investigation held in this case?

5. Who recommended the dismissal and on what ground was it made?

6. Who has been appointed in his place, by whom was he recommended, and what was the occupation of the present incumbent before his appointment?

Mr. PELLETIER: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The postmaster of the town of St. Tite is now Dr. Emil Lacoursière. This postmaster was removed in 1898 to make room for a political partisan of the late government. Since his appointment, he has continued to be a political partisan. The former postmaster has been re-instated. No investigation was necessary, because the facts cannot be disputed.

The recommendation for the re-instatement was made by the present member of parliament for the county of Champlain.

IMMIGRATION HOSPITALS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many hospitals for immigrants have we, and where are they situated?

2. Who are the physicians in charge of those hospitals?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Five. One each at Quebec, Halifax, St. John, Montreal and Victoria.

2. At Quebec, Dr. J. D. Page. At Halifax, Dr. Francis A. R. Gow. At St. John, Dr. Leonard Ellis. At Montreal, Dr. A. D. Stewart. At Victoria, Dr. G. L. Milne.

STATE-AIDED IMMIGRATION SOCIETIES.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What are the societies of colonization, immigration and charity that are provided for by the government?
2. What is the amount voted for each of these associations?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. (1) Salvation Army.
(2) La Société Générale de Colonisation & de Rapatriement de la Province de Quebec.
(3) The Ottawa Valley Immigration Society.
(4) The Women's National Immigration Society of Montreal.
(5) L'Union Nationale Française, Montreal.
(6) The Women's Welcome Hostel, Toronto.
(7) The Girls' Home of Welcome, Winnipeg.
(8) The Calgary Women's Hostel.
(9) The Woman's Welcome Hostel, Halifax.

2. Salvation Army..	$15,516 64
La Societe Generale de Colonisation & Rapatriement de la province of Quebec	4,000 00
The Ottawa Valley Immigration Society..	2,500 00
The Woman's National Immigration Society of Montreal..	1,500 00
L'Union Nationale Française, Montreal..	1,000 00
The Women's Welcome Hostel, Toronto..	1,000 00
The Girl's Home of Welcome, Winnipeg..	750 00
The Calgary Woman's Hostel..	500 00
The Women's Welcome Hostel, Halifax..	500 00

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How much money have we spent during the fiscal year 1910-11 for immigration from the British Isles, the United States, France and Belgium?
2. How many immigrants did we receive in 1910-11, from the British Isles, the United States, France and Belgium?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. British Isles..	$303,915 87
United States..	233.601 10
France..	12.439 02
Belgium..	29,292 26

Mr. ROGERS.

(including $24,055.40 for distribution of literature and other expenses at Brussels Exhibition.)

2. From the British Isles.. ..	123,013
United States ..	121,451
France..	2,041
Belgium..	1,563

FRENCH IMMIGRATION LITERATURE.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. During the fiscal year 1910-11 did the government publish in the French language any pamphlets favouring immigration?
2. If so, what are these pamphlets and where were they distributed?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. 'Last Best West.' French edition, distributed in the United States and France.
'Atlas of Canada,' French edition, distributed in France and Belgium.
'Country Called Canada,' French edition, distributed in France.
Leaflet, French edition, distributed in the United States.
'L'Alberta Region Centrale,' distributed in the United States.
'Le Canada Agricole,' distributed in France and the United States.

FRENCH IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Have we French Canadian agents in France for securing immigrants, and what are the names and salaries of these agents?
2. Have we French Canadian agents in Belgium for securing immigrants, and what are the names and salaries of these agents?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. The agents of Canada in France for securing immigrants, are not Canadians by birth, but Frenchmen who have lived in Canada. Their names are:—Paul Wiallard, salary $3,000 per annum; P. Foursin, salary $1,000 per annum.
2. The resident agent is a Belgian who has lived, and been naturalized, in Canada. His name is D. Treau de Coeli; salary $1,600 per annum. He is assited by Belgian Canadian settlers who are sent over from time to time for this special work.

PREMIUMS ON IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. PAQUET:

How much money did the government spend in premiums for immigration in 1910-11, and to whom were these premiums paid?

Mr. ROGERS. $108,374.41. To booking agents, and commission agents in Europe and the United States.

IMMIGRATION MEDICAL EXAMINERS.

Mr. PAQUET:

What is the number of the examining physicians of immigrants, what are their names, where do they perform their duties, and what are their salaries?

Mr. ROGERS:

At Quebec, 7, Dr. J. D. Page, $3,500; Dr. E. Nadeau, $2,400; Dr. Lessard, $1,200; Dr. Jos. de Varennes, $1,200; Dr. Jos. Gosselin, $1,200; Dr. Jos. P. Dobbin, $1,200; Dr. A. Potvin, $1,200.

At Halifax, 2, Dr. Jas. S. Carruthers, $1,200; Dr. Edgar Douglas, $1,000.

At St. John, 1, Dr. W. Leonard Ellis, $1,600.

At Portland and Montreal, 2, Dr. A. D. Stewart, $1,600; Dr. R. D. Gurd, $1,500.

At Vancouver, 1, Dr. A. S. Munro, $1,500.

At Victoria, 1, Dr. G. L. Milne, $2,750.

At Prince Rupert, 1, Dr. J. O. Reddie, $1,500.

At North Sydney, 1, Dr. J. W. McLean, $1,000.

At New York, 1, Dr. Geo. W. Elliott, $3,000

DEPORTATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What number of immigrants were deported in 1910-11?
2. What amount was spent in 1910-11 in deporting undesirable immigrants?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. 784.
2. $21,958.

CANADIAN GOLD COINAGE.

Mr. THOMPSON:

When will the Mint begin coining five and ten dollar gold coins?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Probably within one month.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon) moved:

For orders in council and all correspondence between the government and the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company and its successor, the Winnipeg Great Northern railway, now the Canadian Northern railway, relative to the proposed route of said railway to Hudson bay, with all accompanying plans and reports; also a copy of all correspondence relative to the offer of Milburn & Company, steamship owners, of England, said to have been made to the government through the said railway company to place a line of steamships on the route between Hudson bay and England on the completion of said railway, and the further offer by the said Milburn & Company to place one of their Baltic steamships at the disposal of the government for the purpose of making a practical test of the navigability of the route for commercial purposes.

He said: Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I move this resolution is that the correspondence to which reference is made does not appear in any of the reports or sessional papers. It is very desirable that the House should be fully informed, not only in respect of the feasibility of the Hudson Bay road, but also of the proper selection of one of the two ports usually spoken of as the suitable termini of the railway. There is no question of public importance before Canada that is of greater interest to western Canadians than the question of a short, inexpensive and speedy route for the exportable products of that part of the country to the markets of that world and for the imports of goods from abroad. Western Canada is having some disadvantages under which eastern Canada is not labouring. The farmers of eastern Canada can more easily pay the duties under the National Policy than can the farmers of western Canada at the present moment, for the simple reason that under that policy there has been built up in eastern Canada excellent home markets and great industries, which have effected an increase in the value of farm lands and farmers have found for their products a close and ready market, the home market. Western Canada's industries have not been built up to the same extent, it is yet a young and growing country, and will presently have its own home market. Western Canada also has the burden of paying freight rates for long distances to take the surplus product to the final market, usually at Liverpool. This may be corrected to some extent, in time, by the reduction of freight rates, as well as by the creation of local industries and a home market. These industries are being begun in western Canada and the home market is enlarging. For instance, the city of Winnipeg is now, perhaps the third largest in manufacturing in the whole of Canada. There will be established industries in Brandon, Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton; and when these markets are established the rural population of western Canada will have the same advantages in respect of markets that those in eastern Canada now enjoy. But, until these industries are established western Canadian producers will be at the disadvantage of being obliged to carry their produce to market over a longer distance than will those in eastern Canada. It is undesirable that a remedy should be sought in the way suggested by the late government, that western Canada should find its market south of the line for its products; for it is not in the interest of Canada to build up industries in a foreign country or consider that its home market is their home market. Nor is it desirable that western Canada should continue to

find a home market for her products only in eastern Canada. Although it is very much better that such a market should be found in eastern Canada than that it should be found in the United States, if that can reasonably be done.

The British North America Act properly states that confederation of the provinces was established to promote the welfare of the provinces, and the promotion of the interests of the British empire. It is far better that the markets for western Canadian produce should be either Canadian or British. When our products are exported it is desirable they should be taken by the shortest route possible from the place of production to the final market at Liverpool. The action of the late government in deciding to construct the Hudson Bay railway is appreciated in the west. It is true they started late, better late than never; although it seemed to the people of western Canada that the Hudson Bay railway would be rendered practically useless if the trade, instead of being turned to the northeast by the Hudson Bay railway were diverted to the United States. The government is to be commended in commencing the construction of that railway, and letting the contract for 185 miles. The whole length from the Pas to Churchill is 477 miles. From the Pas to Nelson is 410 miles, and when the 185 miles are constructed, it will be necessary to decide the direction is shall then go. Is it to go to Fort Nelson, or is it to go to Churchill? As I understand from the reports of the chief engineer of the Hudson Bay railway, that point 185 miles distant is somewhere to the west of Split lake. The route to Churchill would be about north from there, that is the route to Churchill the government was heretofore considering. The new route that is now suggested as being a better one is to run from that point, the end of the present contract, in a more northeasterly direction, crossing the Nelson river, and then south of the Nelson river to a point about 100 miles to the west of Port Nelson. From that point there can be constructed a line almost due north to Churchill, or on the north side of the river to Port Nelson. To decide the route it becomes, therefore, important to determine whether the terminus should be Port Nelson or Churchill. If the port is to be Nelson it will be somewhat nearer to the producers than Churchill, and the railway will run through a better country. The distance from Winnipeg to Churchill is about 600 miles. The distance from Winnipeg to Nelson is about 125 miles less. The distance from Brandon to the Pas is 300 miles, from the Pas to Nelson, 410 miles. Therefore, it becomes important to decide at once what route is to be taken. If the more recently suggested route is to be taken, crossing the Nelson river at a point 100 miles to the west of Port Nelson, the line would be lengthened to Churchill about 15 miles; it will not be lengthened to Nelson. If that route be taken, it will afford an easier grade, and the whole line of railway will not have more than four-tenths of one per cent grade. If that route to Churchill, the one suggested by the late government, is taken, the grades will be heavier. There is no question that the people of the west believe that the route from western Canada to the British Isles should be as far as possible through Hudson bay. Many years before that western country became part of the Dominion of Canada, that was the highway to Manitoba. People still have confidence in that route. They know well that Churchill is much further south than that important point on the White sea, north of Russia, Archangel. Archangel is above the latitude of 64 degrees north, Churchill is about 59 degrees, and Nelson about 57 degrees north. Archangel was at one time the only seaport in Russia. It has now a population of over 20,000. Its exports amount to nearly £1,500,000 sterling annually. It has large manufactories of linen, leather, mats and cordage. There is no reason why, for western Canada, Nelson or Churchill should not be of equal or of greater importance, they are in a better latitude.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the distance along the sea-coast from Nelson to Churchill.

Mr. AIKINS. In a direct line it is about 125 miles, almost due north. Churchill is a little to the northwest of Nelson. The port at Nelson is open perhaps two weeks longer, and closes two weeks later than Churchill. Practically there is a month's difference between Nelson and Churchill. It, therefore becomes important that the House should come to an early conclusion as to which port shall become the terminus of the Hudson Bay railway. If the same energy were applied to the construction of that railway that has been applied to the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway, the railway could be constructed next year; at all events, it would not require more than two years to complete it. When it is constructed, what is then to be done with it?. No arrangement was made, I understand, by the late government for a harbour at the terminus, and unless there is a harbour at the terminus the railway itself will be largely useless. Concurrently, therefore, with the completion of the Hudson Bay railway, a harbour should be constructed where the freight carried by that railway may be received for water carriage.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Where does the hon. gentleman get his authority that Port Nelson is open so much earlier, and remains

open so much longer in the fall than Fort Churchill?

Mr. AIKINS. I shall endeavour to inform the hon. gentleman before I have concluded my remarks.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would the hon. gentleman also please tell us why it would be better to take one of these ports than the other for a terminus?

Mr. AIKINS. That is a question for the House to decide, and in order to come to a conclusion I am moving that all possible information should be laid before the House. I am not expressing any preferences, because I do not know everything about it. It is true I know a great many things, but I do not know all.

Consequently, I think it is desirable that we should have all the available information on this subject and as rapidly as it can be obtained, and so come without any further delay to a conclusion and construct the harbour. The most recent report we have concerning those ports is one that was brought down at this session—of Mr. Wm. J. Stewart, hydrographer of the Department of the Naval Service. Referring to the navigation of Hudson bay and Hudson straits and also to these ports, he says:

Apart from the ice question which it will be seen is by no means insurmountable, the dangers and difficulties of the navigation of Hudson Strait and Bay arise chiefly from the inaccuracies of the charted positions of the salient points, and from the proximity of the magnetic pole, with the consequent effect on compasses.

As the whole of the Hudson Bay chart appears to be more or less in the nature of a sketch or running survey, great caution would naturally be exercised by the shipmasters in making land.

It seems to me that although the recent government decided to construct that railway, they were leaving out a very important part, the water route, and not making the chart necessary for the proper navigation of Hudson bay and straits, and preparing the port.

Mr. CURRIE. Has there never been a chart made of Hudson bay?

Mr. AIKINS. So far as I can ascertain there has never been an accurate survey of the straits or of Hudson bay as will appear a little later on from this report. Further on in the report, he says:

Until the results of the detailed surveys are in, it is difficult to give an unprejudiced opinion as to the relative values of Fort Churchill and Port Nelson as ports, and I can only take the point of view of a master of a vessel making these places for the first time without local knowledge or pilot's assistance.

Churchill harbour although of not very great extent as it at present stands, appears to me to be adapted to easy enlargement, the eastern shore having good water close to. The entrance is narrow and I do not imagine any sea could get up that would inconvenience loading operations alongside wharfs, but the heavy tide and current from the Churchill river running against a strong breeze makes boat work difficult at times.

The current from the Nelson and Hayes rivers is very swift, a great volume of water being discharged into Nelson roads. When this current combines with an ebb tide and sets against the heavy northerly gales which prevail here in August and September, a very bad sea is raised, especially, as may be imagined, inside the five fathom line of sounding.

Churchill harbour is situated in latitude 58-56-10 N. and longitude 94-10 W. and about the middle of the west shore of Hudson bay.

The approach to Churchill harbour is very well marked and comparatively easily picked up. The first landfall (approaching from Hudson strait) is Cape Churchill, which stands well out from the low west shore and in contrast to the shore south of it, may be approached to within a comparatively short distance.

The entrance to Churchill between the 18 foot contours is 1,100 feet wide and has as much as 90 feet of water in it with not less than 6 fathoms outside.

The harbour itself is in two parts, outer and inner, but the latter is so shallow as to be useless and injurious to the former, in that it furnishes a large area in which water is stored during flood tide to cause strong currents through the entrance at ebb tide.

The outer harbour or harbour proper is about 3,000 yards long north and south with an average width of 2,000 yards giving an area of one and a half square miles most of which, however, is very shallow. The area of water over 18 feet deep inside the entrance is about 1,600,000 square yards or about half of a square mile. The anchorage space is therefore not suitable for more than three or four vessels.

That it is only suitable for 3 or 4 vessels is of very serious importance, because if there are to be exported from western Canada 100,000,000 bushels of wheat or 200,000,000 bushels, and no doubt the exportable product will amount to very much more than that. It is quite impossible to export so much by a harbour in which only three or four vessels can find accommodation at once. There will have to be many more vessels there at a time

The range of the spring tide is about 15 feet and the water rushes through this entrance with a velocity of 6 miles per hour on the ebb tide and 2½ miles per hour on the flood. As remarked in the beginning of this report the inner harbour is very large and allows a large volume of water to be impounded furnishing a supply that must escape during the ebb and cause heavy currents. The harbours might be separated by a dyke and thus provide a wet basin above and cut off the supply for the strong currents at ebb tide.

Further in the report he says:

Last season when approaching Nelson river to put the schooner on the station for her

work, the steamer 'Stanley,' with her in tow, ran into shallow water (4 fathoms), then moved out to 9 fathoms and fixed her position as 10 miles from land where nothing could be seen from the deck and only a few trees and the beacon on Marsh point from the Crow's Nest.

After becoming acquainted with the locality and procuring a pilot the schooner was piloted at high water to an anchorage just off the position selected for the outer railway wharf.

Owing to the great difficulties encountered very little surveying that can be placed on paper was done. The greatest labour was necessary to get ashore with material for signals and owing to the low beach these had to be large and high that they might be seen a few miles off. The winds and seas were very heavy and in the exposed situation working from even a large well covered-in launch was impossible.

Observations for tides show that springs rise 16 feet and neap 10 feet, and the tides flow and ebb at from 2 to 3 knots.

Of course, this information is all gathered from cruising about in bad weather, when circumstances made it impossible to fix one's position for transfer to paper and when the survey work is completed it may have a different appearance.

There is one thing certain that the survey is no child's play, the roadstead is exposed to every wind that blows and every sea that runs, the currents and cross currents are strong, the shores so low that nothing can be seen from boats and all locations must be determined from the previously ascertained position of the ship.

Ice began to form, coming down the river on one tide and up on the next, on October 31, and gradually became worse, each day making navigation more hazardous.

Until further and proper definite information is obtained, no opinion can be expressed as to the suitability of this port for a terminus.

It seems a rather singular thing that the government should have undertaken the construction of the Hudson Bay railway without knowing to what point that railway is going to run. I hope that, with the present government and with such a Minister of Railways, the work will be carried on expeditiously, and that what might have taken the former government ten years to accomplish will be accomplished in one or two years at least. The House will readily see that it is of the utmost importance that it should be seized of proper information to enable it to come to a conclusion. That report is the last word that the House has with respect to these different ports. It brings the matter down to 1911. The next report before the House is one that was made by the chief engineer of the Hudson Bay railway, Mr. John Armstrong, in 1909. At the end of the first part of the report, he says:

In accordance with the above, surveys were made of the harbours at the mouths of both the Churchill and Nelson rivers, the results of which have been sent forward to you.

The results at Nelson seem to justify the recommendation that a further appropriation for an accurate survey of that port be made before it is rejected as a terminus for the Hudson bay railway.

Appended to the report are the following statements:

Fort Churchill is at the mouth of the Churchill river where the river passes through a large tidal flat or lagoon mostly dry at low tide except near the outlet to the sea. The lagoon is surrounded by hills consisting of rock at the sea outlet and of sand and gravel further up the river.

The only available situation for docks at present is out near Cape Merry, with the railway terminals from two to three miles up stream, and the townsite from three to five miles up stream. Another townsite is available on the west side, but it would be somewhat difficult to get railway and dock sites.

There is no posibility of improving the Churchll river so as to give inland communication by water owing to its shallowness over its many wide and frequent rapids. The neighbourhood of Fort Churchill is practically destitute of all forest growth for miles in all directions, the vegetation being restricted to mosses and patches of coarse grasses along the edges of the water areas.

The main freshwater supply is obtained from the numerous small lakes in the neighbourhood and is of excellent quality. The tidal flats are thickly stewn with boulders, some so large as to be visible above high water.

Tides and Currents.

The main current in the harbour is along the indicated channel of the Churchill river, being approximately down the centre of the lagoon, but striking more against the eastern side towards the harbour mouth. With the ebb tide the current attains a velocity of from six to eight miles per hour, creating a somewhat difficult entrance for low-powered ships. The local pilots prefer to bring in their ships with the incoming tides.

It is quite useless for anything but a steam vessel to attempt the entrance at any other time. The current with the incoming tide is much less, probably not exceeding 4 miles per hour. The highest tide observed was 13½ feet, and the lowest 8 feet, both probably being subject to modification with a longer series of observations. The water is always more or less salt near the entrance. At low tide fresh water may be obtained in the Churchill channel opposite the Hudson Bay Company's post, but when the tide is in this cannot be done.

Ice Conditions.

The harbour usually freezes over about November 15. The open sea also freezes over during the winter four or five miles out from Churchill. The usual date for the opening of the harbour is about June 19. This last spring the harbour opened on June 7, or about 10 days earlier than usual. The ice lay off the coast and harbour this year, preventing the return of the survey party until July 13, when a start was made for York.

The harbour has been reported on occasions to have been blocked by ice as late as August owing to long continued north winds. This liability of the harbour to be filled with loose

heavy ice drifting up and down with the strong currents will need to be seriously considered in choosing the type of docks to be built here. As shown on the chart, the direction of the current tends to throw the drifting ice against the east shore, the only available place for docks at the present time. The ice, however, does not jam here very much but is swept on out by the strong current. Jams more frequently occur on the west side between the police barracks and Cockrill's Point.

Anchorage.

At the present time very little shelter can be had at low tide by any ship drawing over 18 or 20 feet of water. Space to accommodate two or three ships of this size might be had, but anything larger would have to anchor almost in front of the entrance, which, being three-quarters of a mile, allows the full force of the seas to be felt. The seas enter the harbour with sufficient force to cause a heavy swell to be felt throughout the harbour; in fact it is reported that at times it is impossible for the smaller boats to cross the harbour for two or three days at a time. The bottom consisting of mud affords a fairly good holding ground for anchors.

Material.

The material forming the harbour bottom is mud, thickly strewn with boulders of all sizes, and is probably a deposit from the Churchill river.

Excavating for ships berths close inshore to avoid the heavy drift ice will probably encounter solid rock, as the solid rock in several places runs to the water edge.

Defence.

Fort Churchill being practically upon the open sea can only be defended by strong forts and batteries placed in the immediate neighbourhood of the port itself.

Port Nelson.

Wherever the ice was of sufficient strength the sounding was done through holes, the method of locating being indicated on the chart. The soundings in the open water portion were taken from a boat hired from the Hudson Bay Company at York Factory, and were taken in May and June after the ice had gone out. This portion of the work was accomplished under great difficulties, as only five small buoys could be obtained to mark ten miles of river.

The boat, which was the best obtainable, was the usual coast boat of very shallow draught and clumsy rig, but endowed with special qualities in the matter of drifting.

Owing to this propensity and to the fact that the small buoys were not visible from one to the other, some difficulty was experienced in keeping the proper course. However, after ten days or two weeks hard work a sufficient amount of information was obtained to enable us to state with certainty that a good channel exists in which a ship drawing 26 feet might safely enter at all stages of the tide. Mr. R. D. Fry, the engineer in charge of the party, believes this chart to be a conservative representation of the actual conditions at Port Nelson, and that more extended surveys with the proper equipment will probably show a more favourable situation.

In order to get the best results it will be necessary to have a strong boat equipped with power, preferably a good sea-going tug which could be fitted to burn either coal or wood, with a dozen large sized buoys and fifty or sixty smaller ones to mark the channel and points to be sounded.

General Description.

Port Nelson is at the mouth of the Nelson river, while York Factory is situated at the mouth of the Hayes river, about fifteen or eighteen miles from Port Nelson.

The site at the mouth of the Hayes was chosen by the Hudson Bay Company on account of the better communication with a greater number of inland posts, and also being a much smaller stream was not so difficult to navigate.

A great deal of tracking had to be done on both rivers, and the Hayes being much smaller, offered less trouble in crossing and recrossing to take advantage of paths to tow from. The Nelson river is known locally as the North river, and Port Nelson is named by the British Admiralty as York Roads. Hudson Bay vessels crossing to York Factory with supplies anchor about 15 or 20 miles from the post in York Roads. The site of York Factory was not chosen on account of its accessibility from the sea, but entirely on account of the easier communication with inland posts. The Nelson river proper may be said to end at Flamboro Head, which is the approximate limit to which the tide reaches. The estuary is a wide tidal flat with the main channel running approximately down the centre, finally discharging into an open sea abreast of Beacon Point, some 25 miles from Flamboro Head. At Flamboro Head the banks rise sheer from the water edge to a height of 100 to 125 feet. From this point they gradually diminish in height on both sides of the river until at Sam's creek on the north, and Beacon Point on the south, they are about ten feet above the water. The north shore is of clay with a sufficient fall for drainage and covered with a fair growth of spruce.

A good site for terminals and town may be had in the vicinity of the point marked on the chart. Above this point the banks become higher and much more abrupt.

The south shore is also of clay with a good slope for drainage, but at the present time is covered with a very heavy growth of moss, rendering it very wet. An abundant supply of freshwater may be had either from the Nelson river itself or from various smaller streams and lakes in its vicinity.

Tides and Currents.

The main current when the tide is ebbing is along the main channel, the current over the flats running approximately parallel to it. As the water lowers the currents over the flats converge more and more upon the main current, till at low tide they are approximately at right angles to and approaching it. On the ebb tide, the current flows at the rate of about 3½ miles per hour, being strongest at the mouth abreast of Beacon Point. Under favourable conditions the current here might rise as high as 4 miles per hour. So great is the discharge of the Nelson river that a perceptible current may be noticed several miles out to sea. With the incoming tide a current of about 2½ miles is obtained.

Ice conditions.

About the 20th of December the river is usually frozen over at Seal Island or Flamboro Head. From this time on the ice gradually creeps down the estuary and out from the shore line until the first half of the month of April. About this date the weather moderated to such an extent that the thawing through the day counterbalanced the freezing at night and the ice began to recede towards Flamboro Head, the estuary being usually again clear of ice by May 15.

That answers the question of my hon. friend.

The ice is broken up into large floes by the rising tide, and is borne off out to sea by the ebb tide. Owing to the appreciable current of the Nelson river being felt so far out to sea very little of this ice ever drifts back again. Between May 15 and June 1, the upper Nelson ice breaks up and passes down the centre of the estuary in the main channel, usually occupying from 24 to 36 hours on passing out to sea. During last winter no ice jams occurred inside of a line drawn from Beacon point to Sam's creek and a careful scrutiny of the shore line after the snow and ice had disappeared failed to find any trace of its ever doing so.

The winter of 1878, an exceptionally mild winter, the channel remained open for 40 miles above Flamboro Head.

During the freeze up in the fall, a considerable quantity of slush ice comes down from the upper Nelson.

During the winter more or less ice floats up and down the open channel with the tides, but being very scattered no jams ever occur.

Anchorage.

The anchorage being some nine or ten miles in from the mouth of the channel no serious sea is ever experienced which may cause trouble to anything larger than canoes or row boats. The condition of the seas at Port Nelson will probably be found to resemble those experienced at Quebec on the St. Lawrence. The bottom is of sufficient stiffness to furnish a secure holding ground for anchors.

Defence.

The defence of Nelson from hostile fleets will be comparatively easy, the long comparatively narrow channel approach being easily rendered impregnable by means of sea mines, and rendered otherwise dangerous by the removal or changing of buoys and other channel marks. Battleships which carry the extreme long range guns are of such draught as to render it somewhat dangerous to manœuvre in less than 45 feet of water thus preventing their closer approach than 15 or 18 miles, a distance considerably greater than the effective range of even the heaviest guns. The lighter ships which might approach closer carry correspondingly lighter guns. The establishment of strong batteries and forts at Sam's creek would seem to be all that is necessary to render Port Nelson absolutely unassailable.

It might be mentioned here in passing the greatly increased difficulty a hostile fleet would have on blockading the Atlantic coast of Canada were the Hudson bay route opened. The fact that ships may enter and leave Port Nelson all the year round is a fact worth remembering when the possibilities of war are considered.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do you believe that?

Mr. AIKINS. Well, while my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner) might act on my opinion in that regard I am not sure that every member of the House would. However, the fact is stated here that the mouth of the Nelson River is open all the year around and if that be so we have at once a solution of the difficulties of the west because we will not be restricted to a few months navigation through the Hudson bay but may be able to navigate in other months than June, July, August and September. I submit that from these reports it is impossible to come to any conclusion as to which would be the better port and it is in the interests of the west that the House should have all possible information to enable it to select the best terminal for the railway. Of course there will be an advantage always to Western Canada if Port Nelson be the better terminus, because there will be a shorter railway haul of sixty or seventy miles or more and the port will be open earlier and close later than Fort Churchill, if either should prove impossible as a winter port.

The House has some prior information concerning the matter. Lieut. Gordon's report, made I think in 1886, referring to Fort Churchill, contains the following:

This harbour is admirably suited for a railway terminus. The necessary docks could be easily and cheaply built, and the deep-water basin enlarged at small cost. Stone is lying at the water's edge ready to be laid into docks and piers, and nature seems to have left little to be done in order to make this a capacious port fit for doing a business of great magnitude.

Twenty feet would be deep water at that time. It would be necessary perhaps to have deeper water now; and if, as is stated by Chief Engineer Armstrong, the bottom of Churchill harbour is rock, it will be very much more expensive to create a proper port there of suitable size than it will be at Port Nelson, where no such rock is reported. Prior to that we have a statement made in 1884 by Robert Bell, Senior Assistant Director of the Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada, and that statement has since been amply verified. In answer to a question, he said:

I think it is manifest that the advantage would be very great indeed, and it is a matter, just now, of very great importance. The cost of the transport of wheat, for example, to the markets of the world, say Great Britain, is reduced to the very lowest point by competition with all the world, and consequently, if our wheat regions of the Northwest were labouring under any disadvantage, as far as carriage was concerned, the price must necessarily be reduced to meet this competition. It is, therefore, essential to successful farming in

our Northwest that we should have an easy and cheap route to the markets of the world; and also for carrying heavy freights from Europe to the Northwest, such as iron and heavy goods generally, it is very desirable to have as short a land carriage as possible. As a route for immigrants, the ocean route being as short as to other ports, and the land route being much shorter, it would afford a direct and cheap way of bringing immigrants to the Northwest; and the importance of it is enhanced by the fact that we could keep them to ourselves; whereas, if they were brought in by the present routes, they run the chance of being tampered with by the immigration agents of the United States. It might also be valuable for the export of bulky, low-priced agricultural products, such as potatoes, pressed hay, &c.

That statement by Professor Bell in 1884 can be repeated with the same accuracy and force at the present time. From that time little has been done towards ascertaining what should be the terminus of the Hudson Bay railway and what would be the best route through the Straits and Hudson bay itself. If one goes back to 1878, one finds similar views and doubts in a report in that year by Professor Henry Youle Hind, who said:

When we consider that York Factory is actually nearer to Liverpool than New York, it surely becomes a question of the greatest moment to determine how far existing information would warrant minute inquiry into this very important subject. As the result of a prolonged but desultory study of the question, I have no doubt that continuous and safe navigation by steamers, constructed as sealing steamers are, can be carried on between Port Nelson and Liverpool for at least four months in the year—that is, from Liverpool to Liverpool again, leaving three months, or perhaps a little more, for Hudson bay.

Such navigation would, in effect, bring a thousand miles of sea coast line, now included in Ontario and Keewatin, into direct water communication with the outer world, and develop new interests for the Northwest, apart from the outlet it would afford to its grain. The lignite coal on the west side of the Davis' Straits is of importance in this connection.

Port Nelson river, or as now termed, Nelson river, is the outlet through which drains the whole of the rivers and lakes included within the basin of Lake Winnipeg, extending from the Rocky mountains on the west to within one hundred miles of the shores of Lake Superior on the east, and covering a drainage area of about 360,000 square miles.

Port Nelson is about 80 miles nearer to Liverpool, via Hudson straits, than is New York. It is at the mouth of a river of the first class, carrying a body of water double that of the north and south branches of the Saskatchewan combined, and it reaches the sea through a narrow depression in the Laurentides, having a descent of about twenty inches in a mile, or, in round numbers, seven hundred feet in a little more than four hundred statute miles from the spot where it debouches from Lake Winnipeg.

Port Nelson, moreover, is about the same distance from the edge of a vast fertile region in the Northwest, exceeding two hundred millions of acres in area, as Quebec is from Toronto.

For more than two hundred years from two to five sailing vessels on an average, frequently with warships convoying them, have sailed annually from Europe and America to Port Nelson, or other ports in Hudson bay, and returned with cargoes the same season via the only available route, Hudson straits.

The establishment of a cheap and speedy means of communication between the Northwest and the open Atlantic via Hudson straits, would not only secure the rapid settlement of Manitoba, but open to successful immigration a fertile area twenty times as large as that province. The proximity of this vast extent of country to its own seaboard would, under such conditions, also secure the carrying trade of its own productions under one and the same flag.

The most recent admiralty map of Hudson straits exhibits a want of full information regarding the coast lines on both sides of the straits. The remark made by Lieut. Chappell in 1814, that the southern shore has never been explored, is true at the present day. This officer states that 'all this coast, as well as the northern shore is fringed with islands; the principal of which are King George, Prince of Wales, Maiden Pass, and Mannils islands; and they doubtless afford shelter to many fine harbours.'

The latest charts still show a disconnected coast line here and there for three hundred miles, and the fringe of islands, noticed by Chappell, is not recorded on any published chart. This officer asserts, that the 'Rosamond,' convoying the Hudson Bay Company's ships, in 1814, was piloted through the Hudson straits by the means of a private chart supplied by the chief mate of the 'Prince of Wales,' one of the ships under convoy.

Port Nelson is upwards of two hundred miles nearer to the mouth of the Fraser river, one of the projected termini of the Pacific railway, than it is to Halifax on the Atlantic coast. In other words, it is, so to speak, already more than half across the continent, within the wide limits of the Dominion. Then, again, the distance of Port Nelson from Liverpool is nearly one hundred miles less than Liverpool is from New York. The relative distances measured on the globe being 2,960 miles and 3,020 miles. If two of the Dundee sealing steamers, similarly found, were to start at the same hour in the month of September, one from Port Nelson, the other from New York, the probability is that they would arrive on the same day at Liverpool.

Port Nelson lies under the same parallel as Dundee in Scotland, and it cannot escape notice that numerous fine sealing schooners from the Scottish port, have, since the 10th of March, been pushing their way among the same kind of ice as that found barring Hudson straits, in pursuit of seals. From twenty to five and twenty of those sealing schooners are now engaged in the same pursuit on the coasts of Newfoundland and Labrador, seeking the ice, whose presence we lament later on in the year. The employment of these, or steamers constructed for summer work in the Hudson straits and bay, would

afford a wide field for the exercise of that skill and enterprise which at present finds a temporary employment only in the destruction of half a million sportive creatures—the life of ice encumbered seals.

In answer to another question he said:

Here we have Port Nelson and further south, Selkirk, and there the sources of the Red river, which is a down grade to Port Nelson. In fact here, within a certain radius, the agricultural capabilities are not very great, but in the west and south, in the valley of the Red River, and on a considerable portion of the upper Missouri, Port Nelson will be very much nearer than any other port either down the Mississippi or down the valley of the St. Lawrence, or any of the Atlantic ports.

That was in 1878. Very little has been done by the Dominion authorities to ascertain which port would make the better terminus for the Hudson Bay railway, and of course the railway would be almost useless without a proper and wisely selected terminus.

I therefore suggest that immediate action be taken to obtain all possible information concerning the better routes through Hudson straits and Hudson bay and the better port for the terminals of the railroad on that bay, because on these matters may depend not only the question of railway communication, but communication by the Nelson river to Lake Winnipeg, and thus to Selkirk and Winnipeg. It is quite possible that there may be constructed on the Nelson river a few locks which will give navigation to sea-going vessels all the way from Liverpool to at least Selkirk. Therefore I have much pleasure in moving this resolution.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, I do not for a moment rise to offer any opposition to my hon. friend's method of obtaining increased information upon this subject. I do not know that I should have intervened even for the few minutes I shall speak, but for some general positions which my hon. friend stated very oracularly and very emphatically on the trade question. If I understood him he uttered what must have been regarded by many of the hon. gentlemen by whom he is surrounded as very great political heresy. I think he said that the east was in a better position to bear the burdens of the National Policy than the west. Why Sir, in ten years residence in Canada I have never heard from hon. gentlemen opposite a word about anything but the blessings of the National Policy, and I am gratified indeed to learn that my hon. friend at least is in the way of finding out that the National Policy is not a communicator of blessings only, but of burdens, and I am sure that my constituents and a large number of the inhabitants of Western Canada will be glad to hear of the frank admission that these burdens fall more heavily upon western Canada than upon the east. We shall not fail to quote my hon. friend in that connection and to congratulate his constituents and himself on his coming into line with Liberal views on that matter.

His next statement, based upon that to which I have just referred, seemed to me also extremely heterodox for any one sitting on that side of the House. He went on to say that it was eminently desirable because of the disadvantage under which the people of the west live, to have the shortest routes to the markets of the world. I understood that the party opposite had just conducted a political campaign in support of the long route, the route from western to eastern Canada. I understood that that contention had influenced a vast number of votes in the last election in the province of Ontario, and that it was the general view of hon. gentlemen opposite. I may have been misinformed in that matter, but I am almost certain that I remember when some of these gentlemen were sitting here, they pointed out that one of the great evils of the reciprocity pact was that it was going to lead to the construction of railroads north and south instead of east and west. I thought it was the general consensus of opinion on the other side of the House that it was desirable to have long routes and costly routes so long as they ran from west to east, and not short and cheap routes, to which I am glad that my hon. friend has been converted, because we on this side of the House, trading upon the ordinary methods that guide reasonable human beings, have always held the view that cheap and short routes were good for business.

My hon. friend went on to make what I venture to describe as a somewhat oracular statement. He said it is not desirable to trade to the south. So it would appear that his objection is not to north and south but only to the south. Sir, I want more than the 'ipse dixit' of my hon. friend to convince me of the wisdom of that reflection, and I think if he will reflect he will find there are a great many more people in Canada who want more than his 'ipse dixit' to be converted to that position.

My hon. friend has had a long and an honourable connection with a great railway company. Does the Canadian Pacific railway find it undesirable to trade to the south? If so, why does it build its branches to the south? Is my hon. friend aware that the international boundary line is at present intersected by railways at 42 places? Does not Canadian material pass out of the country at those 42 places? Is it not carried on the freight trains of the company with which my hon. friend has

had this long connection? Thus it would appear that my hon. friend is not only a heterodox member of the party opposite but a very heterodox lawyer of the Canadian Pacific railway.

There are some bankers in Canada and during the recent election one was quite prepared to hear them teaching that the poor farmer should not trade north and south. But these bankers, if they have money to invest, do not hold that this principle applies to them; they go to Wall street very readily if they can use their money to profit and advantage there. So they do not have the same fear as my hon. friend of trade to the south.

When I was in British Columbia last summer I learned that the British Columbia government, which of course is a Conservative government—there are none but Conservatives in British Columbia, apparently—was building the finest automobile road on the continent straight down to the United States boundary line, they had a steam roller working on that road, on each side of which was painted the words 'The British Columbia Government,' and which bore a squealing American eagle on the front. They evidently believe there is good business to be done in the south. The province of British Columbia before Confederation was doing a very considerable business with the states to the south by means of boats. My hon. friend knows that, but perhaps his delusion only takes him to the extent of believing that while it is perfectly good to trade with the south in boats it would be bad to do so in railway trains, although I cannot understand an official of the Canadian Pacific railway making that invidious distinction against the train. The fact is railway companies and the British Columbia government and the steamboats on the coast and the bankers can all trade with the south, but when it comes to the case of the poor fisherman wanting a little more for his fish, or the homesteader on the plains wanting a little more for his wheat, he must let it lie on the plains of Saskatchewan and rot.

But he must not think for a moment that he is fit to share the advantages of the superior people who have to do with the great corporations and the banks. It appears to me the most futile contention in the world that we should not do business with the country to the south of us when the fact is that our international trade figures show what ought to satisfy any reasonable man —that we are doing half of our entire business with the United States at the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. More than half.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Well, I am always conservative in my statements, however liberal I may be in opinion. Canadian people have found that it is desirable to do business with the country to the south of us. I think I have given sufficient reasons for not accepting the ipse dixit of my hon. friend (Mr. Aikins) upon this question. The hon. gentleman went on to say that, while it is not desirable to trade to the south, it was all right to go north, because, if you are not going to trade with Canadians at least you would be trading with British people, which in his opinion is not so bad as holding truck or trade with these awful Yankees. Personally, if I get a good price for potatoes I do not much care who eats them. It is the money I get for the goods that appeals to me in a matter of trade. But even on the question of trading with the British our friends opposite have undergone a comparatively recent conversion. For, in 1897, when the government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) introduced the proposition to help trade with the British—the British Preference—it was received with as much virulent opposition from the Conservative party of that day as did the offer of American reciprocity at a more recent day. I congratulate these hon. gentlemen that their minds are expanding. As my right hon. friends said at the Commercial Travellers' dinner at Montreal, expansion is the very watchword of trade. We thought we were following that rule when we wanted to trade with the United States as well as with Great Britain. But the home market apostle would make a ring fence around himself and deal only within his own country. But, Sir, since the days when the British preference was opposed by our friends opposite they have moved forward at least—even they have been capable of some mild expansion. And the future is with men who want to expand. Let us hope that within the next few years they may go back on their policy of recent times and be converted to a further expansion, even though that expansion be in the way of trade with the United States. These hon. gentlemen say: We want the Hudson Bay line if it is practicable to trade with Great Britain. But, until then, would it not be wise to take the opportunity of trading elsewhere? Is it wise, and I am serious in putting this question to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) who has a great deal of the breadth which is the common property of us westerners—is it wise, from his point of view, to follow the course indicated by the hon. member for Brandon? He (Mr. Rogers) is bringing people into this country; he is following his predecessors in an active immigration policy. What to do? To get people on the land. What to do on the land? To raise wheat. Is it a wise policy to bring these people in to raise wheat and then to let that wheat rot on the prairie while you wait until you build a road through a country which now has

no population, through icebergs where you can get a look at the seals, in order to establish a route to Britain? Is it wise to do this when you have the offer of free and exclusive entry into a market of one hundred millions of people? It seems to me a policy that inevitably leads to restricted production. Until we can get this outlet, would it not be better, instead of definitely taking the position that we cannot deal with the people to the south, definitely to consider taking that market. Sir William Van Horne referring to the unfortunate condition of affairs in the west, used a very striking metaphor. He said: 'The hopper is too big for the spout.' That is, you cannot bring the stuff east fast enough at the present moment. What would a farmer say when faced by such a condition in his own business? Why he would say: 'Get another spout, or get a bigger one.' But you did not do it, and the people of Canada did not do it; and so the stuff is lying on the prairie at the present moment.

As I said, I did not rise to oppose my hon. friend's motion. I quite agree with him that we need all the information that it is possible to get before we proceed to build railroads anywhere. I quite agree that we cannot have too much information on this subject. But I think there is one thing the country will expect, and that is to know what the government policy is. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) in a short and perfectly easily understood and emphatic deliverance—I think the first he made in this House—said: 'We are not going on with these things until we have made more surveys and got more information.' That is a policy that could not fail to commend itself to the sober judgment of the country; it is a policy which would be perfectly defensible upon any platform. But there have been reports that, as the result of a debate in this House or of something else, the order has since gone out: 'Full steam ahead.' I think it is reasonable for me, as an opposition member, to ask whether the minister has issued that second order conveying second thoughts or whether he still stands by what he said—which no one could fail to understand—that they were going to look into the matter before proceeding with the building of the road.

I do not know that I can agree with my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) that the road would be useless without a terminus. It seems to me clear that the road might be built for one or other, or both, of two purposes: It is said that along one of the projected routes there are ten million acres of splendid arable land. Our homesteads in the west are not so numerous as they were; people will continue to come to Canada; and I have not the least doubt that upon these ten million acres of land, if there be such, we shall have numerous settlers going within a very few years. That being the case the road might be justified as being of service for colonization purposes and for the use of the people who will settle upon these lands.

If my hon. friend looks upon the road as purely a trade route, then, of course he would be obviously correct in stating that the road would be practically useless without a terminus at a proper harbour. That brings one to the question—upon which the hon. gentleman has quoted some extracts from various writers but upon which, I think, he gave no definite opinion himself—of the navigability of Hudson bay. Upon that question, I am bound to say, I myself have no very definite opinion. Therefore I support with all heartiness the bringing down of these papers, because we cannot have too much information upon such a project. But I think we are entitled to know at least what the government are doing and whether the Minister of Railways stands by his first definite statement, to which I have referred or whether there is anything in what has appeared in the newspapers, that since that time he has ordered operations to proceed.

Mr. JAMES McKAY (Prince Albert). It is not my intention to detain the House at length on the subject, as both parties in the House have practically come to the conclusion, at any rate so far as utterances in this House are concerned, that it is necessary that the Hudson Bay railway should be constructed.

Now, a few remarks with regard to the statement of the hon member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I give credit to that hon. gentleman for the possession of a great deal more intelligence than one would suppose he had, judging from the remarks he has just made with regard to the construction of this road and our trade with the United States. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the first thing the right hon. the leader of the opposition considered when he was introducing legislation for the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, was the development and encouragement of an east and west trade. The underlying principle was not merely the development of an east and west trade, it was more especially the development of the whole Dominion of Canada. As it was so well put by Sir William Van Horne, the hopper was too large for the spout. When that legislation was under discussion, the then Minister of Finance stated that if one transcontinental railway was not sufficient he was prepared to build a second, and to give another spout to carry out the products of that great west. Moreover, when the right hon. the leader of the opposition introduced that legisla-

tion be established practically contractual relations between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Dominion of Canada, he provided that they should so build this road and so conduct their business that the trade should go to the Canadian ocean ports in consideration of the assistance they were being given by the Dominion. The right hon. gentleman and his supporters must then have been in favour of the development of the trade in Canada. Now, if the great fertile west is at present producing more than our present railways are able to handle, and which I am prepared to admit, let us look around and see if we cannot construct another spout that will help take out this immense product and still not build up interests to the south of us at the expense of our own. In 1904 the Conservative party in this House was prepared to follow the late government in developing the west, and in providing another outlet for western produce. Let us look around and see if we cannot find still another outlet. I think we can find it in the immediate construction of the Hudson Bay railway. I submit that there has already been sufficient money spent, sufficient investigation made, to establish the partial navigability, at all events, of the Hudson Bay straits, and to warrant the immediate construction of this road. I go further, and submit that the country is pledged to the construction of that road. It is not my intention at this stage to dwell on the question of the navigability of the straits, or to the extent of their navigability. All parties who have looked into the question, I think, are agreed that it is navigable to a sufficient extent to warrant the building of the Hudson Bay railway. Now, for the benefit of those who may think that the transportation facilities we now have are sufficient to carry the products of the great west, I wish to remark that even if we never sent a bushel of grain over the Hudson bay and through the Hudson straits, the building of a railway, and even of more than one railway, is warranted by the nature of the country through which this road is to pass. We have the departmental records and reports which have been carefully made by the gentlemen who compiled them, they have been made by men of experience, and they show that there are millions of acres capable of being cultivated and capable of sustaining a large population, north of the Saskatchewan river. When we look at the map and examine the country through which the road would pass, even if we never took a bushel of grain over the bay and had to bring the grain back into the prairie section and carry it to the east, the distance it would have to go from the furthest point would not exceed the distance from the starting point of this road to the Edmonton district. Now if you carry grain from the district of Edmonton, and north of Edmonton, to the eastern ports, why can you not carry grain from a point 200 miles north of Prince Albert to the east, even if you did not carry it to the bay? I would submit it is a reasonable thing to go on with the construction of the road from that point of view.

Now, I will say a word as to the nature of that country. The last grain statistics report to which I have had access. issued by the late administration for teh year 1910, shows that, in round figures, there were only 13,000,000 acres under grain crop in 1910. The survey made by the Department of the Interior show that there are something like 145,000,000 acres surveyed in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Now, when you consider that in 1910, when only 13,000,000 acres were under crop, the product was sufficient to cripple the carrying facilities of our railway system, what will be the case when, with our increase in population, the area under crop will be doubled? The immense west is practically untilled at present. Consequently, it is very important that we should look about for additional means to take our products out as rapidly as possible. By constructing the Hudson Bay railway we will still be following out the policy of the late government in developing our trade in Canada, a policy which the Conservative party in this House and this country have always supported.

In answer to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), if we require another outlet for this immense west in our Dominion, is it not better for us to establish that outlet and develop our cities in our own west instead of developing the cities to the south of us? If the position were that we had no utlet towards Hudson bay then there might be some force and reason in advocating an outlet to the south of us, but why should we develop cities in the neighbouring republic to the detriment of our ports in our own western dominion? I submit that that is a very important reason why we should, as soon as possible, go on with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

I was going on to refer to the conditions of the country north of the Saskatchewan river through which this road will be constructed. Though I am not opposing the construction of the Hudson Bay railway from the Pas, if proper investigations had been made with regard to the country farther to the west I think there would have been no doubt but that the government of the day would have come to the conclusion that it would have been much better to build a road from Prince Albert to the bay than from the Pas. But, it is not too late to start that road and everything should be done by the present administration to encourage the construction of a road from Prince Albert to Hudson bay,

It need not necessarily go right to the bay but it could connect with the present road from the Pas to the bay at some point north of the Saskatchewan river. Anybody who has looked into the question will see that it is very difficult to build from Hudson Bay junction to the Pas as well as the first 80 miles from the Pas towards Split lake. We find in the report of Mr. Armstrong that there was more difficult grading done on the construction of the Mackenzie & Mann road from Hudson Bay junction to the Pas than will be encountered from the Pas to the Bay. But we find that the route which will be naturally followed from Prince Albert either towards Split lake or the bay will not be subject to these difficulties that are referred to in Mr. Armstrong's reports and other reports, namely, muskegs and large stretches of low land. What is the condition of the country north of Prince Albert? We find that one of the officials in the Department of the Interior made an investigation of the country north, or we might more accurately say a little north west of Prince Albert, and he refers to a section of country, mark you, extending for a distance 200 miles north of Prince Albert. I now propose to read from the report of Mr. Crean, C.E. of the Department of the Interior.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER. For what year?

Mr. McKAY. For the season 1908-9. At page 18 he states:

> The gross area explored, and about which some information has been collected, is approximately 22,000,000 acres, being that tract outlined in red on the accompanying plan marked 'A.' The water covered area in this tract (area of lakes and rivers) may be set down at approximately 3,000,000 acres—the remaining land area—19,000,000. I would estimate that an area of fully 5,000,000 acres of suitable for settlement as soon as surveyed and made accessible by roads and an area of about 12,000,000 acres of swamp or land probably too wet at present for successful cultivation, could be reclaimed at a moderate expenditure. All the swamp will, however, eventually repay the cost of reclamation.

Now, in practically a small portion of country extending over 200 miles north of Prince Albert we have an official of the government stating that there are 5,000,000 acres now fit for cultivation and, with a little expenditure, 12,000,000 more making 17,000,000 acres fit for cultivation. How many acres did I say, according to the Department of the Interior report in 1910, were under grain crop the product of which crippled the transportation facilities? Why, a lesser area than that—13,000,000 acres—and we find that in that area referred to by Mr. Crean, wheat has been successfully grown—I will not say to any extent, because naturally there was no necessity for cultivating grain to any extent. According to the information that I have been able to collect from people who live in the north they simply cultivated what they required. At a point 200 miles north of Prince Albert one of the oldest Anglican Missions in the west was established. At that point one of the missionaries successfully grew wheat for seven years without it ever having been touched by frost. They had a little mill where they ground the wheat which they used for food. That goes to show that wheat can be successfully grown in that region. I think I am justified in reading a portion of the evidence given by a reverend gentleman who was before the Senate with regard to this question. In a pamphlet published by the late government entitled 'Canada's Fertile North Land', at page 84, the following evidence is given:

> Evidence of the Venerable Archdeacon J. McKay, of the Church of England, Diocese of Saskatchewan, heard before the Select Committee on February 27, 1907.
>
> Archdeacon McKay explained that he had been forty-five years in the west, in charge of missions of the Church of England, and was ten years at a place on the Churchill river, a little north of Lac la Ronge. The nearest point to Lac la Ronge on the map is where the Anglican mission is situated, about ten miles north of Lac la Ronge, on the Churchill river. This is about due north from Prince Albert, and in a straight line it would be considerably over two hundred miles from Prince Albert.
>
> So far as agriculture at Lac la Ronge is concerned, witness had raised good wheat on that point on the Churchill river for seven years in succession without having it frosted. The climate is good.
>
> The witness had travelled the country about Lake la Ronge pretty freely and if it were clear of timber it would be in his opinion all generally fair agricultural land.

According to an official of the department we have some seventeen million acres of land in that vicinity, and we have the evidence of this reverend gentleman, who states that for seven years he successfully grew wheat 200 miles north of Prince Albert without it ever having been frosted. I submit that that section of the country is worthy of consideration. To-day there is a railway built and operated some one hundred miles through that section, and as fast as the land is surveyed, and as fast as the railway is being built homesteaders are taking up land along the road, shipping out grain and making a successful living. We come now to the country north and northeast of Prince Albert, and so far as I am aware no official has made a report on that section, presumably because it is well known to be good land. One of the surveyors of the Department of the Interior has been subdividing townships in that section,

and within the last year or two he has continued his work to a distance of 125 miles northeast of Prince Albert. He has made no report on the quality of the land because his business was to subdivide it, but in conversation with gentlemen in Prince Albert he has stated:

All that land is good. From where I concluded my subdivision the country appears to be not so good for agricultural purposes as it is more a timber country, but for 125 miles out from Prince Albert the country is a good agricultural country. The whole of that distance I would say would be an excellent farming country. I was there in the winter and summer both. I worked for three years in that district. That country is just waiting for settlers; it is just waiting for a railroad. It is principally agricultural for the first 125 miles from Prince Albert and past that we get into some timber country.

According to other authorities this timber country is also good agriculture land when cleared, but this gentleman is speaking of what may be considered open glades in the bush, and not covered with such large timber as is found further north. Now, Mr. Speaker, why are we surveying that country, and why are we getting people to go into it? I know, of my own knowledge, that to the extent of some thirty or forty miles north of Prince Albert, homesteaders are in there now, and they are going further north as the land is surveyed. Will not these people require the government to build a railroad into that country in which they are being induced to locate? When we come a little further east we find that the section immediately north of the Pas was explored by Mr. MacInnes of the Geological Survey, and in his evidence given before the Senate committee he made the following statement:

The whole region from Split lake to a line of about forty miles north of the Saskatchewan is a clay covered country. The witness computed the area of this country at about 10,000 square miles.

Here you have about 6,000,000 acres according to that estimate. In that country, north of the Saskatchewan river, and immediately north of the Pas, we have an area of 10,000 square miles which has been explored and pronounced to be good land. Going farther west, between that and Prince Albert, we have the surveyors' statements that there is good arable land there, and going a little farther we have Mr. Crean's report—who has spent more time there than any of these other gentlemen—that there are something like 17,000,000 acres of good land. Consequently, if we build the road from the Pas, we will be going through an immense area of good land, according to Mr. MacInnes' report, and if we build farther west from Prince Albert to connect with that line, in territory where settlers are already building their homes, we will find another large area of good land tributary to these railways. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that I have given good reasons for the construction of these roads. Of course, I do not contend for a moment that we would ever have to abandon the Hudson bay route so far as the ocean navigation is concerned. I do not intend to go into the relative distances of the Hudson bay ports, and the other ports in the east from the European market, or the immense advantage it would be to the west to build the Hudson Bay railway because all that is contained in these reports, and it has been dwelt upon very favourably in this House. I submit that for these considerations alone—and there are many others that could be enlarged upon—it is urgent that the Hudson Bay railway should be constructed as speedily as possible. The building of the Hudson Bay railway has been a factor in the west for many years. and for many years there was a land grant for the building of it on the statute-book, which was repealed some time about 1908, and something else substituted. One important point for us to consider is: How will the government build this road, and who is to bear the burden of it. I understand that the land grant I have referred to would have sufficed to build the road, but in lieu of the repeal of these land clauses, legislation was introduced allowing the selling of homesteads and pre-emptions.

The then Minister of Interior made the following statement, which will be found in 'Hansard' of 1907-8, vol. 6, page 11,135.

The pre-emption provision of the Bill of last year was placed in the Bill for the purpose of ensuring and securing the building of the Hudson Bay railway. It was placed there in the room and instead of the provision which had been in the Lands Act since 1882 setting aside a matter of 6,500,000 acres of Northwest lands for the building of the railway.

Of course, that was not the Bill that was eventually passed, but the then Minister of the Interior announced the principle on which he was making the change. Then, farther on, referring to the Act which was in fact passed, he said:

By applying the pre-emption provision of this Bill to that area, we will create a new source of revenue which will provide sufficient money to ensure the construction of a railway to Hudson bay.

The provision there referred to was the selling of these homesteads and pre-emptions. Just what quantity of land has been sold and what amount of money has been collected from this source I am not prepared to say; but in looking into the matter I find that from the sale of homesteads over $2,000,000 will be collected and from the sale of pre-emptions over $24,000,000. I am not prepared to say how much of the land thus sold was in the area set apart for the

construction of the Hudson Bay railway. Of course, I do not for a moment pretend that this money was set apart in a special account for the construction of the road; but I submit that the administration of that day, the members of this House who supported that measure, and the country at large, were led to believe that the revenues derived from the sale of those homesteads and pre-emptions would so increase the revenue of the Dominion that the government of the day would be in duty bound to build the railway. Now, I submit that there have been sufficient areas set apart and sufficient moneys acquired from the sale of those homesteads and pre-emptions not only to build the Hudson Bay railway from the Pas, but to build another branch from Prince Albert to the Pas road, or if necessary to assist any corporation that may be willing to undertake the construction of another road; because I claim that one road will not be sufficient; we should have as many roads through that country as through any other section, because there is a great deal of good land there for settlement. The road can be built undoubtedly as a colonization road, at any rate for a distance of 125 miles from Prince Albert, according to actual surveys made by the surveyors of the Department of the Interior, and we know that there is a great deal of good land beyond it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that these are good and sufficient reasons for the west demanding that the Hudson Bay railway should be constructed immediately. We in the west contend that this road can be built without putting any further burdens of taxation upon any other section of the Dominion; it can be built out of our own lands. We in the west undoubtedly require further transportation facilities, and, therefore, it is only right that we should press the matter, in view of the fact that the building of this road will promote the development of the whole of Canada. All we ask is that this road should be built by selling some of our lands, and if the government of the day look at the matter in the proper light, they will, I am sure, proceed with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway as energetically and as quickly as possible.

Before sitting down, I have a word or two to say with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), in reply to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins). If I understood him rightly, I did not think he took umbrage in any way at what was said in favour of the construction of the Hudson Bay railway; but he seems to have a hankering after the markets to the south. But I hardly think the hon. member was serious in what he said, because he must surely know that we can have very extensive trade relations with the United States without injuring Canada or sacrificing the development of Canada; but we must regulate that trade and control our own fiscal policy. We can go on and trade with the United States as we have been doing, but at the same time we must look to the development of our western country. The hon. gentleman said that he understood that there were no burdens, but only blessings. Surely he was not serious in that. It does not matter how good an administration may be, we must have a revenue to carry on the affairs of the country, and in order to get that revenue we must have some burden in the way of taxation. In that sense the National Policy is a burden, and, as the hon. member for Brandon said, under present circumstances the farmers of the east are perhaps more capable of bearing that burden than the people of the west. But the burden is one from which, under the Conservative administration of that policy, blessings flow, and, therefore the National Policy has always been distributing blessings throughout the wide Dominion of Canada.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). Mr. Speaker, I do not in any way wish to counter the resolution offered by the hon. member for Brandon in which he asks for information in regard to the Hudson Bay railway and route. We who believe in the Hudson bay route feel that the more information there is secured in regard to that route the better it will stand in the estimation of the people of Canada. But I would not like him or the House to understand that my support of this resolution would in any way be considered to justify a delay of one moment in pushing the construction of the railway. I agree most fully with what the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) has said, that there is now before the people of Canada ample evidence to warrant the government of the day carrying forward the policy of their predecessors and securing the early construction of a railway to Hudson bay, the opening of a new route to the British market for the products of our western prairies. I wish to repeat that for myself, and for the vast majority of the people of western Canada we believe that there is, and has been ample evidence to support the late government in its policy, and to support the present government in the continuation of that policy if they should so decide. If their policy is not a policy of the early construction of the Hudson Bay railway, then I can only assure them that they will receive the fullest condemnation from the people of the west that it is possible to afford them. We look at this particular time more than ever before for an increase of transportation facilities for western products. When the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) introduced his Transcontinental Railway policy in 1903 he spoke of the great necessity of the early completion of the work then undertaken. To-day

we in western Canada are placed in a position immeasurably more urgent than ever occurred before in the history of that country. The grain blockade of this year is producing more serious results than any blockade that has occurred in any previous year. Either the railway companies which are to-day transporting the products of that country are absolutely inadequately equipped, and unable to handle the traffic, or they are guilty of not using the endeavours that they should use in handling that traffic. This conclusion is absolutely irresistible.

Without discussing at any length the merits of the Hudson Bay railway, it must appeal to any man who considers that the cost of transportation of the great product of the west is the chief burden that the producer of that grain has to bear, that any plan which will cut out 1,000 miles of rail, or rail and water transportation between the producer of the grain in the west and the consumer in Great Britain, will surely be a stupendous benefit not only to the producer of the grain, but to every interest in the Dominion of Canada that benefits by the prosperity of the producer of that grain. I need not emphasize that from the heart of the grain fields of the west to Liverpool by way of Hudson bay cuts out 1,000 miles of rail or rail and water transportation. Somebody must get the benefit of that reduced cost in transportation, and we are of the opinion that the producer of the grain would receive a large part, if not the whole of that benefit.

It is said that the route will not be open for a long period during the season. Some people claim it will be open for five months, and some for only three, but I say that if it is only open for one month the construction of the railway would be justified. To reach tide water by a line of railway from the wheat fields only as long as the rail route from Winnipeg to Fort William would enable an enormous amount of wheat to be handled by that route in only one month of the year as compared with the time required for the handling of a similar amount of grain to Fort William and then by the long rail or rail and water haul from Fort William to Montreal. There is everything to gain by the shortening of the route, and the cheapening of the cost of transportation of western products, and there is nothing to lose.

Let me point out something that has perhaps not yet been considered in connection with this northern seaport on Canada's eastern coast. There is to-day being developed for settlement in the far northwest the Peace River country.

To-day—this very day—there are hundreds of people who are on their way, in this cold winter weather, to take up homesteads in the Peace River country. Any person who takes the trouble to look at the map will see that, whatever advantage there may be to the rest of the prairie country in securing a railroad outlet to Fort Churchill on Hudson bay, that advantage is accentuated enormously in the case of settlers in the Peace River country should there ever be a direct railroad connection between that country and Hudson bay. My hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) said that the possible settlers one or two hundred miles north of Prince Albert could find the present eastern outlet for their grain at a less haul than the people of Edmonton to-day. That is true. And if that be true in regard to Edmonton how much more true is it in regard to the Peace River country, three hundred or three hundred and fifty miles northwest from Edmonton. The ultimate prospect of the development of the Peace River country depends primarily upon Canada securing the opening of the Hudson Bay route or, secondarily, upon securing an equally northern outlet to the Pacific coast.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SMALLPOX AT OTTAWA POST OFFICE.

Mr. PELLETIER. I think perhaps the importance of the matter justifies me in making an announcement to the House. In the city post office this afternoon there has been discovered a case of smallpox. Unfortunately, the man was allowed to remain there two or three hours before his removal. We have been requested by the health authorities to act promptly in the matter; we have done so, and the city post office is now closed. If hon. members have any pressing messages to send, I would advise them to use the telephone or the wire. I do not know how long we shall be deprived of the use of the city post office. I may have something more to say before the House adjourns.

THE HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. OLIVER. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was trying to show the advantage that would be gained by the Peace River country, now in process of development, by taking the route by way of Hudson bay, over other sections of the west. A glance at the map will convince any one that with the distance west and distance north, the advantage resulting from the adoption of the Hudson Bay route is increased; that is to say, the Peace River country would have a maximum of advantage and the city of Winnipeg would have a minimum of advantage. As you increase the advantage going west or north, so you decrease the advantage going south or east. But all parts of the

country, whether east or west, or north or south, would necessarily be benefited by the addition of a supplementary outlet such as the railway to Hudson bay. At the present time all parts of the country without distinction are suffering for the lack of an adequate outlet; so an increase in outlets would necessarily be to the general advantage of the whole country, whether the locality was east or west, or north or south. But the direct advantage would lie more strongly with the part which is to the west and to the north.

On this point I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that the present located starting point of the government construction at the crossing of the Saskatchewan called the Pas, is probably the most generally advantageous point from which a start could be made; that is to say, the advantages and disadvantages are averaged up by starting from that point. There is a maximum of advantage and a minimum of disadvantage such as could not be obtained were the starting point made farther east or farther west. The choice of this particular point on the Saskatchewan river as a starting point for a government-constructed Hudson Bay railway, was made after careful consideration, and with due regard to all the circumstances of the case. We are satisfied to rest on that point, and if my hon. friend should see fit to change that starting point he will do it to the detriment of the general interests of the northwest. In regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay), I entirely coincide with him as to the probable desirability of a connecting railroad from Prince Albert to some point on the Hudson Bay railway for colonization purposes, and for the purpose of still further shortening the route between the country tributary to Prince Albert and Hudson bay. But even my hon. friend from Prince Albert will admit that if the only road were from Prince Albert, then a large part of the eastern portion of Saskatchewan and the whole of the province of Manitoba would be placed at a serious disadvantage in the matter of railroad distance to the bay. All interests can be served by using the present starting point, and ultimately making a connection from Prince Albert to a point on the direct road from the Pas to Hudson bay, such connection being, as my hon. friend has pointed out, desirable and even necessary for the development of the agricultural portion of that country. So whatever information the Minister of Railways may have had, I want to assure him on behalf of the late government and on behalf of this side of the House, that we are prepared to take our stand on the proposition that the Pas is the proper starting point for the railway to be constructed by the government from the Saskatchewan river to Hudson bay, or in other words, for a connection of the existing railway lines in the prairie provinces by way of a railway to Hudson bay.

Now, while we are discussing this question of the Hudson Bay railway, it may not be out of place to make a comparison between the advantages of the proposed route by way of Hudson bay and the conditions on the existing route by way of Fort William to Montreal. I have heard some people criticise the proposed Hudson bay route in comparison with the route by the lakes to Montreal, on the apparent assumption that all the grain of the prairie provinces was transported to Montreal or tide water by that route in the season of growth. It seems to be assumed that all the crop of the west could be moved to tide water by way of Fort William before the close of navigation in each succeeding year. That is, of course, absurd. I have not the actual figures, nor is it necessary to present them for the purpose of demonstrating the conditions. We will assume that the crop of the west, 80,000,000 bushels, goes forward to tide water, and that of the total amount, certainly not the whole, and certainly not the half, and for purposes of ease of calculation I will say one-quarter, finds its way by Fort William to Montreal or New York in the season of growth. We will assume for ease of calculation that another quarter or 20,000,000 bushels, goes forward by all rail during winter months, which leaves half of the total amount remaining in storage, either in the country elevators or in the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur during the winter months. Now compare these conditions with those by way of Hudson bay. We would have in each season of growth, say three months, in the fall to transport the grain from the wheat fields by way of Fort William to tide water. But by the Hudson Bay route, if you like to say so, we would have only one month, as against three months by way of Fort William and Port Arthur. We will assume that. I do not admit for a moment that that would be the limit, but I am assuming that, so as to make the argument in favour of the St. Lawrence route as strong as its friends could possibly desire. That would mean that half of the total crop going at the present time via Fort William has to remain in storage for not less than five, or six, or seven months before it reaches the market.

You must remember that the terminal elevators are not emptied on the day that navigation opens. Navigation opens at Fort William some time in May and during May and June, and possibly July, the process of emptying those elevators is going on; so that grain which went into storage in Fort William in early December may

possibly only be released from storage some time in July. What would occur in the case of grain going by way of Hudson bay would be that grain which went into storage in the latter part of October would remain in storage until, say, August, to give the most extreme limit that any person could ask, before it would be released. The difference then would be as between five months storage in one case, and, at the outside, nine months storage in the other; that is four months is the possible difference in the time of storage. Now, the storage costs approximately half a cent a bushel a month, or, in other words, the extra storage at Churchill as against Fort William would be only a matter of two cents a bushel. Over and against that increased storage and the extra length of time upon which interest will have to be paid—a difference, remember, not altogether between five and nine months but with respect to a great deal of the grain, between seven and nine months—would be the fact that ocean vessels of the largest size can reach port at Churchill during the season of navigation whether that season be long or short. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, and it cannot be denied that during, we will say, the middle portion of the season of navigation, the Hudson bay route from Liverpool to Churchill and other Hudson Bay ports is no longer and is much safer than the route to Montreal because it must be remembered that the route to Montreal is not devoid of difficulty. There is a very long river channel to be followed and there are the straits to be passed, there are fogs and shallows and difficulties along the St. Lawrence route to a very much greater degree than those which are to be encountered upon the route by way of Hudson bay, barring possibly the presence of ice at certain seasons of the year. Besides that let it be understood that there is not only cut out of the calculation the cost of transportation for a thousand miles of lake and rail, but there is also cut out, at any rate, one, and possibly two, handlings of the grain in its disposed at Churchill and from the elevator in the prairie provinces would be discharged at Churchill and from the elevator there, would be discharged directly into the Liverpool vessel, but the grain that goes to Fort William is discharged into the lake carrier, the lake carrier, then, if it goes by way of Port Colborne, possibly discharges at Port Colborne or possibly partially at Kingston and in any case must discharge again at Montreal; or, if it goes to a Georgian bay port, it discharges at the Georgian bay port and again there must be an elevator charge at Montreal. So that we not only cut out a thousand miles of distance but we cut out one or two loading charges and delays. Taking all these things into consideration there is no question that the advantages of the Hudson bay route are stupendously in excess of those of the St. Lawrence route in such part of the season as there is no difficulty from ice.

The evidence that there is a part of the season in which there is no difficulty from ice is that for over 200 years the Hudson Bay Company have navigated the Hudson straits and bay with vessels year after year, vessels that were not as manageable, or as easily handled, as the vessels of today, and yet they handled the traffic year in and year out profitably and with advantage to themselves. It was only in comparatively recent years that any other route was known into the northwest except the route by Hudson bay. It is only of recent years that any doubt was ever raised to the possibility or practicability of the navigation of Hudson bay and straits.

I wish to say, so far as the people of western Canada are concerned, that there is the most urgent and pressing necessity for increasing the outlets for their great product; and the Hudson bay route offers to them the easiest, the quickest and the most certain means of securing such an outlet as compared with any other existing or prospective routes. I want to refer for a moment to what my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) has said with regard to the cost of this road and as to who is to bear the cost. He reminded the House that at one time there was a land grant set apart by Act of parliament to aid in the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. This Act was passed, it must have been twenty-five or thirty years ago, and it remained on the statute-book during many years, or until it was demonstrated that it had no usefulness, that it would not achieve the object that it was intended for. When it became evident that this proposed land grant would not secure the construction of the road it became desirable for the government of the day to take other means and the principle was adopted of providing for the sale of land in a certain part of the western country on settlement conditions with the view, as my hon. friend has said, of providing an additional source of revenue sufficient to meet the cost of the construction of the Hudson Bay railway out of the treasury of the Dominion of Canada. There is no question who is going to pay for the Hudson Bay railway under that policy; the men who buy the land are the settlers of the west and they will have to find the money out of the product of that land. While it would be improper to make any suggestion of east against west or west against east, I would like to say to the House that, when it is an absolute fact that western Canada looks upon this road as a necessity to its welfare and when such provision has been made in the

statute that western money will actually be provided to build it, it looks very much to me like a case of setting the east against the west if the government of the day would fail to go on with the construction of that road, and to use otherwise the money especially provided to secure for the west that additional outlet to which it is entitled and which is a necessity to its welfare. It was in 1908 that the Act providing for the sale of pre-emptions came into force. Payments upon the pre-emptions did not accrue until three years after their being entered for, but the three years having elapsed the payments on account will now begin to be made. There have been already very large payments in regard to purchased homesteads and interest on the pre-emptions, and I am satisfied that the work of constructing the railroad will not now go forward faster than the money for the sale of these pre-emptions will come into the treasury to meet its charge. There is consequently every reason why there should be no delay in pushing this work forward. There is no question as to the propriety of the starting point, there is no question that for the distance that was covered by the contract let by the late government the road is practicable and is common to either Nelson or Churchill. If the government is not able to decide between the respective advantages of these two ports before that one hundred and eighty-five miles of railway can be built, then I can only say that the government will have been very dilatory in seeking information or else they will have made very bad use of the information they have received. The people of the west are looking to this government, as they looked to their predecessors, to press construction as fast as it can be done, and they look with very very grave disapprobation upon the action of the Minister of Railways in ordering the cessation of work upon the contract that had been let. Such action was not an implementing of the very definite promises made by the Prime Minister when he was leader of the opposition. The Rt. Hon. Mr. Borden visited the West during the past year, and he was particular in all cases to declare for the early construction, nay for the immediate construction, of the Hudson Bay railway. He made light of the intentions of the late government and questioned the smallness of the vote taken for construction purposes. In view of the fact that those arguments were used by him, (and they were used by him beyond any question), the people of the west have the right to feel aggrieved that the very first action taken by his government was to order work to be stopped upon the contract already let. I hope that before this debate closes the Minister of Railways will be able to announce to the House—as has already been announced in the papers and contradicted by the papers as well—that orders have been given to resume construction upon the Hudson Bay railway, and that he will assure the House there will be no delay in pushing that work to its completion.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, as I am very deeply interested in the question brought to the notice of the House by our eloquent friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins), I feel that I would not be doing my duty to my constituents and to the people of the west if I did not add a few words to convince this government—as I endeavoured when I was upon the other side of the House to convince the late government—that the most important issue before the people of this country to-day is the building of the Hudson Bay railway. We have had in the west a number of very important questions to settle, and I do not say that we have settled them all. We have had the educational question which is not without its difficulties; we have had the immigration question, which by the showing of the last census does not seem to have been very well settled; we have had the question of the administration of justice in that new country, but Sir, I am convinced—and I am convinced of it because of my knowledge of the feeling which prevails amongst the people of the west—that the question of transportation is regarded by them as of supreme importance. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), in his remarks hinted at there being an east and a west, but let me tell him that during the last campaign I laid it down as a cardinal principle that there should be no east and no west, and that if we are ever to become the great nation we hope to then it behooves the representatives of the people to forego anything which would lead to even the suggestion of a division of our grand Dominion into an east and a west. The question of the improvement in our means of transportation is a question of common interest to the east and to the west. I do not need to tell my hon. friends on the other side of the House from the west what position the farmers of that country are in to-day. We thought first when the Canadian Pacific railway was built that there would not be work enough for it to do, and the same doubt arose in the minds of many people when the Canadian Northern was constructed. Then, we got the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and whatever our friends on the other side may say, I state on the very highest authority that no Conservative in Canada ever contended that we did not need a third transcontinental line. We may have criticised the manner in which it was proposed to build that railroad, but

we always admitted there was need for it. What is the condition in the west to-day? Are the members of this House receiving any correspondence about education or immigration or the administration of justice, which were live issues in the past? No, Sir, not one per cent of our correspondence refers to these matters, but our constituents are pouring in communications asking for better facilities for the transportation of their grain, and that is easily understood, for what benefit is it to the farmer to have one thousand bushels or ten thousand bushels of wheat if he cannot get it transported to the market?

I say that the live issue in this country to-day is the building of the Hudson Bay railway. Let us have as many transcontinental lines as we like, the long land distance will always be detrimental to the profits of the farmers of the west. I was surprised, in studying the question of reciprocity, to find the great difference in cost between land transportation and sea transportation. When I found that wheat could be carried from the Argentine Republic to Montreal, a distance of 6,000 miles, for 5½ cents a bushel, less than it costs to carry wheat from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, when I found that butter could be carried from Denmark to Montreal at one cent a pound, I began to realize the importance of our getting the Hudson Bay railway. I believe the late government has been humbugging the people of the west over this Hudson Bay railway question for the last 15 years. In my experience of 30 years no government, Tory or Grit, has gone to the country without having as a leading plank in its platform the building of the Hudson Bay railway. I do not think I need tell the present government that the feeling of the western countries to-day, and the feeling of the rest of Canada too, is that we want that road built, and built now. I shall regret very much if the principal plank in the Conservative platform in the next election will be the building of the Hudson Bay railway, because I want to see this road built, if possible, as Mr. Borden promised, within the next four or five years. I would like to ask the late Minister of Interior if there is anybody in this House or in this country to-day who can tell us which is the better port, Nelson or Churchill. Each of us may have his opinion on the subject, but is it not time, after these thirty years, that the government of the day or the late government should be able to answer that question? I am told that there is very little information upon which we can rely; but I say this: we want that road built. The people of the west are very much in earnest in this matter. There are at least 175,000,000 acres of tillable land that will grow wheat or other grains in the three provinces, and to-day only between 14,000,000 and 15,000,000 acres of that is cultivated. See what it will mean when even 10,000,000 acres more are cultivated. The transportation facilities we have to-day are absolutely inadequate to carry out the grain we produce at present. The late Minister of Interior says that it is to the best interest of Canada that that road should go from the Pas. I do not care where it goes from; I want to see a road to Hudson bay, and that is what the people want. I am glad to see it stated that the government are going to start the road from the Pas. I understand that they can build not only the 175 miles from the Pas which was the contract of the late government, without knowing what their destination will be, but even 275 miles. I understand that a four-tenths grade can be got by the Fort Churchill route, and it will go well towards Nelson in order to get to Churchill. The great object is to get the shortest route possible. My hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay), and I do not blame him, says the route should start from Prince Albert. Give us one trunk line to Hudson bay, and you will soon see branch lines built from Prince Albert, Edmonton and many other towns. Now, the distance from Vancouver to Liverpool by the C. P. R., which is the shortest route at present, is 5,868 miles; from Vancouver to Liverpool by the Hudson Bay road, the distance is 4,568, or a difference of 1,300 miles. I understood my hon. friend to say that the distance from Churchill to Liverpool was about the same as from Montreal to Liverpool. Well, according to the very best figures I can get, from Winnipeg to Montreal by land is 1,422 miles, whereas the distance from Winnipeg to Churchill is 945 miles, a difference of 477 miles. The very shortest land route, which is what we want to reduce freight rates, is by the Hudson bay. Is it the fault of the harbours of Fort Churchill and Port Nelson that we have so much opposition to the construction of this road, or is it a question of the navigation of the straits? I am led to believe that it is largely the latter.

As my hon. friend said, we have had the Hudson Bay Company for a century and a half sending 750 vessels through the straits and Hudson bay and losing only two ships. What kind of ships were employed by the Hudson's Bay Company in their trading? As every one knows they must have been exceedingly crude. They had not the aids to navigation that we have to-day, and with the present strong type of ships and efficient aids to navigation the danger of navigating these waters would be still further reduced. I have heard men high in authority ask how the grain is to be got to the old country after it reaches Hudson bay. What was the old government doing that it did not

get some information about that? That is what I blame our governments for, whether Grit or Tory. This is not a new question, it has not been sprung on this government nor was it sprung on the old government, it has been discussed in this House and in the country for years, and to say now that we cannot go on with this road because we have not sufficient information is not doing justice to the intelligence of this government or any other government that puts up such a plea. It is an old old story, and I have no desire to take up the time of the House in discussing it. I stated my views three or four years ago and to-night, supporting the government, I maintain the position I stated when in opposition. Thousands and thousands of bushels of grain are to-day lying either at the stations in the western country or in the granary. What does that mean to the producers of that grain? What would it mean to my friends from Annapolis county if they could not ship their apples? The question is a broad one, it reaches out, it does not affect the farmers alone, but the merchants, the mechanics and every other class of citizen. They cannot pay their bills, they are in just the same position as if the Annapolis valley fruit growers could not market their crop.

Then why should we spend our time arguing whether we should build the Hudson Bay railway? That question has been settled long, long ago. I do not wish to raise any question of west and east. You say you want the Georgian Bay canal and I am with you, for that looks to me like a splendid proposition, for water transportation, I claim, is the only transportation that a farmer can afford to use. We cannot afford to raise wheat in the west with the rise of wages and other conditions in that country and still have these long land hauls. Our friends in the east need not be afraid of all the wheat going through Hudson bay. When I state that only 15,000,000 acres are being cultivated out of 150,000,000 or 175,000,000 acres, it will be evident that there will be plenty of wheat for all the roads to carry. I am in sympathy with what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) said in reference to the time this grain would have to be in the elevators if it went to Hudson bay. When I addressed the House before he produced the statistics for 50 years in reference to the period of open navigation in Hudson bay and showed that the shortest period for which the bay and straits were open and in which they could transport wheat was over four months, and that sometimes navigation was open for five and a half months. How much more open navigation than five and a half months will you have in the river St. Lawrence?

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

I repeat that this question has been sufficiently discussed. It is evident that the time has come for action and the needs of the country demand the immediate construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, when you read the motion of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) I read it over carefully and I wondered whether it was intended to help on the construction of the railway, because in that motion the hon. member asks for copies of papers and documents that are all available and at the hands of the government. I wondered whether the purpose of the motion was not rather to give the hon. member an opportunity of making a speech and of expressing repentance for some of the sins he committed during the last election campaign, because every word that he said and every word uttered by my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) and my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has been an absolute condemnation of the policy of the government during the last campaign. They have pointed out in their speeches the conditions as they exist in the west to-day. They have dwelt on the difficulties under which we labour and all those difficulties practically would have vanished if the grand offer that was made us of trading with the country to the south had been accepted and the people of the west had been able to sell their produce where there is a market for it and where the money is waiting to pay for it.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) the other night took me to task for saying something about the government operating the Intercolonial railway, and suggesting that they might much better hand it over to a company. He criticised me for talking about the east and the west, saying that there should be no east and no west, that we should all be Canadians, and he gave us quite a little screed on loyalty. Sir, I do not have to take my loyalty from a member of a party whose leader says: Not a ship, not a dollar, not a man to help the British Empire, a party some of whose members say they have to shoot bullet holes through the British flag to breathe the air of liberty. But if I was wrong the other night in any way, what about my hon. friend from Brandon who to-night talks about the east and the west and points out the disadvantages under which the west is suffering as compared with the east. I trust my hon, friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) will take his own follower to task for trying to raise issues as between the east and the west.

I was surprised to hear my hon. friend from Brandon acknowledge that the Nation-

al Policy weighed heavy on the people of the west. It is about the first time that we have heard members on that side of the House make that concession. Usually they try to make out that that policy is all right, but I think my hon. friend from Brandon is beginning to find out that the sentiment of the west will not stand such talk very much longer and he is finding out what his own people think on this question. Therefore he is trying to square himself with his own people, at least that is what it looked like to-night. He pointed out that one of the difficulties confronting us in the west was that we did not have manufactures to the extent that they have down here in the east. That is very true, and for many a long year to come it will remain true. There is no question that the west will never be the manufacturing end of Canada. It cannot possibly be because in most cases the goods can be manufactured much more cheaply in the east than in the west, and the result will be that we in the west, instead of putting our energies into the manufacturing of goods, will continue to buy our manufactured goods from the eastern manufacturer, and in order to pay for these goods we should be put in a position where we may sell our product to the best advantage and thus be best able to help out the manufacturers of the east. My hon. friend from Brandon pointed out that the people of the west had to pay for a long haul to get their products to the market. That is true, Mr. Speaker. And not only have we the long haul but we have to pay double prices as compared with those paid by the farmers of the east to convey our products of the farm to the markets of Great Britain or of eastern Canada. That is what we have been complaining of all along. My hon. friend from Brandon acknowledges the long haul, I would like to see him go a little further and say that the time has come when the Canadian Pacific railway—and he is a great friend of the Canadian Pacific railway; has been its solicitor in the west for the last twenty or twenty-five years and is intimately identified with that road—and the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and all other roads should be, by law if necessary, compelled to carry the produce of the farms in the west at the same price as they are carrying similar products for in the east, instead of charging two prices. Within the last two months, the Canadian Pacific railway, in the freight rate investigation, made the statement that while it costs $5.45 to move 1,000 tons of freight, one mile on the Montreal division—that is, between Montreal and Chalk river—yet on the western lines from Chalk river to the Rocky Mountains it only costs $3.75 for the same service. In other words these railways can carry freight in the west for about two thirds of what it costs them in the east. Yet, for the past twenty years they have been charging us almost double. So, if the object of my hon. friend is to hasten the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, I am with him heart and soul. But I only hope that when he gets these papers they will enable him and the government he supports to go on with the construction of that road without unnecessary delay. The hon. gentleman seems now very anxious that whilst we trade east and west the people of the west should also be allowed to trade to the north. True he puts a bar against the farmer trading to the south. But he does not put a bar to the Canadian Pacific railway trading to the south, for, while that company has one road running from the west to the east it has six roads running south into the United States. Why were these roads built by the Canadian Pacific railway? Of course, to make traffic between Canada and the United States. We heard a great deal of talk to the effect that the western farmer should not be allowed to sell his goods in the United States. He is even said to be a disloyal man if he attempts to do that. But do we hear any of these gentlemen say that it is wrong for the easterner to sell his products to the United States? If it is wrong for the western farmer to sell his goods across the line, what is the meaning of these forty-two railways that cross the line between Canada and the United States? Would my hon. friend from Brandon suggest that we should tear up these tracks and not allow traffic between Canada and the United States? I do not think he would take that position. So it comes down to this, that the western farmer can be allowed to trade with the United States provided you tax him high both on the goods he sells and on the goods he buys from that country. But something has to be done to better conditions in the west. I see by the latest issue of the 'Grain Growers' Guide' that at 133 points there is a shortage of 7,000 cars. Anybody who knows the west knows that there are a great many more than 133 points that are calling for cars so in all probability there is a shortage of over 10,000 cars at the present moment. That means that 10,000,000 bushels of wheat—for these cars have an average capacity of 1,000 bushels or over—that should have been transported months ago has not been transported yet. It means that the farmers have to carry that wheat probably all winter or pay storage on it at Fort William. It means that they have to lose in price on account of not being able to ship their wheat and also have to lose the interest on accounts that they owe. Every one in the west is feeling the cost of the lack of cars to remove the crop. Let me read what has taken place at one town in the west. Here

is a despatch published in the Winnipeg 'Tribune' of recent date:

Tugaske, Sask., Jan. 9.—The car shortage here is the worst in the history of the town. Farmers come often as far as twenty miles with their sleigh loads of grain and get here just before daylight so as to get their wagons unloaded should any cars have come in during the night. Many of them are disappointed and they have to turn their loads round and drive back home again.

Between the dates of September 30 and December 31, 1911, there were 589 cars ordered. To date there have been only 203 delivered. It is estimated, quite conservatively, that there will be required at least 1,000 cars to handle the crops. Business is paralyzed throughout the whole district. Farmers cannot meet their financial obligations and must submit to the harrassments of their creditors. Banks are getting tired of running an extended line of credit and are closing down. Merchants cannot meet their accounts with the wholesalers and commerce is disorganized.

So, you see, there is a very bad condition of affairs in the west. My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) made one statement with which I entirely agree—in fact I agree with a great deal of what he said on this occasion. He said that the people of the east had no need to fear that all the wheat would go by the Hudson Bay railway if that railway were built. That is quite true. And in the same way the people of Canada, the people of the east especially, had no need to fear that all of the wheat, or even anything like half the wheat, would have gone into the United States if reciprocity had come into force. But there would have been another market. And, instead of being able to ship only east and west—and north if the Hudson Bay railway is built—we would have been able to ship east and west and north and south. The Hudson Bay road leads us to England. And that is a good market; nobody says it is not a good market.

But there are many times in the year, in my constituency at all events, there is no time of the year that we cannot draw our wheat across the lines and get more money for it than by shipping it to England, or down to eastern Canada. I had a letter the other day from one of my constituents who is farming on the Canadian side of the line, and in the fall he goes over to the town of Ambrose, in North Dakota, two or three miles south of the boundary line, where he buys nothing else but Canadian wheat and flax. He buys there every year from 50,000 to 200,000 bushels of Canadian grain that has been drawn across the line, paying the duty, and sold in the United States or shipped in bond through to Great Britain. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that if it were not for the duties on the products of the western farmer, he would be able to sell his crop; it would not be stacked up in sacks as it is now, lying in the open field on the prairie. He would be able to sell his grain and get a better price for it, the merchant would be able to pay the wholesaler in Winnipeg, and the wholesaler would be able to pay the manufacturer in the east, and we would have a much better state of affairs all round. The western farmer would have been just as loyal under those conditions as he is to-day. Everybody knows it; I do not believe there is a man on the other side of the House who does not know it. I do not believe there is one member on the other side of the House who thinks that trading with the United States without paying duties would make us any more disloyal than trading with them and paying high duties. You cannot stop the people of Canada from trading with the United States. It is not the government of Canada that is trading with the government of the United States, it is the individuals among the Canadian people throughout the Dominion of Canada that are buying and selling goods in the United States. Why do we buy goods in the United States? Because we can buy them better than we can buy them anywhere else, or we would not want to buy them there. Why do we sell goods in the United States? Because we can get more money for them there than we can get anywhere else. But according to the various views held by hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, if the poor western farmer were not made to pay high duties on what he sells in the United States and high duties on what he buys from the United States, he would become a disloyal man. However, we begin to see signs that the representatives of western constituencies on the other side of the House are taking a somewhat different view than they did before the election.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The same views.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, I saw in a paper the other day an interview with the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett), in which he points out that some such measure as the reciprocity agreement was necessary for the people of the west, and there was no more uncompromising opponent of it than the member for Calgary. But he is beginning to change his views, just as the member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) is beginning to change his views, according to the speech he made here to-night, otherwise I cannot understand what his speech meant. My hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) made a good speech in this House to-night, and I agree with practically every word he said. He pointed out truly that 13,000,000 acres under crop can block up all the railways in Canada while other wheat is lying out

on the prairie in millions of bushels—and remember that in the province of Saskatchewan, at all events, twenty or twenty-five per cent of the wheat is not threshed yet—what would it have been had all the wheat been threshed? My hon. friend pointed out that if 13,000,000 acres under crop could block up all the railways, what would it be in a few years when we have 26,000,000 acres under crop? If we have double the amount in crop that we have at present, even if the Hudson Bay railway is in operation, it will not take out the extra amount of wheat, and we will still be under the necessity, if you are going to put the western farmer on any sort of fair footing, of providing him other markets and better facilities for getting his crop to market. I can understand my hon. friend from Prince Albert wanting to see a road from Prince Albert to the Hudson bay, and I agree with him. I believe that a road from Prince Albert to the Hudson bay is necessary, or at least, a road to connect with a road from the Pas to the Hudson bay. But I would not like to see that made the main line, because then, if you want to ship anything from Winnipeg to the old country via Hudson bay, you would have to send it via Prince Albert, which would be too much out of the way. But if the present road is built as a main line there can be a connection made at any point that seems most feasible, and there will be several branches no doubt connecting with it. As to which is the best port, the government has had that under consideration, and has sent out one expedition after another. I understand there was an expedition out there last summer; no doubt the Minister of Railways has the report of the officer sent out on that expedition, I understand there were two sent out. He will have those reports by this time, and he will be in a position to judge which is the best port to make the terminus of the railway. I trust that the Minister of Railways will reconsider the decision that he came to a while ago to shut off the work, and I trust that the report we have seen in the newspapers that he had given instructions that the work was to be started again is true. If that report is true, it will be welcome news to the western settler; if it is not true, the western settler will be much disappointed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to put any obstacle in the way of this motion passing. There is no doubt that if the object of the motion is to facilitate the building of the Hudson Bay railway, it will meet with the hearty approval of everybody in the west, Liberal and Conservative alike. It is a matter for congratulation that this is not a party matter, nor is it so treated by any one in the House. It is a matter that the people of the west are very much interested in, and all hope to have the road built as quickly as possible. I think it would make a great difference in the cost of sending wheat to the old country if that road was built. There is no doubt in my mind that it would be a good road for three or four months, and it would have a tendency to keep the other roads in order. It must not be forgotten that last fall the carriers on the lake and rail route via Fort William to Montreal raised the prices about six cents a bushel, simply because there was a big lot of wheat to get out, and the shippers got together and put the price up. Now if we had a route by the Hudson bay they would not be so well able to do that. I trust, Sir, we will hear to-night from the Minister of Railways something definite on the subject, and that the government of which he is a member is going on with the construction of the road as quickly as possible. If 275 miles, as the member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) says, can be constructed before deciding which is to be the terminus, Fort Churchill or Port Nelson, so much the better. That will keep them busy until they are in a position to decide which is the best port to make the terminal.

Mr. T. MACNUTT (Saltcoats). Mr. Speaker, I only wish to occupy a very short time in discussing this question. I do not think that it is necessary to take up very much time in discussing the necessity or feasibility of the Hudson Bay railway. Those questions were settled long ago. Both the present and the late government are committed to the Hudson Bay railway. In 1908 the then Prime Minister committed his party, the House and the country to the building of the road. Immediately afterwards a sum of money was placed in the estimates for a survey. It was an unknown country and it was absolutely necessary that there should be a scientific survey made of it. The government were then in the hands of their chief engineer. The engineer they employed was a first-class man and I think he is still recognized as a first-class man. Although he is, I believe, a Conservative, I think he values his professional reputation above his politics and he no doubt did as good work under the Liberal government as he would have done under a Conservative government. He found that he was not ready with the information, more money had to be voted and he went on with the survey in the following year. It was only about a year ago that he was in a position to tell the government to go on and call for tenders to build the road and then for the first time the government put a sum of money in the estimates for that purpose. Previous to this they had com-

menced to build the bridge across the Saskatchewan river. There was a great deal of criticism of that step, but their early action in regard to the bridge was justified because, although the contractors are first-class bridge men, the bridge is not completed yet and it will be necessary to have that bridge completed before the work of building the road can go on to any large extent because I was informed by the contractor that a great part of the material which will be required for filling up the muskegs will have to be carried on flat cars. The place at which they can get that material is too far away from the work to make it possible to move it with teams. It will, therefore, be necessary to have the bridge built and trains running before the actual work of constructing the road can go forward. However, it is expected that the bridge will soon be ready.

The former opposition were continually criticising and sneering at the government for dilly-dallying with the road and spending so much time upon surveys bridge making and so on. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), in his trip to the west last year, would not promise everything the farmers asked, but there is one thing he did promise. After criticising and sneering at the government he did promise that the policy of his government, if he got into power, would include the immediate construction of the road. The sum of $2,000,000, placed in the estimates by the former government, came in for very severe handling. It was said that at that rate it would take about thirty years to build the road. But we find that since these hon. gentlemen have got into power there has been a little dilly-dallying on their part. The first thing they did was to stop the work. Later, I believe, it has been ordered to proceed. But there has been a good deal of time lost. We also find that $2,000,000, the identical sum that was criticised last year and which was only intended for the work up to the end of the fiscal year, whereas we are now beginning a fiscal year, has been placed in the estimates by this government and of this $1,500,000 is a revote. Practically we have only half a million dollars of new money placed in the estimates for use in the construction of the Hudson Bay railway during the fiscal year 1912-13 To use the arguments that were put forward last year by members of the then opposition, it does not appear to me that we are going to have that road finished within the next twenty years. However, whether that is so or not, we all recognize the great importance of the Hudson Bay road. It has been looked for for many years, but it is cold comfort to the people of the west who are unable to ship their grain, unable to get a dollar, many being unable to get money to buy coal for the winter or to buy Christmas presents for their children, and who have hundreds and thousands of dollars worth of stuff lying out in their fields spoiling for want of transportation, to know that there is little prospect of the completion of this work within a score of years. Even the immediate construction of the road, even the completion of that road within two years, is not going to help them as the acceptance of the offer of the United States to open their gates and allow our produce to go in free would have helped them. There would have been plenty of transportation then, and I do not suppose that there would have been a bushel of grain lying unsold in the west that the owners wished to sell, not to mention anything about the price. It is not a matter of price so much as the fact that they are not able to sell it at all for want of transportation. I have here some extracts which are taken from letters sent by correspondents of farmers' papers throughout the west. I shall take only a few words from the communications of parties writing from different points throughout that country.

Thousands acres uncut; Car shortage serious; Some can't sell crop; Financial hardship; Losing money; farmers can't meet bills; Situation serious; Shortage very serious; Can't pay debts; Business at standstill; Farmers getting discouraged.

I need not go over them all, but there are statements here culled from letters from some one hundred different points, and there are very few points in the west where the same tale cannot be told. What is the matter with the conditions at all these points? How much harm would have been done to the people in the east if the farmers could have turned their grain into money and employed the money in such a way that it could have found its way down to the east? There was a crime committed against the country generally and particularly against the west on the 21st September last.

There is one thing I do not think has been touched upon, and it is that a great deal of the grain in the west is likely to go tough. It was a very wet fall, since that time and after the snow came it was threshed and it is now lying out in heaps in the fields. It must be taken, not to an ordinary elevator or warehouse, but to a drying elevator because if it is not treated in that way it is going to heat and spoil. That quality of grain seems to have a greater value in the United States than here. A great deal of that wheat will go Nos. 4, 5, 6, and feed. I see that the prices on January 3 as between Winnipeg and Minneapolis were, on No. 4, 7 cents; on No. 5, 12 cents; on No. 6, 17 cents; and on feed, 17 cents, better in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg. If that grain cannot be got out of the country and put through dryers a great deal

of it will be wasted because it will simply heat and go bad altogether. It will be no use for anything. The country is up against a severe proposition all because the short haul to the southern market was denied.

My hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) referred to the shortage of cars and in that connection I wish to read the following article:

THE GRAIN BLOCKADE.

There are more than 7,000 cars needed at 133 shipping points in the prairie provinces, and this will not represent more than a fraction of the total needs of the country to-day. A study of the information supplied by our readers in this issue shows just how serious the situation is becoming. With the thermometer running from 20 to 45 below zero for the past two weeks, with no chance to raise money on grain or at the bank, it can be imagined that there is suffering in many parts of the country. The Canadian Pacific railway is reported to be curtailing its shipments east from Fort William in order to provide relief in the country and prevent all possible grain from going to Duluth or Minneapolis. On January 23 the new rate on flax and barley will go into effect to Minneapolis and Duluth, but it is still far above the Fort William rate. Prospects are for a through rate to Minneapolis and Duluth on wheat and oats towards the end of February, on Canadian Pacific railway, Canadian Northern rail way and Soo lines only. What will happen to all the tough wheat in Saskatchewan that must be conditioned before warm weather? And what will happen to the farmers who have only this tough wheat as a result of their year's work?

It seems to me that one way to relieve the transportation difficulty, for the future at all events, is to proceed immediately with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, but in the meantime it is possible that we shall have to ship our grain south, pay the duty, and sell it in the American market, or else let it rot where it is. I can tell you that there are a great many farmers in the west who will put in their crops next year with heavy hearts, because they know not where to find a market. It is one thing to sow a crop, and reap it, and thresh it, but it is another thing to market it and get the money for it. It is quite possible that the more a man cultivates the more he will lose, and it looks as though that will happen in some cases this year. I know farmers who have always employed two or three men, but who will this year put no more land under crop than they can work themselves, because they are not sure that they will get any return to pay their employees. The consequence of all this is that a great deal of the land in that western country will lie fallow this year. The Hudson Bay railway will afford great relief no doubt, but no matter how rapidly it is built it will be three or four years before it is available. The magnates of Toronto and Montreal whose unholy profits were in danger, prevented us from getting reciprocity which would give us a market in the United States, but it matters not to them how much of our crop goes bad so long as they have the handling of it, and the consequent rakes-off. Had they allowed reciprocity to carry we would have had a great many American dollars circulating in this country, and that is what the most of us are after. If we cannot have facilities for sending our grain to market, then that western country will be at a standstill. Last year, I am informed, that from one distributing point alone—probably in anticipation of reciprocity—four hundred gasolene and steam outfits were sent out, and I have made a calculation that a gasolene or steam outfit will do about eight acres a day on the prairie, and will work at least sixty days. This means eight acres a day for sixty days or four hundred and eighty acres for one outfit, giving a total of one hundred and ninety-two thousand acres, which at twenty bushels an acre would aggregate three million eight hundred and forty thousand bushels. Now, taking one thousand bushels to a car, it would require three thousand eight hundred and forty cars and one hundred and fifty-four engines to transport the grain represented in this instance alone. The people felt sure that they would have the southern market, and they broke up thousands and thousands of acres which may not be cropped next year. In conclusion, I wish to say that if there is any possible way for the government to give immediate relief for the transportation difficulty in the west it would be of much more advantage to us at the moment than arranging for the building of the Hudson Bay road. I do not say that the Hudson Bay railway is not important, but it will not meet our present difficulties, and what will the people do in the meantime. There was but a poor crop in the west this year, and there is fully twenty-five per cent of it not threshed yet, and in some places, fifty per cent. We have three transcontinental roads it is true, but they are not able to provide cars or engines to move the crop, and the elevator room is all taken up. Judging by the vote of only half a million dollars for the Hudson Bay railway this year the road is not going to be proceeded with very rapidly, and even supposing it is built in three or four years, all the routes then available would not begin to be sufficient to take out the grain that will be offered for export, not to speak of what will be consumed at home. It takes time to build railways, and the country having turned down the market of the United States with its short haul from the wheat-fields, it is the duty of the government to offer the

people of the west some substitute. I shall support the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Aikins) because we need all the information it calls for.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no objection to the motion of the hon. member (Mr. Aikins), but I fear that when he gets the papers they will be a disappointment to him, because when I took charge of the department, and assumed the duty of looking over the contracts which had been let just before the retirement of the late government, I was somewhat astonished at the meagreness of the information before the government in reference to the character of the country traversed, in reference to the building of the road itself, in reference to the harbours on the Hudson bay, and in reference to what was to be done with the wheat when it got there. This meagreness of information led me to hold up the contract for a short time in order to ascertain if we could possibly discover what position we were in. I regret to say that I have not yet been able, from the information of the department, to discover which is the best harbour to bring this railway to. The report of the last expedition does not make it in any way more reassuring, but, on the contrary, it seems to mix up things worse than ever before. With all due deference to the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), I have to say that were it not that the route had been surveyed, and the road located and the contract let, I would not, with the information now before me, consider that the location was the best one. But, considering the promises that have been made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House as to the Hudson Bay railway being built quickly, and as to its urgency, I find it is too late now to alter it. I have therefore ordered the contractors to proceed, and the road will be gone on with and completed as fast as possible.

If the harbour question were settled today, I would be in a position to advertise for tenders for other portions; but another expedition will be necessary to settle that question. I feel that we ought perhaps to go a little slow until we get further information. I do not know that we should be getting on any faster if, as has been suggested, we let a contract for 100 or 200 miles further, because there is no way of getting in supplies as cheaply as we could get them in by the Hudson bay if the question of the harbour were settled. But it is the intention of the government to push the construction of this road as rapidly as possible. I may say that there has recently been made to the government a proposition which give us two strings to our bow; that is, that if the Hudson straits prove to be not navigable for a great portion of the year, a line of boats be established, to run from Nelson or Churchill, whichever port is settled upon, across James bay to the Nottawa River in the province of Quebec, and on down through Quebec by the Transcontinental line. This would shorten the distance to the Atlantic seaboard from Prince Albert or Edmonton by 600 miles. If the Hudson bay route should not prove favourable, the feasibility of this alternative could be looked into. I did ask the department what information we had that would warrant us in spending $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 on this road for any other purpose than opening up that vast country; and let me say here, speaking for myself only, that I believe it is the duty of this government or any government, to open up that large section of Canada and see what is there. Great results have accrued from the opening up of a country which was formerly looked upon as a part of the frozen north. Such has been the case in Ontario and in the Yukon, and, if for no other reason than that, I believe that it would be well worth our while to build the road to Hudson bay. But if it is to be also an outlet for the great wheat crop of the west, it is absolutely necessary to proceed with its construction, and to proceed as rapidly as possible. As I have said, the contractor has been ordered to proceed, and he will drive the work forward as fast as possible.

Mr. AIKINS. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) have referred to me as an official of the Canadian Pacific railway and a solicitor of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. TURRIFF. We will make it explicit.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. member alludes to me, I may say that I made no such reference.

Mr. AIKINS. I referred to the hon. member for Red Deer and the hon. member for Assiniboia. I did not refer to the hon. member for Edmonton ; he knew better. Those statements are simply a feeble echo of what was urged as an argument, though futile, prior to the 21st of September. My conviction of the impropriety of the trade policy of the late government, as enunciated in the election, was such that I felt it my duty to relinquish the connection which I previously had with the railway company as its solicitor and counsel and I realized that the constituency of Brandon would perhaps have more confidence if I did sever that connection. I ceased then to take briefs from that company and decided to take a brief from the constituency of Brandon and for the country. I presume that in the thought expressed by the hon. member for Assiniboia that I was experiencing

a change of heart or a change of policy, the wish was father to the thought; but my conviction with respect to the trade policy of the late government, as enunciated prior to the 21st of September, is the same now as it was then. It is true, Mr. Speaker, I did refer to the long haul as being a disadvantage to western Canada for the export of its products, and I do not see any difference between a long haul through the United States to the Atlantic seaboard and through Canada so far as the question of distance is concerned. It has been suggested that some of the surplus wheat that cannot be exported just now by reason of the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William being filled, should be stored at Duluth. I would prefer to see that surplus product stored in warehouses or elevators at Churchill or Nelson. I presume that the hon. member for Red Deer would have no preference as to our product being carried over American railways or over Canadian railways or being stored at Duluth or at Churchill or Nelson. So far as I am concerned, I cannot help having a preference that our products shall be carried over Canadian railways and stored in Canadian elevators. The policy of the late government, I believe would be to a very ladge extent destructive not only of our carrying trade, but of our infant industries that are growing up in western Canada. I have faith in western Canada and in western Canadian people. I believe they have enterprise and virility, and I am certain that, the opportunity being given to them, they will establish industries in proportion to their population quite as strong and prosperous as the industries established in eastern Canada. It is true, it will take time to do it. As to the report which we have received to the effect that the product of western Canada was about $113,000,000 as against a billion in eastern Canada, all I have to say is that times will change and the people of western Canada, with their enterprise and intelligence, will soon establish for themselves those industries and build up those home markets which would never have come into being if the policy propounded by the late government had been carried into operation. The hon. member for Assiniboia has referred to freight rates and has stated that they are excessive. May I ask what steps the hon. gentleman took to have those freight rates reduced when the late government was in power? If he took no such steps, how can he find fault with the present government for not doing so?

In November last a representation was made to the Minister of Railways. The Minister of Railways did take immediate steps, and he received a letter from the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners to this effect:

Ottawa, Nov. 24, 1911.

My dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 20th instant, enclosing copy of a resolution of the Winnipeg Board of Trade. This is the first complaint that has been directly made to the board regarding western freight rates generally. A good deal has appeared from time to time in the western papers, but no step was taken by anybody there to require a general investigation regarding rates throughout the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Why, when the late government was in its palmy days, when it had such strong supporters as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), were not these representations made to the authority which had the right to make the reduction, the Board of Railway Commissioners? During the whole of that period silence sat pleasantly on their tongues.

Mr. TURRIFF. For a couple of years back I had discussed this matter of a reduction of freight rates with members of this Railway Commission, and the reply was that under the Vancouver case on which they have been taking evidence for a long time past this whole matter would be dealt with.

Mr. AIKINS. The explanation given by the hon. gentleman is rather peculiar. He must have done this under cover, certainly it did not appear publicly that such action was taken. Complaint has been made of the poor farmer of western Canada. Western Canada is prosperous. Western Canada is going to remain prosperous, because we have a fertile country, and an industrious people. The Winnipeg 'Free Press,' a paper which supports hon. gentlemen opposite, in its issue of January 6, 1912, contains a suggestive comparison. The paper states that while in 1910 there was sold $48,181,000 worth of wheat, in 1911 there was nearly $63,000,000 worth. Of oats, in 1910 there was over three millions of dollars worth, and in 1911 over six millions. In barley the same proportion obtained. The total of wheat, oats and barley for the same periods were: in 1910, $58,590,000, and in 1911, $75,384,000. Of cattle, hogs, potatoes, hay, roots, poultry, and products of the dairy, in 1910 the total was a little over $80,000,000, and in 1911 over $101,000,000. That paper goes on:

The year 1911 will go down in the history of the west as one of the most unfavourable for the agricultural industry and in no way can the resources and possibilities of the country be more emphatically demonstrated than the mere statement that at the close of such a year, and with not more than 60 per cent of the agricultural productions actually disposed of, over $100,000,000 has been put into circulation from the farms alone.

The paper further says:

In December the enormous total of 18,000,000 bushels passed inspection at Winnipeg.

And also:

For the four months of the crop year of 1911, just completed, 83,000 cars of grain passed inspection at Winnipeg. Of these the Canadian Pacific railway brought in 45,721; Canadian Northern 26,516; the Grand Trunk Pacific 7,587.

The west, as I have stated, is prosperous. One way in which it can be made more prosperous will be to have this short, and, I hope, less expensive trade route for its products to the markets of the world via Hudson bay. I would suggest to the government of the day that they should include in their estimates a sum sufficient to make not only a proper exploration, and examination of Hudson bay, and a proper chart, but that they should also commence immediately the construction of adequate harbour works at the Hudson bay terminal so that when the railway is constructed the whole route may be put into immediate operation.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTS OF BOOTS AND SHOES.

Mr. CARVELL moved:

For a return showing the quantities, the different kinds as far as practicable, and prices of all boots and shoes imported into Canada during each of the fiscal years ending respectively March 31, 1908, 1909 and 1910, together with the countries from which the same were imported, giving the quantities, &c., from each country for each year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is, of course, no objection to bringing down all that can be brought down, but the commissioner points out that it would be almost impossible to bring down a complete return to this order as it appears on the Order Paper. I would suggest that the hon. member let it stand until we can get it worded so that we can comply with the order, and then we can bring the papers down.

Mr. CARVELL. I realized that there might be some difficulty in furnishing the information, and for that reason I inserted the words 'As far as practicable,' thinking that that would allow the minister to exercise his discretion in the information to be given.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The difficulty is that there are so many different makes and kinds of boots that it would be hard to distinguish them. If we knew exactly what the hon. member wanted, we could so word the order as to cover it. We have no objection to let it go through as it is, if he will be present to discuss the matter with the commissioner and express what he would like.

Mr. CARVELL. I will accept that suggestion, or I will even go farther and accept any information the commissioner can give.

Mr. AIKINS.

Mr. REID (Grenville). All right, so long as it is understood that way.

Motion agreed to.

CAPTAIN PETER DECOSTE.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM (Antigonish) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, papers and correspondence, petitions or memoranda presented to the government, or the Department of Public Works, or any official thereof, in connection with the dismissal of Captain Peter Decoste from the dredge 'Cape Breton.'

He said: It is not often that I impose myself upon the House, but as I feel that it is my duty to make this motion so I desire to explain my reason for making it. I sought to obtain the information covered by this motion early in the session. To that end a series of questions were put upon the Order Paper by me early in the session, and a pretended reply was made on the 30th November. But it was not a reply to the questions I put, the answers were evasive and the information was not forthcoming. Thinking that perhaps it was a mistake on the part of a clerk in the office of the Minister of Public Works, I called the attention of the minister to the fact that the answers did not give the information desired. I asked if any charges had been brought against this man, Captain Peter Decoste, and if so what they were, by whom preferred, and whether an investigation had been held. But the minister did not condescend to reply; in fact, he stated that he thought that the questions were sufficiently answered. For that reason I am now obliged to ask for the information in this form.

This Captain Peter Decoste is an experienced navigator, of an experience of upwards of a quarter of a century, and who has been for fourteen years engaged in looking after dredges and tugs for the Dominion government, and has given every satisfaction wherever he has been employed. I know as a matter of fact that he is a capable, competent man and stands high in his community. I know also that his dismissal came as a great surprise to those who knew him. During the time he has been employed by the government, so far as I know, no charges have been preferred against him and no complaint made by any of his superior officers. I am informed also that during that time he has been so fortunate as not to have a single man under his direction suffer serious injury, nor has there been a loss to the department of a dollar in connection with the work for which he was responsible. He received a notification from the superintendent of dredges at North Sydney to quit the service forthwith, but was given no information

whatever as to what were the charges against him. This is a most serious matter. One would suppose that the Minister of Public Works, before dismissing a man of the reputation of Captain Peter Decoste, would have given him a month's notice or at least would have intimated what the charges against him were. So far as the mere matter of employment is concerned, I do not know that he is particularly anxious to serve under the government after the way he has been treated. But the man's reputation is at stake.

Suppose he goes to seek employment elsewhere: the very first question that will be put to him by the man or company that he applies to will be: Where were you last employed? Why did you quit that service? What answer can he make? There is not even an allegation that he has been dismissed for offensive partisanship. Absolutely no information as to the reason for his dismissal. Is it unlikely that his application under those circumstances, will at once be turned down? I submit that this is a most unjust act on the part of the minister. Let me point out another thing. In his answers to the questions to which I have referred the Minister of Public Works informed the House that the successor to Captain Peter Decoste was Captain Daniel Gillis. Now, I am not here to find fault with Captain Gillis or to say anything against him, but it is a fact that he was dismissed in 1896, as I am informed, not for offensive partisanship but for incompetency and incivility. He had the misfortune to lose one dredge, and had the further misfortune of having another dredge sunk with its equipment involving a loss to the country of between $9,000 and $10,000. I do not say this was due to any carelessness or neglect on his part or to any incapacity. It may have been simply his misfortune. He may have been just as good a man as could be found for the position held by Captain Peter Decoste. But I am bound to say in all honesty and fairness that with such a record, the minister before making the appointment, should have inquired what kind of a man the successor to Captain Decoste was. I have said Captain Gillis was not dismissed on account of partisanship. As a matter of fact he was continued in the employ by the late administration after 1896 as mate on some of the government dredges, and has been in the employ of the government up to the time of the dismissal of the man whom he has replaced. Now, the Minister of Public Works has always taken high ground and has declared that he was disposed to do justice to all sections of the community. It may seem rather peculiar that Captain Peter Decoste is the only French Acadian to hold the position of Captain on one of these dredges in the maritime provinces, and he is the first to be dismissed, without an hour's notice and without an investigation. I do not propose to elaborate. I bring forward this motion only because the answers given to my questions on the subjects were no answers at all.

However, that is characteristic of the present government. It seems to me that ever since the House met, when members on this side of the House put proper questions, if answers are given at all they are answers of a character that give very little light, and are such as to leave the members as much in the dark afterwards as before. It is on that ground, therefore, that I move for all papers and correspondence in connection with this man Decoste.

Hon. F. D. MONK (Minister of Public Works). I regret that I was not in the House when the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) made his argument. I confess that, not knowing exactly that this matter was to be brought up this evening, I have not the papers with me, and am not in a position to discuss the circumstances of the dismissal of Captain Peter Decoste. The papers will be brought down at once. Let me call attention to the serious difficulty that we encounter when we are called upon to discuss the circumstances of a dismissal such as this one without the papers being before the House. My hon. friend probably is more familiar with all the circumstances of this dismissal, not having had as many to attend to as I have had since I came to the office, and is in a better position to enter into all the details he has just enumerated than the minister can be, who requires the documents in order to properly discuss the dismissal. This is an anomaly which I am sure the House will appreciate. When the papers are brought down, and we come to discuss the estimates with reference to dredging in my hon. friend's county, or elsewhere in the maritime provinces, we will be able to go more fully into the details. For my part I must confess to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am surprised at the audacity displayed by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in connection with these dismissals. My own experience of the dismissals which took place in 1896 makes me extremely humane and cautious in matters of that kind, and it is my pretension that since I took possession of the department I have made no dismissals whatever except for just and clear cause. Why would it be otherwise? What pleasure can a minister have in dismissing an official? Is there any member in this House who takes pleasure in recommending dismissals when there is no ground for that recommendation. I do not think there is a man in this House of that cruel disposition. In 1896 I was new to public life, I had just been elected in the county of Jacques Cartier, through which runs the Lachine canal.

Shortly after the government of that day came into power, every man on the canal was dismissed, without any charge, without any notice, almost without the knowledge of the Minister of Railways and Canals. It mattered little whether these men had been placed there by a Liberal or Conservative administration, they were all dismissed, without notice, without a hearing of any kind. When I complained to the Minister of Railways and Canals, at that time the Hon. Mr. Blair, he told me that he knew nothing about it, that these dismissals had taken place under pressure of members of parliament from the district of Montreal. I remember particularly the case of a man named Sauvé, who had been placed on the canal by the Hon. Mr. Laflamme when he was Minister of Justice in the Mackenzie administration. Mr. Sauvé had always behaved very well, he had been retained after 1878 by the Conservative administration. He was bridgekeeper in 1896, he was a Liberal, who had never meddled in politics. At midnight, in the month which followed the advent to power of the right hon. the leader of the opposition, that man, with twelve children, living in a small house near the bridge, government property, an infirm man, guardian of the bridge, with that large family, was told to leave next morning. He had to clear out the next morning, without having any knowledge whatever of what he was charged with. He had never meddled in any way with politics, and was not given any opportunity to defend himself. The matter created quite a sensation in that locality. From one end of the canal to the other it was known that the man in charge at Ste. Anne's was dismissed, without even a mock inquiry. It is well known that everybody was changed on that canal from one end to the other. In Sauvé's case he was removed on this short notice, and under those circumstances, to make place for a brother-in-law of a member in the district of Montreal. That was the experience I had when I entered public life, and I am bound to say to this House that it created such an impression upon my young mind at the time that I determined that I never would be a party to proceedings of that kind. Let me say to my right hon. friend who leads the opposition and who was primarily responsible for all that occurred at that time, that though we may try to improve the Civil Service law, and remove the Civil Service entirely from the operation of patronage, whatever else you may do, you must absolutely prevent our civil servants from meddling in politics. Unless you are rigid on that point all the other reforms will come to naught. All civil servants of whatever grade or condition must be absolutely prohibited from meddling in politics if you are going to carry out any real reform. They must know, they should know by this time, that any interference in politics must meet with immediate punishment, and that if they choose to meddle in politics they must take the consequences. When you have proof before you, satisfactory proof, that they have infringed that wise and salutary rule, you must act upon it, they must be dismissed. What are you going to do when you find that a civil servant has meddled in politics? What does the minister do when he finds one of his employees at fault? He dismisses him. If he has committed faults of omission of sufficient gravity he dismisses him the moment he is satisfied in his own mind that the man is guilty, that he has really infringed the rule. Is the minister going to have a trial, a kind of Warren Hastings trial, in the case of every public servant when he is satisfied that he has infringed the rule? I think it is a wise rule which says that the minister must be satisfied. In what way? Well, it has been considered I think, that the denunciation by the sitting member in this House, who takes the responsibility of making the accusation, is a sufficient warrant to the minister. I believe it is. Is he going to appoint a Royal Commission to make a costly investigation when he is satisfied from the declarations before him that the accused has interfered in politics contrary to the rule? Let me call attention to this fact, that many candidates, to my knowledge, have called upon civil servants to help them in elections. To my mind that is a very grave matter. Members of this House will all admit that that is done sometimes, men who have teams are invited to furnish their teams for election purposes. That was done in the last election, public servants were invited to take part, to come to the committee rooms, to canvass, to work, and very often the civil servant did so with reluctance.

But what I wish to emphasize is that, when the minister is satisfied by the evidence placed before him or from his personal knowledge that the rule has been infringed, the public should know that the very best step to take at once is to be severe. No reform in the Civil Service will be of any use unless that rule is adhered to. I had the case of a man to deal with, and I was perfectly satisfied from what I had been told, from information received here and there, that he had infringed this rule. I was reluctant to place the department to the cost of—how much?—$150, $200, $250, or $300, for an investigation, and I sent for this man. I asked him: Have you anything on your conscience; do you not think you have, unfortunately—because I had no desire to dismiss this man—infringed the rule? I believe my colleagues will bear me out when I say that our experience is that, probably in the hope of saving themselves civil servants deny hav-

ing engaged actively in politics, having gone beyond the mark, having infringed the rule. What is the consequence? The country is put to an expense of some $200 or $300 when the minister in reality, had it not been for the sentiment of mercy, and the desire to do justice, would have been justified in acting on the information he had. But the country is put to the expense with the result that the facts are established so that you have to act.

I believe, as far as my experience has gone since I have been in office, that it is always with reluctance that members of parliament, even in the face of gross violations of the rule, the everyday rule which all civil servants ought to know, and which they do know as a general thing, take action towards the dismissal of an official guilty of that offence. I do not believe, whatever may be said, that the idea of the spoils of office for the victors is prevalent in this country or among my colleagues in this House. But when we have the evidence that a rule of that kind has been transgressed we are acting in the public interest in applying the sanction of that rule as it has been recognized time and again for fifteen years on both sides of the House. In England interference of the public service in elections was the bane of the country. It was the plague of public administration. They reformed it. I was talking to a man the other day who has sat for many years in the British parliament. He told me that thirty years ago these abuses completely disappeared, and that during the many years that he sat in the British parliament as a member he had never once been applied to for any position or for anything in the nature of patronage. In 1882, the American government sent a commission to England that came back and made a complete report, and the American government, beginning with Mr. Cleveland, have, in many of their departments, carried out reforms, placing the Civil Service entirely outside of the region of politics. They are pursuing these reforms every day. In this country we have to make considerable progress before we reach that stage of perfection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Give us an example.

Mr. MONK. Well, I will not copy the example you set for me fifteen years ago when you spread desolation throughout my county under the circumstances I have just indicated. But, I venture to say that we have gone a great deal further, and at any rate cases which have come under my observation have been most conspicuous. I think I should give this explanation to the House.

With regard to dredging in the maritime provinces, it has not been necessary for me to be a long time in the control of my department to ascertain there are great reforms to be effected. The branch of my department which, in my estimation, calls for the most drastic reforms is that of dredging. Dredging has been carried out to a very large extent, and the necessity for it is increasing, but with regard to the awarding of contracts there are a great many things which require to be looked into and which I hope will be looked into with the least delay possible. Where the dredging is done by the government with its own plant the abuses have been most grave. The appointment of officers upon these dredges, and of the men who serve under them has been a question of political patronage and particularly so in the maritime provinces. I do not at this moment remember exactly the circumstances of the dismissal of Captain Decoste, but I am perfectly certain when the documents are all brought down it will be found that the department has acted with prudence and that the facts absolutely justified the action we took.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to think that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) does not know what is going on in his department. There are very few officials in the Department of Public Works in the constituency that I have the honour to represent. I only know of three and the whole three have been dismissed without any trial and without any complaint as far as I know against them. There was one case that I brought on two occasions to the notice of my hon. friend—the case of Mr. Roderick Sutherland, the caretaker of the public building at Canso. When I heard that this gentleman had been ordered out of the building without any complaint being made against him and that another gentleman was waiting at the door with his furniture——

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman say that no complaint was made against him?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That was my information. My information was that no complaint was made against him that he knew of. No complaint was made to him or to myself and I endeavoured by letter to find out from my hon. friend what the reason was for the dismissal of Mr. Sutherland. It was very severe weather, Mr. Sutherland had a family living in the upper part of the building, he had no other house to go to and he was ordered out on the street with his family. The furniture of the heeler who was to take his place was piled at the door and he was striking and rapping for admittance. I received telegrams from Mr. Sutherland and I wrote a letter

and asked the hon. minister if he would be kind enough to tell me what was the complaint against Mr. Sutherland and further requested that he would be kind enough to give Mr. Sutherland a trial. I waited for more than a week but I got no reply to my letter. I have had no reply yet although that letter was written weeks ago. I brought the matter up in the House and I endeavoured to extract from my hon. friend some information with regard to it. He informed me on that occasion that when I was through with my speech he would give me the information. That happened some time ago, but he has not yet honoured me by giving me any information with regard to the dismissal of Mr. Sutherland. It could not be done on the word of any sitting member because there is no member from Guysborough except myself. It must have been done on the recommendation of a defeated candidate or some one else. We were told in the House the other day by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) that the policy of the government was that when a defeated candidate asked for the dismissal of an official there would be an investigation and evidence required.

A number of dismissals have been made in my constituency on the recommendation of the defeated candidate, and there have been no investigations, and no charges made, so far as I can find out.

Mr. MONK. I did not get a request from anybody for an investigation.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Why, in Sutherland's case the minister has my letter requesting an investigation which he has not honoured with a reply, and he has my further request from my seat in this House. It is not asked that there should be a long trial, like that into the conduct of Warren Hastings, but we protest against the Star Chamber manner in which he is carrying out these dismissals. There is no department in the government where such cruel and unheard of things have been done as in the department of the hon. gentleman. If he only carried out the principles he has announced in the House all would be well, but when we know of our knowledge he is not doing so, I will not sit here without entering my protest.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The papers have stated that the Minister of Public Works has appointed a gentleman in Ottawa to conduct an investigation into the charges made against officials in the Public Works Department. Is that true?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the name of the gentleman?

Mr. MONK. Mr. Hector Chauvin has been appointed to investigate the applications for dismissals in Ottawa.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

Mr. H BOULAY (Rimouski). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker,, our hon. friends on the side of the House are very touchy in regard to these dismissals, when their supporters are affected; but I may be allowed to submit certain particulars which are not generally known and especially to recall some of their doings of 1896 and the years following. I still remember the deeds of almost incredible savagery which were committed by the Liberal party in 1896 on reaching power. I propose recalling a few of them in support of my contention. I shall quote letters written by certain officials of the Railway Department dismissing our friends without even giving them the two weeks' notice provided by statute. Here is a letter dated Campbellton, January, 1899, to Mr. Théophile Michaud, section foreman at Amqui:

Dear Sir,—I am instructed to notify you that after the 15th of the present month your services will be dispensed with. This will give you the usual 14 days' notice. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours truly,
JAMES PATTERSON.

No reason is given for such dismissal.

Another letter, dated October 28, 1896, from River du Loup, to Mr. George Dubé's address reads as follows:

George Dubé, Esq.,
Sectionman,
St. Alexandre.

Sir,—I am instructed by the chief engineer to notify you that your services will no longer be required as sectionman on the Intercolonial railway. You will, therefore, consider yourself discharged after the 31st of this month.

Yours truly,
JAMES YEO,
Trackmaster.

As will be seen, it was only a short time after the former government had come into power. That man wrote to the department to obtain particulars, and the answer sent to him was as follows:

Moncton, Nov. 2, 1896.

Mr. George Dubé,
Ex-Section Man,
St. Alexandre Station, P.Q.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 30th ult., asking the reasons for your discharge from the service.

I do not know of any reports against you. My order was from the general manager and was repeated to Mr. Yeo.

Yours truly,
P. S. ARCHIBALD,
Chief Engineer.

Now, that is only a sample of what was going on in 1896. And in my constituency where there are about a thousand civil servants, a clean sweep was effected throughout the county of poor sectionmen on the Intercolonial, most of whom

earned $1 or $1.25 per day. They were all dismissed with the exception of the supporters of the government then coming into power. Strangely enough, two of these unfortunates along with others were dismissed simply because they bore my name. One of these victims was at the bedside of his dying wife, and what did the Liberal party do? Did they postpone taking action until that man resumed work? No, news of his dismissal was carried to him at home while his wife was lying on her deathbed, and that poor woman was so much taken by surprise that within twenty-four hours she died.

But that is not the whole story. A poor sectionman of St. Flavie, named François Roy—and that case is still vivid in the minds of the people of that locality, so painful an impression did it make—was on his deathbed. Lest they might lose the opportunity of depriving him of the small insurance which would be forthcoming from the Intercolonial, had he died while in their employ notice of his dismissal was forwarded to him two days before he expired, and his family was thus deprived of that amount.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few samples and illustrations of the doings of the Liberal party in 1896. And our opponents to-day protest forsooth when we insist that some of their friends should be discharged. In my own constituency there are still living twenty of the victims of 1896, and not a single one has been reinstated. Will our opponents contend that we have not the right to discharge their friends in order to reinstate those who lost their situations in 1896, though their only fault consisted in their party leanings?

Liberals take the ministers to task for having effected too many dismissals. We are of the contrary opinion, we think they are not discharging as many as they should. I am sincerely of opinion that before adopting the principle laid down by the Liberals, we should first restore things as they were when the Liberals came into power, that is to say set things right by discharging their friends to reinstate ours, and then if there are reforms to be carried out let these gentlemen suggest them, and we shall approve of them if they are right. But first let each one have his due.

Cases of dismissals of that sort are not wanting; there is one recurring just now to my mind. At Moncton, Mr. T. V. Cook was dismissed on the ground of old age—he was forty-six years old—and he was replaced by a Mr. Palmer, who was sixty-one, but who was a friend of the government; he was appointed though by fifteen years the senior of the man he replaced.

I shall not dwell any longer on the subject of dismissals. The matter has been already debated at length in this House, and I think that public opinion is pretty well posted in this connection, and hon. members of this House as well.

Our opponents have very bad grace to show surprise under the circumstances, for they have exhibited a remarkable lack of decency and fairness in dealing with our friends in 1896.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). The Minister of Public Works has told us that the denunciation of the sitting member is sufficient for him to dismiss an official, and lest the impression should go abroad that I, the sitting member, denounced the Captain of the dredge 'Cape Breton'. I wish to say that such denunciation did not come from me, nor have I been able to find out whence it came. That is why I put the question in the House, a first time and a second time, as to the manner in which that dismissal was made, and that is why I have moved to-day for the papers. The minister tells us that it will be shown that the department acted with prudence, but I think it will be shown that the department acted with characteristic promptness. I am told that in the matter of these dismissals the Minister of Public Works is the biggest sinner of them all, which is to be wondered at, because in this House, when in opposition, he always pleaded for political purity, and denounced, as we heard him to-day, everything that savoured of unkindness or lack of charity. He was moved very deeply this evening when he told us of the dismissals that took place in 1896 on the Lachine canal, but he forgot to tell us that he denounced the then government for having done what he now tries to excuse himself for doing. It is quite plain that these gentlemen opposite are not honest and sincere. Why don't they stand up manfully and say that they have dismissed these men because they were partisans; why do they not tell us that in the assurances they gave the electors they were trying to fool the people, and that when they were trying to seek their votes they proclaimed they had virtues which they did not possess.

Why do they not say that they are only playing a game—call it hypocrisy if you will—and that they are no better than others? What the country wants to know is where these hon. gentlemen stand; it wants to know what foundation there is for all this pretended virtue. The hon. gentleman refers to the cases of men who were dismissed from the Lachine canal. No doubt everybody sympathizes with any men who have been summarily dismissed; but I submit that it is not as great a hardship for an ordinary labourer to be dismissed as it is for a man say in the position of a sea captain. Captain Decoste depends for his livlihood on the knowledge which he has as a navigator. If he is dismissed without any

reason being assigned, the supposition may be that it was for dishonesty or incompetency or something of that kind, and he may find it difficult to obtain another position. Suppose the official of a bank is dismissed without any reason being given, what other bank is going to engage him? He must have as it were a clearance from his last employer. Take a railway conductor or operator who has been dismissed in the same way, if he goes to seek employment elsewhere, the first question he is asked is why he left his last employment. Therefore, I say the Minister of Public Works inflicts a great hardship on this man by dismissing him without assigning any reason, even if he had no better reason than that he was a political partisan. I hope he will do at least this measure of justice to Captain Decoste, that he will give the reason for his dismissal and give him an investigation. I rather suspect that the minister has been imposed upon in connection with this matter. I have an idea that the facts were not correctly represented to him. I know Captain Peter Decoste, who is a man highly respected in the community in which he lives and wherever he is known. While he has his opinions and exercises his franchise and has the courage of his political convictions, he is not by any means an offensive partisan. I would like to know what means the Minister of Public Works has of judging what an offensive partisan is. If a man simply exercises his franchise, is he to be dismissed? If a man happens honestly to believe that a certain policy is the best for the country, exercises his franchise accordingly, and gives expression to his convictions without being offensive or making himself a nuisance to the public, I think it is unfair for the administration to dismiss him because he happens to be a Liberal. I would say that the least expected of a man in the service of the country, whether Liberal or Conservative, is that he should be faithful to his employers; but he should surely be allowed to give expression to his views without being called an offensive partisan. What I regard as an offensive partisan is a man who goes about provoking controversy and making himself a public nuisance and not discharging properly the duties of his office. The Minister of Public Works gave us this evening one of the sermonettes that we heard from him quite frequently when he was on this side of the House. In the cold shades of opposition he used to preach virtue loudly and eloquently; but it was a rather hyperborean atmosphere, because he was not in much more favour with his own friends than he was with the Liberals. I am afraid it is a case of

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish).

When the deil was sick the deil a monk would be,
When the deil was well the deil a monk was he.

When he has the reins of office in his hands, and is pressed on all sides by ravenous wolves looking for jobs, he falls from grace, and shows that he is not entitled to be placed on that high pedestal upon which we have been accustomed to place him.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers, correspondence and orders in council in connecton with and relating to the dismissal from office of public officials from each of the departments of the government from the fourteenth day of July, 1896, to the 10th day of October, 1911, including both the inside and the outside service.—Mr. Goodeve.

ADJOURNMENT—THE OTTAWA POST OFFICE

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PELLETIER. Before the House adjourns, I desire to give a little more information in regard to the unfortunate occurrence at the city post office to-day. In the first place, I may inform hon. members that the mails from this House and the Senate to-night and to-morrow morning will not be taken to the city post office, but will be taken directly to the trains. Every possible precaution has been taken by the health authorities with the co-operation and concurrence of the department. The mails are being fumigated to-night, and the process will last until six or seven o'clock to-morrow morning. All mails which had not left the office when the event became known have been kept there to be fumigated. The public will understand that it is better to have a little delay in the mails than to run any danger. It is probable that all the employees in the city post office will be vaccinated to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). There may be one or two Bills, which are on the order paper and after that Supply. We will deal with the estimates of the Minister of Customs in the afternoon and then with those of the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjurned at 10.49 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 16, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INQUIRIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. On Thursday last I asked that Bill (No. 19), to amend the Inquiries Act, be held over to give me an opportunity to look into the point raised by the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley), as to whether or not the Bill should be preceded by a resolution, under rule 77 of this House.

An examination of cases shows that this rule has sometimes been given a wider application than the rule itself seems to justify. Bourinot, at page 638, states that 'it is the invariable rule that all measures involving a charge upon the people should be first considered in a committee of the whole.' A discussion of the point also appears on pages 566 to 573.

The Bill applies both to part I and part II of the Inquiries Act, which is a consolidation of two previous Acts, neither of which was preceded by a resolution. Part I was a Bill introduced in the Senate in 1868 and part II was a Commons Bill introduced in 1880.

It has been urged that though the present Bill does not deal with the question of payment of the persons to be engaged by the commissioners; they might, under its terms, incur expenses which would be payable out of the consolidated revenue fund and thus be a charge upon the people without parliament making any provision for their payment by a resolution in Supply.

This objection could certainly have been urged, with at least equal force, in the case of the two Acts which this Bill seeks to amend. And yet, as pointed out, no resolution was deemed necessary as a condition precedent to their enactment.

An English precedent, referred to in Bourinot, note (n), page 643, was a motion for leave to bring in a Bill to enable the government to acquire lands for public purposes, but not providing funds for the same. On objection being taken that the Bill 'involved a charge upon the public,' answer was made that the Bill only proposed to give the government power to buy land, but for that power to be of any use an estimate must be voted in committee; that the Bill would not enable the government to purchase any lands until the House in committee had considered the estimates and agreed to them; that the Bill did not authorize the expenditure of any public money although the expenditure was contemplated. The Speaker ruled that the object of the Bill was to take ground for certain purposes. It did not give them power to purchase the property. The funds should be voted afterwards in committee of the whole.

The question is not free from difficulty. Mr. Bourinot in his observation seems to have extended the scope of the rule rather beyond the terms in which it is worded. What those terms cover is 'a motion for any public aid or charge upon the people.' This Bill does not constitute such a motion. The most that can be said is that under its provisions something may be done which may give rise to a claim against the government. If this is sufficient to bring it within the rule, then it would have to be held that every Bill conferring a power upon the government in the exercise of which expense might be incurred, comes under the rule. This, in my opinion, would be giving altogether too extensive an interpretation to the words 'a motion for any public aid or charge upon the people.'

While the authorities are not absolutely reconcilable, I am not disposed to attach to the rule this very enlarged meaning. I am therefore of opinion that no resolution is necessary.

PUBLIC ARCHIVES.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient, (a) to authorize the transfer of public records, documents and other historical material from the various government departments to the Public Archives, which material shall be placed in the custody of an officer to be called the Dominion Archivist, who shall have the rank and salary of a deputy head; (b) to provide for the purchase, under the authority of the minister named for that purpose, of records, documents and material, and for expenses in connection therewith; and (c) to provide for the appointment of such officers and clerks as are required for the proper care, custody and control of the Public Archives.—Mr. Borden.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN. This resolution explains itself fairly well. At the present time the archives have not been constituted under any particular Act. They have been attached to the Department of Agriculture in common with a great many other subjects which have no particular relation to that department. It is proposed upon this resolution to found a Bill which will be known as the Archives Act and which will contain provisions for the administration of the archives under the President of the Privy Council. I do not know whether it is desired to discuss the proposed resolution now or whether it would meet the views of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to pass the resolution and discuss it on the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will have the discussion upon the Bill

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66) respecting the Public Archives.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 19) to amend the Inquiries Act, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In what respect will the Act as amended differ from the existing law?

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice). It may possibly be that with regard to engaging the services of competent technical officers, counsel, &c., necessary to assist the commissioners, that power is conferred impliedly under the existing law. There is a maxim that things that go without saying go better when you say them, and so the amending Act makes that power clear. However, I do not think it could have been intended by the existing law, as is provided here, that subject to such a power being expressly inserted in the commission, the commissioners may depute their right to carry on the inquiry to such experts or other persons as they may indicate, and that these persons so deputed may exercise their powers in the same manner as the commissioners themselves. This seems to be a desirable power to confer upon commissioners, more particularly where the scope of their inquiry may cover a very wide field, and where it might be found convenient to carry on different branches of the inquiry simultaneously. Under the second part of the existing Act which deals with departmental inquiries, there is power to depute the right to investigate, but that is limited to a particular case and applies only to a commissioner appointed by a minister to conduct a departmental inquiry. It seems desirable that this power should be conferred on the commissioners as is provided in this Bill. It is obvious that such power will enable a commission charged with the investigation of a very large department or a number of departments, to proceed with greater expedition than would be possible if the commissioners had personally to conduct an investigation into each particular matter which might arise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To the object of the amendment, that of giving the commissioners more ample powers, I can see no objection, but I do not know that a Bill is necessary for that purpose. I have always understood that the powers conferred on the commissioners to investigate were sufficient to enable them to employ accountants or special experts.

The first part of the resolution reads as follows:

> 11. The commissioners, whether appointed under part I or under part II of this Act, if thereunto authorized by the commission issued in the case, may engage the services of such accountants, engineers, technical advisers, or other experts, clerks, reporters and assistants as they deem necessary or advisable, and also the services of counsel to aid and assist the commissioners in the inquiry.

I have no objection to this, but as to the other part regarding the delegation of powers I may have to offer some observations later on. But if the commissioners have the power to engage counsel to assist them, does not my hon. friend think the party whose conduct is being investigated should have a similar power?

Mr. DOHERTY. There might be circumstances under which it would be considered just that the party whose conduct is being investigated, should be entitled to the assistance of counsel; but I do not think it would be necessary for that purpose to insert any provision in the Act. We are dealing with powers conferred on the commissioners; and if it should appear to them desirable that any one whose conduct is being looked into should be aided by counsel, they would not require any special authority to consent to such counsel being heard. That would not be the case of their calling on anybody to render services to them, but would be merely an exercise of their own judgment as to whether the assistance of a counsel on behalf of the party accused would be advisable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This Bill is a departure from the law in a very important essential by authorizing the commissioners to engage counsel. I do not suppose that this government would claim to be so unjust as to appoint its commissioners from among gentlemen who are at all biased by partisanship. I believe that, upon the recommendation of my hon. friend, commissioners have already been appointed. Those gentlemen are all known to be very active Conservatives. It is now proposed to give them the power to employ counsel. I take it for granted that they will employ counsel somewhat tinged with partisan bias. I would not expect them to employ any one known to be a good Liberal. Now a one-sided investigation—an investigation in which there is only one lawyer—is bound to give great dissatisfaction. It would be the easiest thing in the world for a lawyer—and he will do it perhaps un-

consciously—to give a bias in favour of the particular side of the question in which he is interested. When we propose to give power to the commissioners to employ counsel it is only right that the official whose conduct is being inquired into should be given the right to be also represented by counsel. Only in that way will he get fair-play. Therefore, it seems to me that the suggestion of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should be accepted. It ought to be the inalienable right of every man, whose conduct is being investigated, to employ counsel in order that he may get fair-play and that all the facts be brought to light.

It is only by giving to a man that right that justice will be completely done and that the public will be satisfied that justice has been done. In order to bring the matter before the committee, I would move that section 1 be amended by striking out the word 'section' in line 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'sections.' That would enable the additional sections which I have suggested to be added. Then I will move that the following be added as section 12:

Any person whose conduct is being investigated under this Act shall have the right to be represented by counsel on such inquiry.

It is not proposed by this amendment that the expenses of counsel, other than those employed by the commissioners, shall be paid by the government. The party whose conduct is being investigated, if he chooses to employ counsel, will have to pay that counsel himself. I trust that my hon. friend will see, on reflection, that this request is a very reasonable one.

Mr. BORDEN. No one is disposed for a moment to quarrel with the suggestion that any man who is being investigated by a commission appointed by any government ought to have the right to be represented by counsel if he so desires. I do not know that this rule has been very fully carried out in the past, because under at least one commission issued by the late government the parties whose conduct was being investigated were permitted ostensibly to have counsel, but the counsel was not permitted to say a word or take any action. I think that any commissioners appointed under the provisions of this statute would have it entirely within their discretion to permit any person whose conduct was called in question to employ counsel. I think that course was taken by Mr. Justice Cassells acting under the commission issued under the second part of this Act, which conferred upon him certain powers of inquiry into the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I do not think the proposed amendment is necessary. At the same time, I would not be disposed to oppose the suggestion of the hon. gentleman if it would not lead to confusion. For example, suppose that a commission appointed to inquire into certain departments of the government, begins its work in a particular department, is every person in that department whose conduct is inquired into to have the right to employ counsel and the whole work of the commissioners to be thrown into confusion in that way? My own idea is that it would be better to leave the matter to the commission, with the assurance that fair play would be given in every case. However, if my hon. friend has a strong opinion about it, we will let this section stand and take his suggestion into consideration and give him an answer to-morrow. I can assure hon. members that we are disposed to put into this Act every provision which will ensure fair play.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The suggestion made by my hon. friend beside me may not be necessary, but the Minister of Justice stated a moment ago that the Bill itself may not be necessary. It has been felt hitherto that the powers sought to be concurred by statute were implied powers, but it is to make assurance doubly sure that the Bill is introduced—to put it beyond doubt that commissioners will have power to employ experts, accountants and counsel. In the same way it is just as necessary to make it absolutely sure that any party whose conduct is being investigated shall have the right to employ counsel.

Mr. BORDEN. We are dealing with two entirely distinct things. In the one case we are making sure that the commissioners shall have the power which my hon. friend thinks they have at the present time, but in the other case we are dealing with a matter as to which the commissioners have perfect discretion at the present time, and one could hardly suggest in advance that that discretion would not be exercised fairly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The suggestion of my hon. friend is that the party whose conduct is being investigated should have the right, beyond the discretion of the commissioners, to walk into court and say, I want to be heard by counsel. If he had not that right, he would have a sense of injustice and the feeling that he was not getting fair play. I think there is nothing to be lost and everything to be gained by giving him this right, and I hope my hon. friend will accept the suggestion.

Mr. DOHERTY. It is only fair that any person against whom any imputation is made, implying guilt or misconduct of any kind, should be entitled to have counsel. And, while I do not expect perfectly angelic commissioners, I confess that I did not suppose that the commissioners that this government would appoint would

be so devoid of a sense of justice that under these circumstances they would refuse a man the right to have counsel. It does seem to me, then, that when you provide, as in the terms of this suggested amendment, that any person whose conduct is to be investigated shall have the right to counsel, you go too far. For, if it be necessary to investigate the operations of a department, the conduct of every employee in that department will be subject, at all events, to be investigated; and if every one of these employees has the right to be represented by counsel, even before anything has been suggested reflecting in any way upon his conduct, you may hamper the entire investigation. As I have said, I have not the slightest objection to any man against whom an imputation is made being entitled to be heard by counsel and defended by counsel, should he so desire. I never doubted that any commission we would appoint would recognize that principle and act upon it. It never occured to me that anybody would want to act so unfairly as to refuse such a right. But it seems to me that the difficulty may perhaps be in the terms in which the proposal is made rather than in what is intended. I can hardly think the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) would suggest that everybody whose conduct was subject to be investigated should, as a matter of right, be entitled to have counsel before the commission. To insert such a provision, it seems to me, would afford facilities to block the investigation and that, I think, we ought to avoid. I am sure we are as desirous that any investigation made should be carried on wtih absolute fairness as hon. gentlemen on the other side can be. But, on the other hand, I do not think we should so far overlap as to run the risk of making an effective investigation impossible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. minister (Mr. Doherty) is supposing an extreme case—that each officer of a department under investigation would wish to employ counsel to speak for him at the inquiry. The right proposed to be given is that any employee should be free to engage counsel and pay him out of his own pocket. No one would do that unless he has cause to employ counsel. There may be a hundred cases to be investigated and of these probably ninety-nine will feel it unnecessary to engage counsel. But the commissioners have the right to employ counsel and a similar right should be given to the other party. I understand that this matter will be left for further discussion later on.

Coming now to the second part of this amendment of the law as proposed by the hon. Minister of Justice, I must say I have very serious doubts as to the working of this proposed legislation. It reads:

—and the commissioners may authorize and depute any such accountants, engineers, technical advisers, or other experts, or any qualified persons, to take evidence and inquire into and report to the commissioners upon any matter within the scope of the commission as may be directed by the commissioners, and such persons shall, in the execution of the powers as deputed or authorized, have the same powers which the commissioners have to issue subpœnas, enforce the attendance of witnesses, compel them to give evidence, and otherwise conduct the inquiry.

In this my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty), proposed to afford means by which these experts may be given powers in effect even greater than those given to the commissioners. The commissioners are authorized to engage other experts, and then to hand over to these experts the same powers as to subpœnaing witnesses and compelling evidence that the commissioners have themselves. I am sure that the government will place at the head of this commission a man who is a lawyer or a judge, one who understands the examining of witnesses with a view to ascertaining the truth. But to hand over to the experts the same powers that are given to the commissioners seems to me illogical, and if I may say so with out offence, impractical. You cannot expect an accountant or an engineer to have the same ability to examine a witness so as to find out the truth as a man whose business it is to deal with these matters. I think that under the circumstances the hon. member (Mr. Doherty), on fuller consideration, will agree that this legislation is extremely dangerous, and is not calculated to give justice to the parties whose conduct is to be investigated.

Mr. DOHERTY. This legislation is not by any means the first under which it is provided that men of technical knowledge should have the power to summon and examine witnesses. Gentlemen who are familiar with our laws in the province of Quebec will know that we have a whole series of articles in our Code which provides for reference of matters of this kind, matters requiring expert knowledge in connection with certain arts or sciences, to experts, these experts being not only empowered, but required to hear witnesses. An accountant who goes into the accounts of a great business covering, possibly, the operations of years, will require, in order to arrive at correct conclusions, information that does not appear on the face of these accounts. If some such provision as this were not made, when he needed such facts he would have to report the fact to the commission, the commissioners would have to sit and bring the witnesses to them.

I think that is not a very reasonable suggestion. It seems to me, it would be better to follow the course which is followed, certainly in my own province, and I am told in other provinces as well.

The only difference I can see is that with regard to the legislation I am referring to where the courts exercise these powers of conferring a power of investigation and examination upon accountants, and experts, and other persons of those classes, the power of compelling an answer, for instance, might possibly have to be referred back to the court. There is an obvious reason for it. The court has a function, and a quality which after all the commissioners do not necessarily have. There is no reason to suppose that the special commissioner who may be named under these provisions, the man whom I may call the sub-commissioner as distinguished from the principal commissioner, will not be a man perhaps more competent to elicit proof with regard to a technical matter, if I may so describe it, and use a word that may include them all, than would be the commissioners themselves. To empower that special commission to carry on an investigation seems to me to be, with all respect to the criticisms of the right hon. gentleman, the most rational method of arriving in the most effective way at the truth with regard to the charges which are the subject matter of investigation, or that may call for being treated in that way. As to these commissioners having power to compel the attendance of witnesses, and compel them to answer, I cannot see that there can be any objection to the special commission that might not equally be applied to the commissioners themselves, and of course a commission that would not have power to compel the attendance of witnesses and compel them to answer, would be on its face a perfectly nugatory one. I confess that I cannot see that the observations of the right hon. gentleman justify his expression of such a very strong objection to these provisions. The right hon. gentleman speaks of them as something absolutely new. As I pointed out at the outset, to a very moderate extent the power of deputing the power to carry on an investigation is to-day, under the Inquiries Act, conferred upon commissioners who may be named under it, that is, in the case of commissioners named for departmental inquiries. Section 9 of the Act already provides for that case. It is therein specially set forth that you may have such a deputation of power or powers:

> If, by reason of the distance at which any person, whose evidence is desired, resides from the place where his attendance is required, or for any other cause, the commissioner or commissioners deem it advisable, he or they may issue a commission or other authority to any officer or person therein named empowering him to take such evidence and to report the same to him or them.

Then it goes on to provide:

> Such officer or person shall before entering on any investigation, be sworn before a justice of the peace faithfully to execute the duty entrusted to him by such commission, and shall, with regard to such evidence, have the same powers as the commissioner or commissioners would have had if such evidence had been taken before him or them, and may, in like manner, under his hand issue a subpœna or other request or summons for the purpose of compelling the attendance of any person, or the production of any document, book or paper.

Now that power seems to be a large one, but it is conferred only in the case of a departmental inquiry, and would not, therefore, apply to the case of a commission issued under general powers, under the provisions of general application of part I of the Act. In the second place, the power already conferred is to be exercised only in that particular case, and with regard to the examination of a person or persons to whom it is difficult, by reason of distance or for other causes, to be present to testify, or whom it is not possible or convenient for the commissioners themselves to examine. So the legislation at present is after all but a widening of cases where this power of deputation may take place, an extension of it, so as to make it apply not only in one particular instance a departmental inquiry but also when, in the judgment of the commissioners it is advisable in the case either of a general inquiry, or an inquiry under the general provisions, or in the case of a departmental inquiry.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend think that the very fact that parliament, by section 9, only provided for a special commission to be appointed in an exceptional case where, by reason of the witnesses being far away from the headquarters of the commission, it would be exceedingly difficult or inconvenient to get the witnesses before the commissioners, that in that particular case power should be given to a special commissioner to make an examination—does not the hon. gentleman think that this fact shows that parliament at that time, at all events, when the original Act was passed, was of the opinion that this deputing of authority ought to be exercised only in exceptional cases? But in the present Bill my hon. friend proposes to widen it, so that it would be absolutely at the discretion of the commissioners to appoint a sub-commission without any reason at all, without it being necessary to do so for the convenience of a particular witness to give his evidence? The words are very broad. It says:

Commissioners may authorize and depute any such accountants, engineers, technical advisers or other experts, or any qualified persons, to take evidence and inquire into and report——

In other words, it gives to these commissioners absolutely the same power which the Governor in Council has to-day to appoint commissioners. These three men, or these commissioners, whatever number there may be, whenever they choose to do so, may appoint special commissioners, who may be absolutely without qualification to hear evidence, absolutely without knowledge of the rules of evidence, absolutely incompetent to carry on an important inquiry; they may be appointed to hold these investigations anywhere they please throughout the country, even though there might not be the slightest necessity from the standpoint of the convenience of witnesses. My hon. friend has said that it is not at all uncommon in the province of Quebec to have experts make inquiries. I do not dispute that at all; in the other provinces the same thing is done. But I know that in the province of New Brunswick inquiries made by a court go to referees, as a rule, indeed I think always, referees who are always men of experience, who know the rules of evidence, and who, therefore, are competent to carry on these inquiries. My hon. friend has also said that in the province of Quebec, if any question were to arise with respect to a witness declining to give evidence upon a particular matter, the referee would have to send the matter to the court and let the court take proceedings. But there is no such provision in this statute. These experts might be utterly ignorant of the rules of evidence, utterly ignorant as to the mode in which an inquiry of this character—because it is a semi-judicial inquiry—ought to be conducted, might be utterly ignorant of the rules which govern such an inquiry. If a witness should decline to give evidence, you can bring him up at once, or have him brought up before a magistrate, and have him fined $400 without referring back to the commissioners at all or without any reference to a court. It is surely a dangerous power to give to an expert, to give to an engineer or to an accountant or to some person who has not the slightest idea of the rules of evidence. But that is what my hon. friend proposes to do. As the Prime Minister has said, presumably, in appointing commissioners of this character, the chairman would be a lawyer of good standing, or he would be a judge. The reason that a lawyer or a judge is selected is that he knows the rules of evidence, he knows how to conduct an inquiry, he knows what questions ought to be asked of a witness, and what questions ought not to be asked of him.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

He knows the difference between giving evidence of facts and giving hearsay evidence. If a witness should decline to answer a question these commissioners can then take proceedings before a magistrate to have the witness fined $400 for refusing to give evidence. But my hon. friend proposes to vest that power in anybody whom these commissioners may choose to appoint, men who may not be lawyers, men who, indeed, it is expected, will not be lawyers, men who may be engineers, architects, accountants, or other persons, and who may be entirely ignorant of the rules of evidence and will not have the slightest knowledge of the mode in which the inquiry should be carried on. It seems to me that the present provision contained in section 9 is amply sufficient for the purpose. This Bill gives to the commissioners very wide powers with which we make no quarrel upon this side of the House. Where, by reason of a witness whose evidence it is desired to obtain living a long distance from the place where the commissioners are holding their court, it is desirable to have sub-commissioners appointed, such sub-commissioners may be appointed under section 9. I think that covers all the cases which might reasonably be expected to arise, and that upon the whole it is better to keep these inquiries under the control of your own commissioners, as to whose knowledge, qualifications and experience you are able to judge when you make the appointments. It would be a most unreasonable and improper thing to allow these commissioners, of their own motion, without the necessity arising, as is provided for by section 9 of the present law, to delegate the powers which they themselves possess to men who may have no experience whatever as to the conducting of inquiries and as to the law of evidence, to allow them to determine as to whether a witness is refusing to state what, in law, he is not bound to state and to empower them to have him brought before a magistrate and have this large fine imposed upon him. I could understand that my hon. friend might justify this amendment if it were proposed that there might be in certain circumstances a reference back to the commissioners or a reference to a court or a judge, but this will give all these sub-commissioners, who may not be lawyers or judges or men having the slightest knowledge of the rules of evidence, the very improper right and the very absolute power of bringing a man up before a magistrate and having a very heavy penalty imposed upon him simply because he refused to answer questions which were entirely improper and which he was not bound to answer.

Mr. BORDEN. I think the dangers which my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) conjures up are more or less imaginary. Take the cases that have been put forward as illustrations by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), of references in courts which we see every day; a matter which will occupy a long time is, by reference, committed to some person with the duty of inquiring into it. We know that these men to whom these references are made very often have no legal training, and that notwithstanding this, these apprehended injustices do not occur. In addition to that, there are hundreds of officials throughout the country who have no technical legal training whatever, but who administer oaths and conduct inquiries and no detriment to the public interest is apparent. For example, coroners for the most part are medical men having no training in the law and yet they conduct inquiries and receive evidence, and I have never known of any serious injury resulting from their lack of technical legal training. There are hundreds and thousands of justices of the peace throughout the country who, under the laws of the different provinces, have the authority to examine witnesses on oath.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And who make a great many blunders, too.

Mr. BORDEN. Well, there are a great number of them and I do not think as a general rule that any serious injustices result from their acts. They are men, it is true, who have no technical training, but they do hear witnesses on oath and draw conclusions from the evidence so given. The proposal embodied in this Bill is purely for the purpose of convenience and expedition. It comes down in the end to this, with which every hon. member will agree at once, that it is desirable to empower these commissioners to employ experts for the purpose of making an inquiry, whether the inquiry be near or at a distance.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It also proposes to empower them to take evidence as well as to inquire.

Mr. BORDEN. I understand that; I am coming to that. I think we all agree in what I have said that it is desirable, at all events, to give that power. The only point that has been raised is as to whether or not, granted the expediency of appointing experts to make these inquiries, it is desirable in the public interest that they should have the right to take evidence on oath for the purpose of making their inquiry more thorough and effective than it otherwise would be. It does not seem to me that there is any particular detriment to the public interest or any injustice to any person in carrying out a proposal of that kind. I do not know in what way it could be limited, unless we struck it out altogether. Thus, it does appear to me, as at present advised, that if you grant the expediency of permitting men of that type to be employed to make special inquiries, from the standpoint of efficiency and thoroughness, you advance the matter by giving them power to take evidence on oath. In any case all they can do is to report to the commissioners and then the commissioners surely might be trusted to see to it that any injustice, if such injustice should transpire, would be remedied by them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will give me his attention for a moment I think I can show him that this amendment is not consistent with the principle of the Bill. The principle of the Bill does not introduce any new feature into the Act as it exists at the present time, but it simply has to do with attempting to clear up that which is doubtful. The Act which exists upon the statute book, which has been on the statute book since Confederation and which has been borrowed from the legislation of other lands, is an Act of great public convenience. It empowers the government to investigate all sorts of subjects. This power is not only in the direction of good government, but its value is becoming more and more recognized. The Bill does not propose to depart from the principle of this Act or to introduce any new feature, but simply to grant certain powers which would be already implied; that is to say it would be implied that the commissioners appointed to investigate any public question would be given full power to employ counsel, accountants and experts. But, this was not sure. It is made sure, but at the same time the powers of the commissioners under the Act were not as extended as the powers of these accountants will be under this proposal. The commissioners had the power to delegate the authority, as was stated by my hon. friend a moment ago, to interrogate witnesses on oath under all circumstances as a matter of course?—not simply under certain conditions, and here is the law cited by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) himself:

> If by reason of the distance at which any person whose evidence is desired resides from the place where his attendance is required, or for any other cause, the commissioner or commissioners deem it advisable, he or they may issue a commission or other authority to any officer or person therein named, empowering him to take such evidence and report the same to him or them.

Under the existing law, it is only in certain cases that the commissioners can dele-

gate the authority vested in them to examine witnesses. In this case the Minister of Justice takes power to authorize the commissioners to appoint accountants, bookkepers, or engineers, whose calling does not train them to take evidence, to investigate and to seek the truth. Sometimes the courts of justice will delegate such authority but the Minister of Justice knows better than anybody else that the courts exercise this power with extreme caution and that it is a universal rule that the best way to get the truth is to have the witness himself before the court. I think you are going too far in this instance when you give men untrained in the law the power to conduct such inquiries. We do not object that the commissioners shall have power to get at the truth in every possible way, and they can examine experts, engineers, and accountants, before them. But to depute to these experts the power to conduct an inquiry is not conducive to the best interests of justice. As to the example cited by the Minister of Justice of a coroner conducting an investigation, he knows that the first duty of a coroner, although sometimes he may not do it effectively, is to acquaint himself with the rules of evidence. My amendment is, I believe, a reasonable one, and I therefore move:

That all the words after 'inquiry,' in line 11, be striken out.

This would eliminate the words 'and the commissioners may authorize and depute any such accountant, engineer, technical adviser or other experts, or any qualified persons to take evidence and report, &c.'

Mr. DOHERTY. I endeavoured to make it clear that in connection with this right to depute the power of investigation to accountants, or experts, or other persons, we were enlarging the scope of the existing Act. The argument of my right hon. friend, that Parliament when it enacted section 9 thought it wise to limit that power to one particular case hardly applies, because we are here to-day asking parliament to say that it is wise to extend this provision. Hon. gentlemen opposite are conjuring up imaginary cases. They seem to have perfect confidence that the Governor in Council will appoint commissioners who can be trusted to carry on these investigations, but they fear that the sub-commissioners may not be so trusted. The Bill does not enact that whenever a commission is issued the commissioners shall have power to depute; it is only in cases where the Governor in Council, in the commission issued, confers the power to depute that the commissioners will possess such power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the Minister of Justice say that these commissioners cannot appoint experts to take evidence unless they are specially authorized? As I read it, the moment the Governor General in Council authorizes the commissioners to employ accountants and experts it ipso facto vests in them the power to take evidence.

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, but the commissioners have no power to delegate anything to these accountants and experts unless their commission expressly authorizes them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which of course it always would do; that is the object of the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY. That would depend on who happened to be the advisers of His Excellency. No doubt, if the hon. gening to its circumstances, and who, when it should be done, but there are some governments which judge of each case according to its circumstances, and who, when they have the power, exercise it only when they believe it wise to exercise it. That is the kind of government we are entrusting this power to at the moment. It seems to me that if you trust the Governor General in Council to select commissioners having these wide powers you might entrust the Governor General in Council also to determine the kind of men to whom this power should be deputed and the circumstances under which it should be exercised. Under the Act as it stands the Governor in Council could give all these powers to three men whom he might choose, and all that is suggested now is that these three men so chosen, and for the exercise of whose judgment the government must be responsible, should be authorized to delegate certain of their powers when the necessity arises.

It does not give the commission by virtue merely of its appointment the right to delegate. So that you have that very direct control over the men who are given this power to depute and also over the circumstances under which it may be wise that they should be given the power to depute.

My right hon. friend has said that it is only in very rare and exceptional cases that this power is exercised by the courts. Why, it is a power that is frequently exercised in the case of technical disputes. The court may refer a disputed claim to an accountant and give him the power to hear evidence. The court may refer a builder's claim to an architect and give him power to hear evidence. Why is this done? Because the facts to be inquired into concern matters with which these men are specially familiar and are, therefore, more competent to get at the truth in the most satisfactory and shortest way.

Again, these sub-commissioners are merely going to report to the commission,

and their finding is not to be necessarily that of the commission. If any injustice has been done these gentlemen are under the control of the commission, which passes upon their report, and the commissioners are under the control of the courts of the land. Should they, for instance, endeavour to compel an answer under circumstances when, by law, a man is not bound to answer, the court could be appealed to for the protection of the witness. Hon. gentlemen opposite are too frightened about what may happen under the operation of this Bill. It is simply a matter of applying to this particular instance methods that have stood the test of time under the ordinary law as administered by the courts of justice in order to arrive at the truth in the most expeditious and satisfactory way.

There are other instances of similar legislation. The late government entrusted to the Railway Commission the investigation of matters of very great importance indeed. That commission was given a very free hand as regards rules and regulations and is not composed exclusively of lawyers. They examine witnesses and exercise all the powers given by this Bill, and I must bear this testimony to the value of that commission, that they have done so generally to the satisfaction of the public.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend will look at the possible consequences of his legislation, he will see that the opposition from this side is not a factious opposition, but one conducive to substantial justice. He has cited the case of a judge deputing to an accountant or other expert a disputed claim. But the commission you are appointing is to investigate the civil service and is being given very large powers. I do not object at all to the appointment of that commission. It may or may not do very valuable work, according to the spirit in which it engages in that work. But that commission, which has jurisdiction over the whole country, may appoint one expert here and another there, and another elsewhere, and each of these experts will have the same powers to investigate as the commissioners themselves. Do you think it right that these experts—these accountants or architects or engineers—should be given the same powers as the commissioners? Why do you appoint these commissioners? Simply because you believe that justice is more likely to be administered when you have three heads than when you have only one. But you allow these three men to give all their powers to one man, and this man can investigate just as can the commission itself. While it may be wise that the commissioners should be authorized to appoint these experts, it is not wise that each of these experts should be given the same powers of investigation as are given the commissioners themselves.

Mr. BORDEN. My right hon. friend puts the case in a very fair way and I am quite ready to take issue with him as he puts it. For example, I suppose he would have no objection to any one of these commissioners making a necessary inquiry. That practice prevails in the case of the Railway Commission under the Act passed by the late government. One member of that commission may make an inquiry and report to the board. And that commission is not composed entirely of lawyers. There were also men appointed by the late government to investigate the Civil Service, none of whom were lawyers, and they had all the powers of investigation which my right hon. friend now thinks should not be exercised except by commissioners learned in the law. No great detriment to the country resulted from this. Further than that, let me call attention to a case directly in point. In Nova Scotia in 1896 or 1897 it became necessary to appoint some gentlemen to make inquiry into the conduct of officials of the government who were accused of offensive partisanship. One of the men sent to make these inquiries, and who conducted a great number of them, was a man who had no training whatever in law. He was a retired sea captain—Captain Bloomfield Douglas. If Captain Douglas, according to the judgment of the right hon. gentleman, was competent to make inquiry into the conduct of officials, what possible objection has he to the appointing of an engineer or an accountant or other experts of standing and reputation to make a like inquiry into certain questions which it is necessary to investigate in the public interest. I cannot distinguish between the two cases. If this proposed measure comes into operation, it will be found that the proceedings will be conducted just as thoroughly and fairly as in the case of any inquiry before the commissioners themselves.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can see a wide distinction between the case mentioned by my hon. friend and by my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) and the powers proposed to be given under this Bill. If the appointments were in the hands of the government the government is responsible in parliament, but he proposes to delegate that power to commissioners who are not answerable to parliament.

Of course, the government is responsible in the first instance with respect to the appointment of these commissioners, but the commissioners, in delegating to others certain powers, are not answerable to parliament. So it seems to me that there is a vast difference between the action taken in

1896, referred to by the right hon. leader of the government, and the present action. In that case the government of the day acted and was answerable to parliament for its acts.

Mr. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend think that the difficulty would be removed if these various experts should be appointed only with the approval of the Governor in Council?

Mr. EMMERSON. The government would be responsible, and I do not think it is wise to have the powers of the commission delegated to anybody.

Mr. BORDEN. I would prefer as the fairest way to leave it to the judgment of the commissioners; but if there is any very strong feeling that the government ought to take the responsibility, that is to say, to approve of the appointment of any accountant or expert, I would be prepared to consider the suggestion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is such a thing as carrying a principle too far, and it seems to me that this is a case in point. You have provided that the commissioners shall have power to appoint experts. When you have gone that far it seems to me that you have gone all the length that is required. I grant that the commissioners would have their work facilitated by the appointment of experts, but that these experts should have the same powers as the commissioners I dispute.

Mr. MONK. As far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, if the suggestions made by hon. gentlemen opposite are adopted, the inquiry will be blocked. If a branch of that particular department is under investigation by the commission, and the conduct of fifteen or twenty people, officials, contractors and others, is in question, is it going to be suggested that each one of those interests or individuals shall have the right to appoint a separate lawyer to represent them before the commission? If that were to take place, it would be impossible for the commission to advance its work. I know that is not under the immediate consideration of the committee, but I mention it because it seems to me that the commission has the necessary discretion in that regard. Then, suppose the commission determines to investigate certain branches of the service of my department, that of dredging, for instance, and finds it necessary to conduct a partial inquiry necessitating the presence of an expert in some distant province, where the expert will necessarily have not only to view the work, but to hear witnesses in order to ascertain certain facts. If this amendment were adopted, the commission, in order to ascertain particular and limited facts in connection with one particular work, would have to transport itself to that remote part of the country, whereas, as the Minister of Justice has explained, it would be better that such an inquiry should be conducted by an expert. It seems to me that the amendment suggested in this regard would only retard and block the work of the commission.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Under the first part of this section it is proposed to enable the commission to employ the services of two different classes of persons: First, they may engage the services of accountants, engineers, technical advisers or other experts; further, they may employ the services of clerks, reporters and assistants. But they can only employ either or both of these classes if they are authorized to do so by the commission appointing them. If the rest of the section had followed this wording, the section as a whole might not be so objectionable. For instance, if the accountants, engineers, technical advisers or other experts were authorized to inquire and report to the commissioners on any matter of a technical or expert nature, I believe that would be fair legislation; but under the latter part of this section, which asks for power to authorize the employment of any qualified person to inquire, not into any matter where special or technical knowledge is called for, but to take evidence and report to the commissioners on any matter within the scope of the commission, the commissioners might delegate their entire power if they so wished. I think it is fair to say that no legislation except under the greatest safeguards should enable the power granted to the commissioners to be delegated by them. If so, the grounds upon which their power might be delegated should be specifically stated, as provided in section 9 of this Act.

It is true that in this country it has been found necessary, to assign to the courts in a certain sense, legislative powers. At least it is found better to grant the courts restricted legislative power, for experience has shown that these matters can be better worked out by courts even than by legislatures. So, I submit, the power to take evidence and inquire should never be delegated from the person primarily authorized unless the exceptions are designated in the statute, or the commission. I think they are very well set out under section 9. As the latter part of section 2 presumes to give power that the former part of the section never intended, I think that probably there is an error in drafting.

Mr. DOHERTY. No, there is no error in drafting. Nor is the hon. member (Mr. Maclean, Halifax), mistaken in saying that the law does propose to give power not only to experts, but even to persons who may not be experts to inquire into facts.

As I pointed out when I first spoke on the Bill. there may be facts to be learned in particular localities which it would be difficult for the commissioners as a whole to reach; or it may be necessary in a commission covering a very wide field to carry on the investigation of facts regarding different branches of the matters to be inquired into simultaneously in special cases. There is no mistake it is intended that the power should exist. It is intended, however, that the power should be exercised according to the necessities of the case and we contemplate that it would be exercised by men who in its exercise would bring to bear upon the question of when, and where, and how they should exercise it, a sound judgment. If I understand correctly the main objection to it is that we are giving to persons whom the Governor in Council appoint power to delegate certain of these powers. I confess, I do not see that, either from the point of view of the responsibility of the Governor in Council for what is done or from the point of view of the wisdom with which it may be carried out, there is any very material difference between providing what is here proposed, and providing that the Governor in Council may issue separate commissions to different people to carry on given sections of this investigation. If I understand the objection, it would not apply to this latter course because the powers would come directly from the Governor in Council to each individual or group of individuals called upon to exercise it. If that is considered to be a serious matter, and it is thought any advantage would be derived from it, I should be disposed to consider whether, if it met these objections, we might not insert in the Bill a proviso that this power of delegation should be exercised with the approval of the Governor in Council. This would bring home to the Governor in Council the express authorization for the exercise of this power and the choice of the persons to exercise it. If that is what is wanted I should be disposed to consider the advisability of doing it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and more particularly the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) will agree with me that, so far as the practice of the courts of any of the provinces is concerned this Bill is a new departure, and certainly there is no such practice in the courts of Great Britain. A great deal has been said by the Minister of Justice about references in the Supreme Court. But no one knows better than the Minister of Justice that a referee in the Supreme Court is hedged about with a great many safeguards. In the first place, the rule of reference is drafted with two lawyers keenly watching what it contains. It is then submitted to him in the way of evidence names the particular case in which the referee shall inquire. And the referee is not a judge of evidence, as the right hon. the Prime Minister knows,—in our province at all events—he may not reject evidence; he must take everything that is submitted to him in the way of evidence write it down and mark any objection taken to it. There is another phase of reference which, I presume, is the same all over this country, but, which is not provided for in the Bill before us. After the rule of reference is returned to the judge, the judge does not at once decide it, but, it is open to the counsel of both sides to criticise the evidence. And, if the power to make a finding is in the referee, it is open to the judge to set that finding aside on hearing counsel. So, the Minister of Justice cannot find consolation in comparing the procedure under this proposed Act with the procedure in the courts in regard to matters of reference. The Minister of Justice has also said that it is common to refer questions of building to architects. I have never heard of such a thing myself. I have often known the judge to refer such a matter to a referee with power to bring achitects before him to give evidence; but it is new to me that an architect should be the judge or should take the evidence. A question of bookkeeping may arise that would take a week to inquire into. The judge does not wish to take up the time of the court with it and leaves it to a referee who will take the necessary time, bring the witnesses before him and investigate the case. But a bookkeeper is not appointed to take the evidence; a lawyer or some competent person is appointed for that purpose. Any one familiar with the practice in the courts knows that that is the rule observed in every part of the country. The Minister of Justice says also that it is only when the power to call in these experts is named in the commission that they can be called in. I submit both to the Minister of Justice and to the right hon. the Prime Minister that it is very often only after we have gone on several stages in a trial that we discover what kind of evidence is necessary in order to reach a proper conclusion. Do the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice say that every time a commissioner 'strikes a snag,' reaches a stake where such evidence is required, he must go back and have his commission amended?

Mr. DOHERTY. If the 'snag' was not foreseen and the necessary power was not included in the commission,—certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then a new commission is needed every time a new class

of evidence becomes necessary. It seems to me that is a very clumsy way of conducting an inquiry. My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) knows that in our province the only class of tribunal of this kind that exists is the Admiralty Court. If the judge of that court is not a seafaring man, if he does not understand navigating or the working of a ship, he has the right to bring to his assistance what are known as assessors.

No person knows better than my right hon. friend that that is done every day, I suppose in every province of Canada, at all events in Nova Scotia. There would be no objection to vesting power in these commissioners to call such men to their assistance if it was necessary, and if necessary, let them appeal to the department under whose control they were acting. If, for instance, in the Department of Public Works, it is found that the commissioners require certain expert evidence, say for instance, an engineer, they could make application to that department, and have an engineer put at their disposal and give expert evidence. Then the appointments would be all the time under the control of the department, and the power of making appointments under the control of parliament. But this spreading abroad of jurisdiction is, I think, entirely without precedence, and I think without authority in common law or in common sense. There is another objection I would point out to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Justice. It appears to me that there could be at least a dozen courts sitting at the same time inquiring into the same matter under this Act. There are, I think, about a dozen different authorities that can be appointed. It is a sound principle of law that a man has a right to be present at any inquiry into his case. There is nothing in this Act to prevent at least half a dozen such courts sitting at the same time, one at Victoria, one at Sydney, one at Halifax and another at St. John, inquiring into the same case, with the experts appointed under the power of this commission, into the acts of the same individual, who is supposed to be present at all these places, or be represented by counsel. This may be an extreme supposition, but the power is there. The engineer, accountant, bookkeeper, or any other expert that may be appointed, is not at all to take any cognizance of the fact that another branch of the commission is holding court somewhere else, or can hold a court. I think the powers of his court, like those of every other court, should be concentrated as much as possible, and not spread abroad in this way. If, in the wisdom of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, it is thought desirable to procure the assistance of experts to help these commissioners, they should go to that court as assessors, go to the admiralty court in our province, and in that way procure the desired assistance. The character of the experts would be such as to give the decision more authority, and we would have the security of knowing that no person will be appointed except upon the approval of the Prime Minister, who is responsible primarily for any appointments that may be made in connection with this or any other inquiry.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Does my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) seriously think that half a dozen investigations could take place at different points in this country to inquire into the acts of the same individual?

Mr. McKENZIE. Why not?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Because it is not common sense.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then this Act is not common sense.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It is absolute common sense. My hon. friend knows that his supposition is absurd. You must give the commissioners and sub-commissioners credit for ordinary, every-day sense, and it is not possible that half a dozen investigations could be taking place at the same time in as may different cities, inquiring, as he said, into the acts of the same individual. Now it seems to me that the objections which have been raised to this amendment are entirely fanciful. Fears have been expressed as to the possible abuse of the legal procedure which, I think, are entirely without foundation. Take the case of an arbitration. Will any hon. gentlemen say that a lawyer, or two or three lawyers, must always be appointed as arbitrators under the Arbitration Act of the several provinces? It is a matter of common experience, at least in the province of Ontario, that an accountant, or an engineer, or an expert, or other qualified person, or an ordinary every-day layman, an ordinary citizen, is entrusted with the power of holding an arbitration upon cases involving property rights of the greatest value, and no one has ever heard of the consequences ensuing which have been suggested by the hon. gentleman. I have had a great deal to do with arbitrations in the course of my life, and I have never known a matter brought before the jurisdiction of the High Court in which arbitrators have been appointed, experts, accountants, lawyers or ordinary persons—and these arbitrators in the province of Ontario, at all events, are given power of pronouncing upon the admissibility of evidence—I have never heard of any penalties being imposed by them, and I have never known of any abuse under the Arbitration Act. Now it does seem to me that these sub-commis-

sioners are only given the powers that are given to arbitrators under the Arbitration Act; the Bill enables the commission to carry out its duties anywhere in Canada by multiplying itself in a proper manner, in order that a wider inquiry may be held.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Are they supposed to make inquiries largely of an expert and technical character? Is that the purpose?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I do not know. I am dealing only with the clause in this Act which is under discussion. I do not know what application may be given to it or if it can be given a wider application than is provided for by this Act. What does this Act say? It simply says that these comsioners may delegate to subcommissioners and other persons mentioned certain powers, that they may employ an accountant, for instance. An accountant is an expert, an engineer is an expert, and they may appoint such technical advisers or other qualified persons as they may deem necessary. You will observe that it stops short of reporters, assistants, clerks and others, it is only experts that are to be appointed.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is meant by 'qualified persons?'

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend knows what a qualified person means as well as I do. A qualified person is a man who has the qualification necessary for the special investigation, and that is precisely what we want. Now let us consider what is the safeguard in this Act, because I am sure we all want to meet the wishes of our hon. friends in this matter, if their objections are substantial and not shadowy. What is the real safeguard? In the first place, the commission is to be appointed by the Governor in Council, in other words, by the government of this Dominion. In the second place, you will observe that it is only under authority of the commission issued in the case that this power of delegation is given, in other words, the government of the Dominion which appoints the commission knows that it is a commission in which the power of delegation exists, and consequently knows all that may flow from that power of delegation. The result is that the Governor in Council will be charged with the responsibility of seeing to it, and will be held responsible for seeing to it, that only such commissioners are appointed as may be safely entrusted with the power of delegation. It must be assumed, therefore, that these men so appointed will exercise a wise discretion in deputing their authority to subcommissioners. My hon. friend from Halifax said that they might delegate their entire powers; in other words, I suppose they might take a holiday, and delegate their entire powers to a hundred or so accountants, engineers and other experts, to conduct the investigation. Now, I think we may assume that there will be a certain amount of common-sense employed by the commission in carrying out its work.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Let us make sure.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). You must apply common-sense to everything. There is not a statute in this country against which you might not bring a hundred or a thousand fanciful objections.

Very often lawyers have, but nevertheless the legal business of the country is transacted in due course. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite have really gone out of their way to suggest fanciful and foundationless objections to this legislation which is designed to meet the case of an inquiry extending over a great area. It is absolutely impossible for the commissioners to investigate every particular case that may arise and it seems to me that under these circumstances it is good legislation. The government is responsible for bringing this commission into action. It does not follow that in every case the commissioners are going to do this but it does mean that, if, in a particular case such as that with which we are confronted at the present time it is desirable under the statute to appoint five or a hundred men, we should give the commission the power of delegation so that it may, in the exercise of a wise discretion, appoint sub-commissioners who will carry on, throughout the length and breadth of the country, the investigation that is required under the authority of this Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), intended to defeat the objection which is raised, in my estimation, is a very strong confirmation of the stand which we have taken. The whole of the argument of my hon. friend springs from the fact that he has assimilated the investigation of this commission to the work of an arbitration. If this were an arbitration I would agree with him, but it is not an arbitration—far from it. In an arbitration the two parties agree upon two arbitrators. One agrees upon one man, the other agrees upon another and these two arbitrators agree upon a third. If they have only one arbitrator they agree upon some one man. Therefore, they select their own tribunal and they may select whom they choose. They may select a technical or a non-technical arbitrator, but, at all events, they select men in whom they have confidence. But, this is not the case of an arbitration. The man who is to be investigated will be forced into this case. He has nothing to say as to the appointment of the arbitra-

tors. If it were a case such as has been suggested by my hon. friend, where he had something to say in the selection of the arbitrators, well and good. But, he is brought before a tribunal not by his own consent but perhaps against his will. He has nothing to say as to who his judge shall be. Therefore, can my hon. friend show why, under these circumstances, we should not be guided by those rules which experience has shown to be the best and the most conducive to the ends of justice? The rules which have been employed to safeguard the administration of justice should be thrown around an inquiry such as this. Let us have the services of experts, but to say that these men shall have the power to investigate and pass upon the matters referred to the commission is to depart from the sound principles which should guide us in a matter of this kind.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has shifted his ground. The objection that was made at the outset to this Bill was that legal procedure would be abused and that penalties might be inflicted upon witnesses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It was said that penalties might be inflicted upon witnesses. Even if the parties do appoint their arbitrators, as they do appoint them under the Arbitration Acts of the several provinces, what abuse has taken place in so far as the infliction of penalties is concerned where the arbitrators have not been lawyers but have been laymen? That is the point I am making. I say that the objection in regard to the abuse of legal procedure is fanciful. The objection was taken that only lawyers were qualified to hear evidence because they would know whether evidence was admissible or not and yet, in all the hundreds of arbitrations going on all over this country, whoever heard of any particular abuse, whoever heard of the imposition of penalties, whoever heard of the matter being brought before the High Court of Justice in order that justice might be done, or that penalties might not be improperly inflicted? If you wish to shift the ground to argue it on another basis, well and good, but if I am correct in what I say that is your objection and it must fall to the ground in this case. There is no objection from the legal standpoint to accountants and other experts holding an investigation and none of the abuses which have been suggested will be permitted to take place.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think that if we knew what was the purpose and object of the legislation we probably would agree as to our conclusions upon this particular Bill. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice if the main purpose of this Bill is not to provide the assistance of experts and those technically trained. Is that not the main purpose of the Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY. What?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). To secure for the commissioners the aid of technical advisers and experts?

Mr. DOHERTY. That is one of the objects. There are two purposes, and that is one of them.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is the other?

Mr. DOHERTY. The other is to enable the commission to carry on this investigation with promptitude by making it possible for certain aid to be provided in cases where it is necessary that they should be investigated simultaneously.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The Minister of Finance says not.

Mr. DOHERTY. I did not so understand the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It strikes me that the chief purpose of the draughtsman of the Bill was to provide technical and expert aid to the commissioners. I think, if I might suggest to the Minister of Justice, that the Bill might very well stand amending in several respects. I think it is hardly wise to have 'clerks, reporters, and assistants' follow the enumeration of 'accountants, engineers, technical advisers, or other experts,' when later in the clause you give the former named officers certain defined powers to take evidence. 'Clerks, reporters, and assistants' are terms which should have been used earlier in the section, and should be made a separate sentence. Assuming that the purpose of this legislation is to provide assistance for the commissioners in the way of experts and those technically trained I say the legislation is perfectly fair, and I personally would agree to a clause enacting that these accountants, engineers, technical advisers and experts should be commissioners to take evidence in questions of a technical nature or where technical knowledge was required. I do not think that is objectionable, but when, in the middle of this clause, you interject a very general authority to the commissioner to delegate his power of taking evidence upon any subject named within the scope of the commission, you adopt a new principle altogether. Then, it is departing from the scope of the Bill to say that two different objects are aimed at. That is the objection that we have to the Bill namely, that it enables the commissioner to dispose of the power given to him under the commission, to others. If it were simply confined to granting powers to technical ex-

perts to take evidence in technical matters I do not think it would be so objectionable.

Mr. MURPHY. Might I inquire from the Minister of Justice whether the commissioner or commissioners will have the power to delegate their authority, or any authority, to sub-commissioners, even if that authority is not expressed in the commission?

Mr. DOHERTY. No. The first condition of the commissioners having any power of delegation is that their commission expressly empowers them to so delegate. With regard to the objection of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), to our empowering persons other than accountants or experts, if I followed him rightly, he would not object to accountants being authorized to make inquiry with regard to matters of accounts——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Yes, that is right.

Mr. DOHERTY—or other experts being employed to make inquiries in expert matters? His objection is to other qualified persons being authorized to investigate with regard to facts coming within the scope of the commission.

My statement was that the intention of this Bill was to make it possible in the case of a commission whose scope was very wide to carry on investigation into certain branches simultaneously.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). These different branches might refer to the same case and the same men; take for example a contractor who had dredging in different parts of the country.

Mr. DOHERTY. You would have to assume that because there is power to carry on investigation into different branches simultaneously, there would be such gross abuse of that power as would entail the carrying on of the investigation without that man being present or being heard. Of course, I never dreamt that such a thing as that would occur. And, unless it is assumed that this is some Machiavelian machinery devised for the purpose of getting people into trouble, such a thing as that is not conceivable. I am not at all certain that if this power were sought to be abused, in violation of every principle of natural justice, that the courts of the land could not restrain. This commission is not going out to a world where there is no law and no justice and, as the Minister of Finance has said, no common-sense. I do not suppose that it is possible to enact anything which, under any condition and under all circumstances it is not possible to devise abuses under. No parliament can undertake that they will grant powers, which are not susceptible of being abused, unless indeed we should get that angelic commission which my distinguished friend from St. John said we were not going to appoint; but, in my opinion, there is not a remote possibility that there will be any such abuse of this power.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Can the Minister of Justice suggest any case, in which the division of this inquiry will lead to good results?

Mr. DOHERTY. There may be a matter of expert knowledge and account that would be required to be looked into by experts and accountants, but there may also be a tangled-up question of fact which can only be cleared up by an investigation of the facts; for example, in the city of Halifax.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That may be quite possible.

Mr. DOHERTY. I suppose it is conceivable that there are matters in Halifax which may require investigation, and there have been so many extreme possibilities suggested by gentlemen on the other side that I was led to take that example. There may, for instance, with regard to the Department of Public Works be matters of fact calling for investigation both in Halifax and in Montreal, and if the commission has to be present on every occasion at the taking of evidence with regard to these facts, then its work might go on indefinitely, whereas if you get competent people to take the evidence and report to the principal commissioners who are going to make their findings, it would undoubtedly lead to expedition. Be it remembered that these deputed people are not going to decide; they will simply take the testimony and report it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would not the report of the commissioners be of more value if they hear the evidence in Montreal and Halifax, rather than that they should hear it in Montreal and have it taken by a sub-commissioner in Halifax?

Mr. DOHERTY. It is conceivable that there may be certain points of view from which it would be better to have all the evidence heard by all the commissioners, but the advantages which would result from that would be vastly more than counterbalanced by the grave inconvenience which would result from the delay in the operations of these commissioners. After all, in the courts of the land, the judgments that finally determine things are the judgments of men who did not hear the evidence but who had it reported to them. Nobody would suggest that it would be much better that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council should

come over to Canada and hear the evidence.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not see any analogy between that and the present case.

Mr. DOHERTY. Do not their Lordships determine on questions of fact?

Mr. McKENZIE. They accept the findings in almost all cases.

Mr. DOHERTY. I beg to differ most emphatically from my learned and hon. friend; it is elementary that there is an appeal upon a question of fact.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). They give more weight to the evidence where the judge below has heard it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And generally they accept the findings on facts.

Mr. DOHERTY. The cases are of course numerous where judgments have been reversed in appeal upon questions of fact. In this case not only will there be a report from the deputy commissioner, but that will be accompanied by the actual testimony.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Testimony about what?

Mr. DOHERTY. About whatever matters of fact are investigated.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would the minister consider it good business and ordinary common-sense, to use the word of the Minister of Finance, to take the opinion of a man in Winnipeg and a man in Montreal and a man in Vancouver upon the manner in which a certain branch of the Public Works should be organized, without the Chief Commissioner being there so that he might hear the different views and form some sensible business-like conclusion? If you are simply inquiring into the conduct of an official in the public service the minister may be right.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not think that the main business of this commission is going to be to inquire into the opinions of gentlemen scattered all over the country as to how the public departments of this government are going to be ordered. If that is necessary it is quite simple for the government itself to get the advice of men who are competent to give that advice. But, if what we hear is true, there are a great number of matters of fact that call for investigation and that are proper matters for testimony of the people who will tell what the facts are about certain transactions. This can be as well investigated by men deputed for the purpose, as by the principal commissioners, and that evidence can be brought back and reported to them.

Mr. DOHERTY.

There may be special cases in which it would be specially advantageous that the commissioners themselves should hear the evidence and they will have to exercise their judgment in deciding whether that is necessary or not. But if we are to have a practical investigation, such as we all desire, we are only providing in this Bill the necessary means to attain that result within a reasonable period of time. For my part I am willing to give serious consideration to the suggestion that each particular delegation should be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. That would practically be the same as if the Governor in Council were to issue a commission. Our only motive is to give the public a satisfactory and effective investigation and avoid abuses as much as it is possible to avoid them under any legislation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand my hon. friend is going to consider the amendment we have suggested to this Bill. I would like to suggest another amendment in the shape of an additional section. Before doing so I would say that the feeling in this parliament has been growing for some years that it is desirable, not only that the government should have the opportunity of holding investigations into public matters but also that the right should be vested in the minority of the members of parliament to compel the holding of such investigations. We know that there are cases arising from time to time with regard to which the minority may consider properly that there should be some investigation, and I submit that in such cases their demand should be granted. I would move, therefore, that the following section be added to the Bill:

Whenever forty or more members of the Senate or House of Commons or of both, of whom the leader of the opposition for the time being in the House of Commons shall be one, represent in writing to the Governor in Council that in their opinion it is expedient and in the public interest that inquiry shall be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof, or in reference to the state and management of the business or any part of the business of any department of the Civil Service of Canada, either in the inside or outside service thereof, or the conduct of any person in such service, so far as the same relates to his official duties, the Governor in Council shall forthwith cause such inquiry to be made; and for such purpose shall by a commission appoint a judge of the Superior Court to make such inquiry, who shall have all the powers granted to commissioners under this Act, and all the provisions of this Act shall apply to such inquiry.

Mr. BORDEN. This proposed section is so absolutely contrary to the utterances of my right hon. friend the leader of the oppo-

sition, as I have heard them many times in this House during the past ten years, that I could hardly believe my ears when I heard him seconding the motion. I have known of a great many occasions during the past two years when, not forty but eighty members of this House desired investigation into public departments, and the right hon. gentleman was the first to rise and say that these investigations should not be granted unless in each case a charge were made. Under the circumstances I do not think the right hon. gentleman can be serious in seconding this motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has certainly happened that when motions were made by my right hon. friend I did not agree with him, but whenever I differed from him he found fault with me and appealed to a higher court, the people. The people supported him and they expect him to carry out the principles he advocated when in opposition. But when we propose that he should put those principles into practice, in every instance he goes back on them. I am not at all surprised that he should do so in this case. During the last four months we have seen him on many occasions turning his back on his own platform.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman challenged us to appeal to the people. We did appeal and we got a judgment in our favour.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Upon your own doctrines?

Mr. BORDEN. Exactly and we got a decision in our favour. As a matter of fact the amendement proposed is entirely out of accord with the principles of responsible government, as understood in this country, and no one knows that better than the right hon. gentleman, and no one has declared that so often.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have held that the minority should not dictate to the government as understood in this country, of the right hon. gentleman declaring that the minority were entitled to investigations when they called for them. We appealed together to the people and they supported him. Let him now carry out his own doctrine.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). The right hon. gentleman goes beyond the principle of a minority. These forty might be the minority of a minority.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That does not impair the principle.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see anything objectionable in this.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Of course not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that it is only carrying out what we have the right to believe is the desire of the people of Canada.

My right hon. friend who now leads the government has for many years contended that the people's representatives were here, the minority as well as the majority, to watch the people's interests—that the government were like the board of directors of a financial institution, and that the minority of the people's representatives in parliament had the right to demand that there should be an investigation into any matter connected with the government of the country. If I remember rightly, in the Bill which was introduced to amend the Bank Act, that principle is applied, because it is there distinctly provided that a minority of the shareholders of a bank, I think one-fourth, may at any time have an investigation into its management. The people have sustained my right hon. friend, but we cannot pick out the particular policy on which they have sustained him. We have a right, therefore, in regard to the different policies he has laid down, to expect that my right hon. friend, and those associated with him in the government of the country, will recognise as sound the principles which they contended for when in opposition. We also think that it is our duty, as servants of the people, to take note of the wishes of the people, and I certainly think it is in entire harmony with the wishes of the people that when a considerable number of the members of parliament, and certainly 40 is a considerably number, consider that there is a matter of public importance which ought to be investigated, and take the responsibility of attaching their signatures to a memorial to the Governor in Council to that effect, such an investigation should take place. Then, this amendment has the additional safeguard of requiring that of those 40 members one shall be the leader for the time being of the opposition in the House of Commons. That, it seems to me, guarantees parliament and the government against any frivolous demand for an investigation. It is a guarantee that only on the strongest possible ground will a memorial for such an investigation be presented. We do not ask that the opposition shall have any voice in the appointment of the commissioner. All we ask is that the Governor in Council shall issue a commission to a judge of a Superior Court, and he shall conduct the inquiry in accordance with the provisions of this Bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, does not that strike you as a reasonable proposition? I would be greatly surprised if it did not strike, not only you, but every member of this House as entirely reasonable. Surely the government can have nothing to complain of in it if the affairs of the country are being properly and wisely adminis-

tered. It is the pride and joy of Canadian and British institutions that we can trust our judges to rise above party and carry on investigations of this character in a judicial manner. If this proposition is refused, it will surely mean tying the hands of the opposition and preventing us from having an investigation of public matters when we think an investigation should take place. This seems to be an appropriate time to move forward in the direction of reform. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice, wants to make these investigations very effective. He wants all at once to be able to start a roving commission to investigate the conduct of the officials of the different departments of the government from one end of the country to the other. We have had no intimation from him as to where he is going to begin or as to where he is going to stop.

Mr. DOHERTY: We will begin at the beginning, and we will stop at the end.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where my hon. friend will begin we do not know, but I am sure that he has fixed in his mind that the investigation shall end on the 10th or 11th of October last. I think we are in harmony with the progressive sentiment of the people in desiring that there shall be the fullest light of day thrown upon the conduct of the government of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I called attention casually to the fact that the resolution as it was presented, was not contented with laying down the principle, entirely new, I think, in parliamentary practice, that His Majesty's opposition, even when a united voice, in any matter of public business or public interest, should automatically prevail to the extent of having an investigation conducted, in any public matter on any occasion that it might choose. I do not think that representative government could be carried on with that as an arbitrary condition. But it becomes positively absurd when it makes the demand that, whenever forty members in a minorty consider it in the public interest, an inquiry shall be made—forty members in a minorty which may range up to 82, 83, 85, or may be 100. Now a small section, perhaps not half, of the minority in parliament is going to be clothed—if such a law as this passes—with authority to impose its will upon the majority. Have we ever heard of anything so revolutionary, so absurd, advocated in a Canadian parliament? You have here two hundred and twenty-three members. The number may soon be two hundred and fifty, or three hundred. And it is proposed to enact a law to put it into the power of a mere fraction of that House to make itself the judge of what is expedient in the public interest, to interfere with the machinery of government, and at any time when it please to impose, not one or two, but it may be thirty or forty or fifty investigations. Not a rump of the parliament, but a mere rump of the opposition, may impose upon the majority of parliament any fad or fancy it may choose. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows that it is absolutely absurd. Why should he think that he is obliged to stand at the back of the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in any of his newly found fads or fancies in public virtue and public purity? Let the hon. member for the city of St. John make his specious plea to this House, and, if he can, convince himself and—what would be a good deal harder—convince others that he is consumed with the desire to purify politics; but why should he drag so reputable and so experienced a statesman as the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) behind him in these vagaries. A reading of the resolution is enough to convince the whole country of its absurdity. I have been somewhat amused, and a good deal edified by the course of this whole discussion. I have full sympathy with hon. members opposite in their pleading for the rights of the person whose office, whose reputation, or whose conduct as a public official is impugned, and have noted with pleasure their burning and consuming desire that even the smallest and meanest in the service of the country should not be deprived of having counsel to represent his case before this commission. It is a lovely sentiment, and humane in the extreme. But where was this sentiment concealed in the breasts of hon. gentlemen opposite at a former stage of their career? I agree with them that if even one man's reputation, his life interest, or his wordly future is involved in an investigation of the working of any part of the government machinery, something dear is impugned, some thing of value to him at least is at stake, and it ought to be the clear right of common humanity that he should have the power to represent his case, and, if opposed by legal representatives, he should have the power to bring legal representatives to his aid. But did my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) make much outcry not many years ago when that right was absolutely denied by commissions appointed by himself? I never heard that he did. But, if, in his own bosom, he was plagued by such humane feelings, I am glad to know now, at long last, that he had them, even though he most effectually smothered them at that time.

Mr. DEVLIN. I did not intend to take any part in the debate, having great faith in any suggestions which my good friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) should offer. But when it comes to the question whether the opposition shall have the right to ask for an investigation into

the acts of government in the management of the departments, I must say I most heartily support the amendment of the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley), and I fail to see how, in view of the events that have taken place in this House in recent years, hon. gentlemen opposite can possibly refuse to His Majesty's loyal opposition or to a fair number of the members sitting on this side of the House, the right to inquire into the acts of the adminstration. There is absolutely no blame attached to the members of the government side or even those on the treasury benches. This is a young government, a very young government. They have not had time to sin; but they will sin, there is absolutely no doubt about that in the minds of the people. But what surprises us on this side of the House is that they should be afraid to allow us the right of investigation of the acts of the departments over which they at present have administrative power. At present we are seated upon this side; but in two or three years the sides in this House may be changed again and hon gentlemen opposite then may claim the very right which they to-day are refusing to grant us. Take, for instance, the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). Of all the members on the opposite side, he certainly must feel the most uncomfortable. How can he refuse to give to the opposition the right to investigate acts of the departments when he, day after day in this very House, insisted that it was the right of the opposition to investigate every department? What is he going to say to-day? And what will other hon. members opposite say? Are they going to refuse the people of this country through their duly elected representatives, the right to investigate the acts of the departments? Sir, if the government refuse that which is asked for by the hon. member for St. John city then they go back upon every promise they made to the electors of this country and upon every principle that they advocated when they were on this side of the House.

If the country will not believe in their—what should I say?—in their sincerity, then the electors will ask themselves why they made a change of government. The present government asked the people to give them the privilege of adminstering the affairs of this country and to show what they could do. To-day, when we say to them: Practise what you preached when in opposition, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) gets up and says, Oh, but this is not constitutional. Well, if it is not constitutional to-day it was not constitutional when we sat on the other side of the House. But hon. gentlemen opposite said it was thoroughly constitutional then. If it was constitutional when hon. gentlemen sat on this side of the House, it is fairly constitutional to-day.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Staples.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Ames.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr Currie.

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Boyce.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 53) respecting certain Patents of Edmund F. Piper.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Quinze River and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Brabazon.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Union Bank of Canada.—Mr. Barker.

INQUIRIES ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 19) to amend the Inquiries Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I understand there is an arrangement that there is to be no division in connection with this Bill this evening.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I have not any specific knowledge, but I think the arrangement was that there was to be no vote on the principal amendment. It will, I suppose, be possible to get rid of two of the amendments and then the committee can rise.

Amendment (Mr. Pugsley) negatived.

Mr. DOHERTY. We promised to take into consideration, with a view of possibly adopting it in its present form or perhaps of finding terms which would be more satisfactory, the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) providing for

the right to those whose conduct might be impugned, to have counsel. As to the amendment of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) eliminating that portion of the clause which provides that the commissioners be authorized to depute any portion of their powers, I do not think any amount of consideration of it would lead us to that angelic frame of mind where we would be disposed to accept it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I thought it was understood that this amendment should stand, but any way I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that he could improve the drafting of that clause in the Bill, and it would be better to let it stand.

Mr. DOHERTY. I have no objection to that. I would be very glad if there could be any modification of the wording which would suit the views of hon. gentlemen and which would retain the purport of the clause.

Mr. ROSS. My understanding was that the whole matter should stand.

Mr. DOHERTY. The result is that with the exception of the last amendment which has been disposed of, the other amendments to stand.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—THE NEWMARKET CANAL

Mr. WHITE (Leeds), moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. A. M. ARMSTRONG (North York). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would ask permission to draw to the attention of this House a matter that is of some importance to every member here, and which is certainly of vital importance to myself and to the riding I have the honour to represent. For the past four or five days the newspapers throughout western Ontario have been giving considerable space to announcing the fact that the government has decided to close down on that great national highway, that immense artery of commerce, that everlasting monument to Liberal stupidity and incompetence known as the Newmarket canal. I think I am justified in saying that no member of this House is more vitally interested in the ultimate fate of that public work than I am, as I have the honour to represent the riding in which it is built, and I am proud to say that I was born, and that I reside in that riding. And, lest hon. gentlemen opposite might have a tendency to misconstrue my remarks this evening, permit me to say in the first place that I considered that work from its very inception an unjustifiable expenditure of public money. Permit me to say further that the action of the late administration in commencing and carrying on that work cannot be explained or exonerated, and, if I may be permitted to use a hackneyed phrase, I will say still further that the scheme as it was carried out was conceived in infamy and born in shame. Well, since the 21st day of September last another phase of this question has presented itself, and as representations have been made in the public press with regard to my stand on the question, I rise now to place myself fairly and squarely before the members of this House and before this country with regard to the stand I take on this question. Let me say that throughout the campaign which was closed on the 21st September last I ridiculed that work; I criticised it on the hustings throughout the length and breadth of North York, and under similar circumstances I would take that course again, as I consider it to be the bounden duty of any honest man to criticise a work of that kind. But Sir, as I understand it, some seven hundred thousand or eight hundred thousand of the hard earned dollars of the people of this country have been sunk in that work, and the question arose as to what would be done by this government. Let me point out to the House and to the country that I proclaimed privately and publicly throughout the length and breadth of my riding before the elections, that should there be a change of administration then in view of the vast expenditure that already had been made in connection with that work I would urge that a commission be appointed—this was my own idea only—consisting say of three men, one an expert engineer, whose position and reputation in his profession would preclude the possibility of political interference from either side, another who occupied a high position in the financial world, and the third a man who had considerable experience in questions of transportation and who might be termed an expert in that direction.

I consider that such a commission, if appointed, would be a proper one to investigate into this matter and report to the government and this House on the possibility and practicability of that work, after examining it from alpha to omega. We would then be in a position to decide whether the cost of completing that work would be justified by the amount of traffic which we might expect it could accommodate. That was the stand I took during the campaign. I said that if such a commission were to report that the amount of traffic would not justify the expense, I would be the first to stand up and demand that the work should cease; but on the other hand, if that commission should report that the traffic would justify sufficiently the money expended, I would be the first to ask this government to push

that work to completion. I am glad to say that while the present administration has not taken the course I hoped they might, I have sufficient confidence in the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) and this government to feel satisfied that they have in their possession sufficient information to convince themselves and the electorate that it was not possible or practicable to go on with the work, and I would ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane), in view of the fact that I have the honour to be the representative of the riding particularly concerned and that the electorate of this Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific are interested in this work,—I would ask him to lay on the table the information he has gathered which has led him and his colleagues to the conclusion that the traffic we might expect on that canal would not justify the expenditure of further public moneys to complete it.

Before I resume my seat I would like to refer to a statement which appeared in the public press a few days ago. I noticed in the 'Weekly Star' that a gentleman who had the honour to represent the riding of North York in the last parliament, and who, I thought, was politically dead, but who apparently has enjoyed political resurrection, has given a lengthy interview to a reporter. In that interview I noticed a statement to which I wish to refer. He wound up by saying—I refer to the hon. Sir A. B. Aylesworth, ex-Minister of Justice—'politics never entered into this matter at all.' I take issue with that hon. gentleman. Let me tell this House and the country that I fought that octopus known as the Newmarket canal for three years and no one can convince me that, from its inception, it was ever anything else than a political machine. Were it not for that canal and the numerous contracts scattered by the ex-Minister of Justice and his predecesor throughout the riding of North York, he would have lost his political scalp in October, 1908.

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

SUPPLY.

Ottawa Astronomical Observatory—additional buildings, &c..	$ 60,000
Ottawa New Departmental Building and site therefor..	500,000
Ottawa Eastern Departmental Block —addition..	220,000
Total..	$780,000

Mr. MONK. This first item of $60,000 is to make provision for the erection of a boundary and geodetic survey building and camera huts. Also for sidewalk to the electric cars, alterations to furnaces, awning for the observatory and sundry other items. This estimate was prepared a good while ago by the chief architect under the direction of the officers who were employed on this work.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Where is the geodetic survey building to be erected?

Mr. MONK. At a suitable point on the Experimental Farm. The estimate was carefully prepared by the chief architect in order to meet the requirements of the officers engaged in this branch of the service.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have noticed in the public press in Ottawa a statement to the effect that the government proposed expropriating property on Wellington street for the new departmental buildings. If I remember correctly, the newspaper stated that the government had abandoned the idea of erecting these buildings on Sussex street, as formerly contemplated. Will the minister inform the committee whether there is anything in this or not?

Mr. MONK. The question of my hon. friend is a very natural one, because I have myself seen in the newspapers that intimation; but there is no foundation for it in fact. The government has not had the necessary time to consider carefully that question or to arrive at a decision in regard to it. As the committee is aware, we found, when we came into office, a very long site down on Sussex street which had been acquired by the government some years ago at very considerable cost, totaling, with the expenses connected with the acquisition of it, over $700,000. Plans were competed for and prepared for the erection of some of the departmental buildings there for the accommodation of the Justice Department, the Supreme Court, the Exchequer Court, the Railway Commission—everything pertaining more or less to the administration of justice. But nothing has been done during this long period, and the reason, I imagine, for the delay and for allowing that site to remain idle, with the large capital which its acquisition involved, was that many objections apparently were urged upon the late government against the final adoption of that site. We heard some echoes of those objections when we came into office.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). What was the nature of those objections?

Mr. MONK. It was urged that it was not the proper site in the first place for the erection of the departmental buildings, as it would not afford proper accommodation for a large installation. Then, whatever accommodation could be obtained there would be at the sacrifice of appearance. I have heard it suggested that we should utilize Major Hill park, which has lost some of its usefulness as a park on account

of the construction upon it of a large hotel. It has also been urged that the locality is somewhat low and it is not at all as advantageous as other localities higher up in the western part of the city. But it has been absolutely impossible for us, with the pressure of business and the arrival of the session, with all that that entails of labour on each of the departments, including the preparation of the estimates, which generally begins in August, but was in this instance necessarily delayed until a few days before the beginning of the session, to give to a question of that magnitude and importance the mature consideration that it absolutely requires.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I suppose matters of patronage take up a considerable time of the minister.

Mr. MONK. I would not deny that they take up some time; but I can tell my hon. friend that if that matter were absolutely eliminated it would be impossible to give the question the mature consideration that it deserves. I think I have some justification for that statement in view of the fact that since nearly ten years the absolute necessity for increased accommodation has been making itself seriously felt, and yet nothing has been done except the expensive leasing of premises to meet the urgent wants of the various departments. And although a considerable period has elapsed since the expenditure of that large sum, amounting to three-quarters of a million or perhaps more for the purchase of the site on Sussex street, that site has remained absolutely idle, and is to-day like a desert.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is there any income from the properties purchased?

Mr. MONK. Not that I am aware of. After the properties were acquired, the buildings were pulled down, and there the place stands as a monument to the wisdom of the late government. We deemed that under the circumstances the matter required further consideration. I may tell the committee that at the present moment not one of the departments is properly, conveniently or adequately accommodated with space. I have here a list of the leases of properities we have made throughout the city.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The hon. minister might particularly mention the buildings that have been leased by the present government.

Mr. MONK. We have refrained from leasing as far as possible. I am aware of only one lease that has been made, and I think my hon. friend will find upon examination that we have carefully observed the rule that the lessor should not receive more than a reasonable and moderate per centum upon his investment.

Mr. MONK.

Mr .MACLEAN (Halifax). What is moderate?

Mr. MONK. 6 per cent, when you deduct the cost of administration, is a fair return to any lessor. In the city of Montreal you cannot expect to derive a sufficient return from a real estate investment when you get only 6 per cent.

That is what we have done in the one lease just made through my department, and I think I have strictly conformed to that rule. We have acted under pressing demand from all the departments for increased accommodation. There was amongst others the Post Office Department in the Langevin block, where the accommodation was absolutely in violation of the first laws of hygiene. They are cramped there to a degree which, I am perfectly sure, no health officer would tolerate for a moment if he inspected the premises. I give the Post Office Department as one instance, but I can assure the committee that all departments are cramped for space, my own as well as others. Some have to divide, one important part of the department being installed in one part of the city and another elsewhere; and it must be obvious to hon. members that, under these circumstances, the business of the department is carried on with great difficulty.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the hon. minister give us some information about the lease to which he has referred?

Mr. MONK. I was just mentioning that it is a lease of a building on Metcalfe street adjoining the Langevin. If my memory serves me rightly we were asked $19,000, then $16,000, and finally we succeeded is obtaining a five years' lease of that large, new and commodious building for the sum of $13,000 a year. If it were possible to avoid these leasings, I think it would be extremely desirable to do so. Any practical man will admit that, in the face of our requirements, we should get to work as soon as possible upon the erection of the new departmental building or buildings. But that, so far, has been utterly impossible. I could give the committee some idea of the increasing wants, and of what has been done by the government in order to meet these wants within the past few years.

Mr. McKENIZIE. Before the hon. minister leaves the subject of the lease, perhaps he would explain further. Is the rental based upon the size of the place, and if so what is the rental per foot of floor space?

Mr. MONK. In the rental of large buildings, that is the principal consideration. We were asked at first a sum considerably exceeding $1 a foot. Though the building was new and presented many advantages, being right in the midst of our departments, we still thought that

price was excessive. But hon. members will be surprised to know to what extent rentals have recently increased in the city of Ottawa, and also the price of real estate. I spoke a moment ago of our property on Sussex street. At the end of that street is the large Lindsay block. That block has not been acquired by the government; and if we could compare the price at which it might have been acquired two or three years ago and the price quite warrantable demanded at present, we should be convinced of the large and permanent increase in real estate values in Ottawa. That makes it all the more urgent, I think, that, with as little delay as possible, the site or sites required for the accommodation of new departmental buildings should be secured. As I say the price of $1.30 to $1.40 per square foot of floor space per year for this new building appeared to us excessive. But on investigation we found that in some instances here in Ottawa that price had been paid. I would not be positive, but I think it was paid by the late government for accommodation that could not be compared with what we obtain in this instance. But ultimately the price was cut down to, I think, 86 cents per foot. Even that rate somewhat surprised me, because in the city of Montreal you can get very good accommodation at 86 cents per foot. Nevertheless we could not find anything that would so well meet the immediate wants at a lower price and finally we concluded that we would accept.

Mr. McKENZIE. How does that compare with the experience of the department in former leases?

Mr. MONK. Very favourably, I think, under the circumstances, and in view of the increase of prices to which I have referred. The price of the Woods building per foot was about 78 cents.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). And the hon. gentleman's friends objected to that price.

Mr. MONK. Yes, and I think with good reason. I think that an examination of the debates which took place in regard to some of these rentals will convince hon. members that we paid a rate on the investment in some of those instances far exceeding six, seven or even ten per cent.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not think that would be a fair way of judging the value per foot.

Mr. MONK. That is considered a fair way to estimate when you do not go on the assessed value, which would not be fair in a city like Ottawa, particularly where the assessed value is lower than the real value. But if you can obtain pretty sure data as to the real value, and if on that the lessor receives only six per cent, I do not think that is an excessive amount. This building is new, and it is to be divided inside to meet our requirements. Also it is heated and has elevator service.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). And lighted?

Mr. MONK. No, it is the custom for the tenant to do the lighting.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the tenant put in the lighting fixtures?

Mr. MONK. No, he only furnishes the current.

Mr. McKENZIE. Who is the landlord?

Mr. MONK. His name is Blackburn. I believe he is a good Liberal. But we attend to these affairs without consideration of politics, keeping in view only the merits of the thing. I think this is a very good transaction. We simply had to find space, and this was an eminently suitable building for our purposes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does the Militia Department occupy any part of this building?

Mr. MONK. No; I think the Militia Department, though wanting space, is pretty well installed as compared with some of the other departments.

In the Department of Public Works we had to move our accountant from the immediate neighbourhood of the department in order to provide some necessary space. These inconveniences have become manifest to me in almost every department. So that, however, quickly we proceed to put up the departmental buildings, it may be again necessary to lease additional space to meet necessary requirements. But I am anxious to do that as moderately as possible, hoping that the very inconveniences to which we are all subjected will oblige us to devise some means to install permanently the departments as soon as possible. But nothing in that regard has been decided. It has been impossible to give adequate consideration to these large problems within the short time we have been in office.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Will the minister give us the total amount paid in rentals for government offices in the city?

Mr. MONK. In rented buildings the floor area in 1900-1 was 38,970 feet; in 1905-6 it was 132,685 feet; in 1910-11 the requirements had become so great that the rented space amounts to 365,221 feet. The total amount paid in rentals at the present moment is $192,000 a year. It is extremely desirable that as soon as possible we should cease paying any rentals at all.

But that is a matter that requires very careful handling.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Can the government, with the appropriation now asked for, go on and change the site without referring back to parliament?

Mr. MONK. I would not like to say that for sure. But it seems to me that, within the terms of this appropriation, some of it might be used for the acquisition of land, if that was absolutely necessary. It is my opinion, without having been able to give it much consideration, that we should utilize as much as possible the space required at such large cost in some way without placing the departments in a cramped position. I believe there was a competition for plans, and we had a plan of the Justice building and the Supreme Court competed for, and the prize was won by one of our most eminent architects in Montreal, Mr. Maxwell. I have not seen that plan, nor am I a good judge of plans, but I should imagine that we could avail ourselves of that plan. I think there will be left around it sufficient vacant space to avoid the necessity of cramping the Justice Department and the Supreme Court. But nothing has yet been decided for want of time, and I would ask the Committee to trust the government on the assurance that we will give it all the attention it deserves.

Mr. NESBITT. Can the minister tell us whether that six per cent allowed for the lessor is gross or net? That is to say, who pays the taxes?

Mr. MONK. It is net.

Mr. McKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is now dealing with a new building. Has he followed any rule for providing space, or has he any rule as to the number of occupants he will put in any given space? I may point out that in school buildings, for instance, there is a regulation by which a certain amount of space must be given to each pupil. Is the minister going to adopt means to preserve as much as possible the health of people occupying rooms in the departments, both with regard to allowing the necessary space to each person, and in providing good ventilation? Also what step is being taken to furnish these office buildings with a supply of pure water?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend's question is a very natural one, because it deals with a subject of great importance. But so far as I have been able to see, no rule has been observed in the past in that regard, that is to say, in allowing so many cubic feet of air for each occupant of a room, as no doubt the laws of hygiene necessitate. Some regard has been paid to that rule in the new building we have rented. But it is impossible to lay down any such exact rule in the departments as you would do in a school where a uniform rule can be applied. Some departments require more space than others, according to the nature of the service that is rendered. At any rate, I will bear in mind my hon. friend's suggestion. But up to the present, I think those rules have been more marked in the violation than in the observance.

Mr. NESBITT. Is provision made for proper ventilation?

Mr. MONK. Yes, and in regard to water supply also. I think that matter has been attended to in this new building we have rented. Generally throughout the public buildings in Ottawa, hon. gentlemen will find that there is a special effort made to secure a pure water supply.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think the minister is entitled to some consideration in connection with the delay in the construction of these new public buildings. I am sorry, however, to see him question the wisdom, and perhaps the good faith, of the late administration in buying this property over on Sussex street. Perhaps I misunderstood him, but I thought from the manner in which he referred to it that he doubted the wisdom of having purchased the property at all, and that as a location for a public building, it might be objectionable. This is a matter that I think should be decided by the members of the House of Commons, altogether free from political partisanship. When one thinks that the property upon which the parliament buildings now stand was selected prior to confederation, and by the governments of Upper and Lower Canada, one cannot but appreciate their foresight and business capacity. They did appreciate to a large extent the possible future of the country. Still, in this year of our Lord, it is easy to see that even they, with their excellent judgment, did not quite foresee the growth of Canada.

In my judgment it matters very little whether or not these buildings are erected on the Sussex street property although it might be convenient for the public service. I think it would be a good expenditure, indeed, if many years should elapse before buildings are placed upon this property. I hope the present government will proceed to expropriate many hundred thousands of dollars worth of property in the city of Ottawa and as near the parliament grounds as possible I think the needs of the future will demand this property. The advance expenditure will prove to be a good investment and I think the future will justify most completely the action of any government in buying in advance of the present needs property in this growing city of Ottawa. The Sussex street property might eventually be decided not

to be a proper site for some of the new buildings to be erected by the government. I cannot venture any opinion upon that because I have not examined that property and my judgment might be worth very little in any case. I think there are many reasons why the government should proceed, notwithstanding the fact that the Sussex street property may not be put into immediate use by constructing buildings thereon, to expropriate property to the west of the parliament grounds. I think it is a matter for which the country would commend any government in the future. It will not be material as to whether or not there is an immediate necessity for the construction of buildings upon these properties because in many cases the buildings upon the properties purchased may remain there and the rentals will yield a sufficient revenue to pay the interest upon the money expended. I agree, however, with the Minister of Public Works that there is a crying demand for increased building room for the public service and I trust that when he gets over the immediate rush now upon him and his colleagues—and I fear the Minister of Public Works is a little busier than some of these other hon gentlemen for reasons which I suggested a moment ago—he will find time to give some consideration to the higher questions which concern this country.

Mr. MONK. I am very glad to hear my hon. friend express the opinion which he has just given to the committee in regard to the acquisition of sufficent space here in the city of Ottawa to accommodate for many years to come the increasing wants of the government at this central point. I quite agree with my hon. friend when he says that, whatever may have been the lofty thoughts which inspired the founders of confederation in the acquisition of land here, they do not seem to have fully realized the wants of the future and we should without delay, I think, ensure to the government more space than we absolutely require at the present time in order that in future gradually, as the necessity arises, without being obliged to arrange every day for new fringes or pieces of property, we shall know that we have, before eal estate takes another leap upwards, the property we want. I assure my hon. friend that I have no desire whatever to cast any animadversions upon the dealings in real estate of the late government on Sussex street. I feel that, coming suddenly, as it were to the department, which has so many engrossing branches of the service to attend to. I require the good-will help and assistance of all the members of this committee. Still my hon. friend will bear in mind that I merely referred to it as a proof that the late government was proceeding slowly. We have invested in the Sussex street acquisition about $600,000 and more than that, I believe, with the surrounding expenses of which I have a full statement here. But evidently the question of the immediate construction of the new building was so puzzling and difficult to solve that the late government preferred waiting and proceded to rent property instead of utilizing that piece of land. I believe myself that if it is possible for us to be guided by the principle laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) a moment ago, not to be too niggardly as to space, we should install there some of the public buildings, but I would be sorry to say that we will confine everything in that long, narrow space, at least every inch of it. I do not think that would be wise. We must acquire at once, either by expropriation if necessary——

Mr. SINCLAIR. What frontage have you on Sussex Street under that purchase?

Mr. MONK. A frontage of about a thousand feet.

Mr. NESBITT. Can the minister give the average depth?

Mr. MONK. 155 feet.

Mr. NESBITT. Can the minister give us any idea of the value of the property now supposing he decides not to build there at all?

Mr. MONK. The amount for the acquisitions on this street was $596,915.06. I could not give my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) a very valuable opinion as to the present value but no doubt it has gone up considerably since the acquisition. The people who own property in the immediate vicinity complain of this neglect of the property, of its lying unutilized as it is, and if we decide to utilize it immediately, either in a limited way or altogether, the neighbouring proprietors would be extremely grateful because representations have been made to me since I took charge of the department that the present condition of affairs is ruinous to the properties on the other side of the street and in the immediate vicinity. But all that would disappear if we decided to utilize the property one way or the other, while if we decide finally to part with it I think it will have considerable value. It has gone up 20 per cent in value. I am not surprised at that because there has been a great increase in real estate values. I hope, as soon as this short session has terminated, or as soon as the House and the committee have disposed of these estates, to look upon that question as one which should be taken up first and foremost. It is a very pressing question, but at the present moment. with the disturbances to which my hon. friend has delicately referred, and others, it is very difficult properly to consider the question.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think this is a very opportune time to discuss this question of the site of the public buildings. I am very glad that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has brought this matter up. A remark was made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) with regard to the cubic feet of space utilized in this building. I remained here during the greater part of the vacation and took the opportunity of visiting the various departments. No member of this House can visit the departmental buildings, and especially the Post Office Department, without coming to the conclusion that the governments of this country have paid very little attention to the sanitary condition of these buildings.

It is gratifying to note that to-day an enthusiastic wave is sweeping over Canada, for the building of sanatoria, but it is true on the other hand that some of the public buildings in Ottawa are busy preparing subjects for these institutions. I agree with the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that our opinions may not be worth very much, but after all public opinion is to some extent formed by reading the newspapers, and I have seen some very strange suggestions in the Ottawa newspapers—which I suppose are particularly interested in this subject—one of which was that the departmental buildings need not necessarily be close to the existing buildings, but that they might be situated, like the Victoria Museum, which is possibly a mile away. The newspapers, which suggested that, cannot have understood the extent to which members of parliament have to visit the departments, because it would certainly be most inconvenient if those doing business with the government had to go a mile away to find a public building. There seems to be no doubt but that there is urgent need for new and larger buildings to accommodate the demands of the growing public service of the country, and in the erection of these buildings it is exceedingly important that the health of the civil servants should be considered. In that connection I believe that the site on Sussex street purchased by the late government, being so much lower that the level of Mackenzie avenue, is not a suitable place. It might be a good place for cellar kitchens, but I do not believe it is suitable for the erection of departmental buildings. I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that our fathers looked well to the future when they erected the existing buildings, and it behooves us not to be niggardly in this direction. In my opinion the north side of Wellington street, west of the Supreme Court, would be a very suitable location and I believe the government could not possibly go astray if they secured that property.

Mr. MONK. As this is a question which must be solved before long, I am sure the government would be glad to have expressions of opinion on it from the members of the committee, and if there is any hon. gentleman who has anything to say with regard to the choice of a site I would be glad to hear it. It would seem to be a pity not to use, at any rate for the partial construction of our public buildings, the Sussex street site, although it has some objectionable features, inasmuch as the late government had acquired it at very considerable cost. It is absolutely insufficient in my opinion and I believe we should now, before values take another leap upwards in Ottawa, acquire all the space we will reasonably want for quite a number of years. I believe too, that the buildings to be erected should be as near as possible to the present buildings.

Mr. NESBITT. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) that there are properties near Parliament hill, which if they can be acquired at any reasonable price would afford eligible sites for departmental buildings. I do not think, however, that it would be wise for the government to indicate what land they are likely to take until they have finally decided on the matter, and I think, with the minister, that the Sussex street site should be considered for at least a portion of the new buildings

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like the Minister of Public Works to say that in the near future he will take into consideration the providing of better accommodation for the discharge of our legislative duties. The accommodation provided by this Chamber is very uncomfortable, and it is not fair to ask the representatives of the people to work under such conditions as now prevail. I heard the late minister (Mr. Pugsley) complain a few evenings ago that some of the New Brunswick Liberal members were very uncomfortably housed in a room in the basement. It may be very difficult to devise a remedy, but surely there must be some way of arranging in the near future that every member or every two or three members should have a room wherein they could work. The average member of parliament is supposed to come here to work. He cannot do it in this Chamber at all times, and it is only fair to him and the country that greater convenience should be available.

I would like to suggest to the hon. minister that this is not a duty which should be cast on the government, and the Minister of Public Works should not assume work of this kind. This is one which concerns the members themselves, and the minister might well ask for the appointment of a parliamentary committee to deal with this matter.

Mr. MONK. I shall make a note of the observations of my hon. friend, because we all desire that the accommodation of members should be sufficient. I shall see that his observations are communicated to the proper officer to-morrow. As regards leaving the matter in the hands of a committee of the House, I should be very glad to be relieved of any of the arduous duties I have to perform; but I do not know that that would be a very practicable scheme. However, I shall consider it with the other suggestions.

Mr. MURPHY. In this connection I may say, with regard to the Sussex street site, that the late government reached the decision that the site was not sufficient for present requirements, not to say anything at all about future requirements. That will explain why the new departmental building was not erected on that site. In order to provide facilities for the proper housing of the different officials in the different departments, a sub-committee of council was appointed, of which I happened to be a member. That committee was appointed to make a selection of desirable sites in the city upon which buildings immediately required, and others required later on, might be erected. On that committee was the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and myself. We made a pretty general inspection of what we thought would be desirable sites in the city; but at that time the then First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was absent attending the Imperial Conference, and as he was much interested in the erection of departmental buildings, we thought it advisable not to make any report until his return. But the dissolution of parliament followed so speedily after his return, that no report was made.

In connection with the preparing of a general plan which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) has indicated will be made for these buildings, I would like to impress on him the advisability of keeping in mind what his right hon. leader (Mr. Borden) suggested a few days ago, namely, that effect might be given to the recommendations made by a committee representing the Royal Institute of Architects. That committee waited on the right hon. gentleman a short time ago and made certain representations regarding the work of the Ottawa Improvement Commission. The work of that commission is intimately connected with the erection of public buildings and the general operations within the city of Ottawa of the department over which my hon. friend presides for the time being, and I would suggest to him the advisability of proceeding along the lines which the leader of the government intimated would be followed in connection with devising a general plan which would comprise new buildings and the selection of sites for buildings hereafter to be erected. No doubt it is desirable to consult the convenience of members by having these buildings situated as closely as possible to the existing ones, but that is not the only nor by any means the chief object to be kept in view. Architectural effect is something not to be lost sight of in that connection; and if the buildings be erected in a straight line along one street, that architectural effect will be absolutely lost.

A visit to some of the buildings in Washington that I made a year ago last summer disclosed that they have there a topographical map of the whole city upon which are shown not only the present buildings owned by the government, but also the sites of whatever buildings may be erected in the future, and not merely in the immediate but in the distant future as well. A suggestion formerly made by me that something of the kind might be done in Ottawa was met by the objection that if anything of the kind were done here, the owners of property would immediately advance their prices. But information of that character need not necessarily be communicated to the public, nor do I imagine it would be possible at this stage of the country's development for the government to go into such an extensive plan. That is possible in Washington, because that city is organized under a district system—the District of Columbia. But what I wish to impress particularly on my hon. friend in my capacity as a citizen of Ottawa and representative of a county which embraces a portion of that city within its boundaries—is the necessity for keeping the architectural as well as the practical in view, and if possible of acting in conjunction with the Ottawa Improvement Commission or with any body of architects the government may consult, for the purpose of selecting sites that will not only provide sufficient room for present needs but also produce architectural effects as well.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend's suggestions have to a certain extent already been acted upon, because I have already had some communication with the body of architects to whom he refers, and we do not intend doing anything decisive until we are able to confer with them at regular length. We at once struck a committee of the Privy Council for the purpose of settling this question, but have not been able to give it the necessary time so far. As regards Washington, I have on several occasions visited that city, and I do not know that we could very advantageously copy the system adopted there in any

way. If we wish to establish here departmental buildings that will harmonize with what we have already, we will have to diverge considerably from what they have done there. However, all these considerations will be borne in mind and dealt with as soon as possible.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I was much pleased that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) referred to the unsatisfactory condition of the present building. I would like also to draw the attention of the minister to the deficiencies of this chamber. No doubt great improvements could be made in it by a skilful architect. The ventilation has always been very bad, and no doubt that could be improved. It is very difficult to hear across this chamber. I found great difficulty the other day in making the Minister of Militia hear the few words I had to say to him, and every hon. member knows how difficult it is to hear in this chamber. I read recently in a book published by Toby, M.P., a very interesting description of the improvements made in the House of Commons at London by some slight changes brought about by a skilful architect. When the English House of Commons was erected, it was like this chamber. It was almost impossible to hear what was said in it. But by improvements in the roof and in other ways, it is now perfect, so far as acoustic properties are concerned.

Similar changes were not made in the House of Lords chamber; it remained as it was before, and it is now a very difficult chamber in which to speak. It is said that there are not more than half a doenz peers who can throw their voices across that chamber. It was an exact copy of the House of Commons at the time it was built. I have no doubt that great improvements could be made in this chamber, by changing the roof, for example. I think the deep places in the roof have a great deal to do with the sound of our voices down here. This matter has been before this House nearly every year since I have had the honour of a seat here. But we have now a new Minister of Public Works, who will want to make a record for himself, and if he can give us some good air to breathe in this chamber, and so change it that we can hear one another, he will earn the gratitude of every member of this House.

Mr. MONK. I think the problem of improving the acoustic properties of this chamber, and the ventilation also is a very difficult one, because of the mode in which it is built, with no openings from it except into the lobbies, representing the cloisters of ancient times. It is perhaps an advantage to some of us in some cases not to hear what is being said in the chamber. However it should be otherwise, and I think the observations of my hon. friend will lead me to ask the House in the supplementary estimates for an amount specially to enable us to consult some skilful architect to see if the present conditions cannot be improved upon.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not only should the acoustics of this building be improved, but there should be something else. If you travel on the continent of Europe or even in such a matter-of-fact country as the United States, you will find the various Capitols provided with historic tableaus. In the lobbies of the House of Commons, and the House of Lords in England there are pictures of great beauty, representing the best history of the land. Our walls are quite nude in this respect, and if I were in my hon. friend's place for a few months I think I could improve them. I know my hon. friend's artistic sense, and I think he should encourage some of our painters to decorate the walls of this building. It is true, we have in the corridors of the Senate the portraits of our past Speakers, but these are not enough. It seems to me that there are events in the history of our country which should be reproduced on the walls of this building.

Mr. MONK. We shall be very ready to do this, and I am sure that my hon. friend will help us to get the money necessary, because what pertains to art nowadays costs money. We have the historic events worthy of commemoration, but we lack to a certain extent the native artists to reproduce them. Art is still at its dawn in this country. We have never encouraged it as it should be encouraged. Although we have a great deal of latent talent and some also that has manifested itself, I think there has not yet been enough production on the part of our native artists to warrant us in placing an amount in the estimates for the purpose of covering our walls with scenes commemorative of the great events of our history. For some time still I am afraid they must remain written in golden letters on the pages of our annals.

Mr. OLIVER. In reference to the question of the better ventilation of this chamber, I venture in all humility to offer a suggestion. While it might not be possible to secure absolutely satisfactory ventilation, I submit that there should be no serious difficulty in greatly improving the present conditions, unless it is beyond the ability of the architects of the Public Works Department, by providing for the opening of the windows. There are large windows on both sides of this chamber at the upper part which open into the outer air, and it has always been a mystery to me why provision has not been made for opening these windows so that the outer air may come in, and the inner air go out. If these windows could be opened, there is

nothing to hinder their being opened after parliament adjourns at night and remaining open until people begin to reassemble here in the morning. It seems to me that in that very simple way the ventilation could be easily improved, and we do not need a very skilled architect to carry out the project.

Mr. MONK. We do not require any great artist or expert to do what my hon. friend suggests, but we have both sat for a great many years in this House and endured these inconveniences. I will endeavour to ascertain whether any attempt has been made in the past to remedy the evil which my hon. friend has pointed out. If none has been tried, we will endeavour, with the assistance of the chief architect and others, to invent one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Might I ask my hon. friend, who has a very generous nature, to look a little better after the members of the loyal opposition?

His compatriots from the province of Quebec belonging to the Liberal party are all in one little room—about fifteen or sixteen of them. We hear much about the 'housing problem.' Would not my hon. friend look at the housing provided for his friends on this side of the House and give them a little better accommodation? I must say he was very kind to me and my friends from Beauce (Mr. Beland), and Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), and the ex-Speaker (Mr. Marcil). He gave us his own room; and it is a room full of memories. It is easy to fancy that we hear the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Monk) voice ringing in that room, and we enjoy that thought immensely. But the Quebec Liberals are all in one little room where they have no light or air—and the Liberals like light and air. We want to be in perfect trim to fight this government. But in the quarters provided we have not room to air our grievances. I know the hon. minister's generous nature, and I urge upon his attention the claims of his Liberal compatriots from Quebec. The Liberals, when in power, were generous. They gave all the nice rooms in the new wing to our friends on the other side. I surely need not urge the lesson of this upon my hon. friend.

Mr. MONK. I will give my hon. friend's observations immediate attention. I have the warmest sympathy for hon. members from the province of Quebec who sit in opposition. For many years we had not even the little room to which he has referred, but wandered about the lobbies and rooms of this building like some of those pictured in Dante's Inferno, having no place in which we could take refuge. I think it was only about a year before the change of government that we finally got one room. That gave us courage. And my hon. friend knows what a good account we gave of ourselves in the contest. We will see what can be done for our friends opposite. If the matter is not attended to I hope my hon. friends will remind me of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I invite my hon. friend to be our guest in our little room. I assure him of a warm reception, and I am confident that when he sees how inadequate our quarters are he will decide to give us better accommodation.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not wish to confuse the minister with too many suggestions, and I suppose that the internal management of the library of parliament, of which I wish to speak, does not devolve upon him, but upon the committee of both Houses. The subject of the enlargement of the library presents many difficulties, but that it must be enlarged very soon can be seen by anybody who visits the library to-day. I do not know who the members of the committee are, but there is one matter I wish to point out. In going in and out of the library one encounters piles of bound volumes of Canadian newspapers upon the floor. I like to read the Canadian newspapers of both sides; but I doubt that there is good reason why this amount of space in the library should be given to these volumes. However, I am not pressing this as a grievance for the consideration of the minister, as I know he has enough. But I think the committee in charge of the library should take the matter into consideration.

Mr. MONK. Certainly the need of increased accommodation in the library is very urgent. I may say that the Joint Committee of both Houses on the library has regularly for at least eight years past called the attention of parliament to the absolute insufficiency of the accommodation afforded by the library building. No doubt the inconvenience to which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, Halifax), calls attention, these huge volumes of newspapers encumbering the library, must have struck every member of the committee. I imagine, without having knowledge that this is due to want of space, that there is absolutely no place else to put these volumes. The problem of enlarging the library, with the configuration of the present building, is almost insoluble. Plans have been made —one the addition of a wing to this building in which books not often required might be stored; another to dig a large vault in which old and unwanted volumes might be kept. But none of these schemes have been adopted. The necessity of enlargement is an urgent one, and as soon as possible the government will take it into consideration.

Mr. MURPHY. In last year's estimates there is an item of $100,000 for a new Printing Bureau; but in the estimates before us no figures for the Printing Bureau appear in the extension column: is this an indication that the intention is abandoned, or is the building to be proceeded with?

Mr. MONK. We had some idea of asking parliament to renew that vote, because the Printing Bureau building is quite obsolete and inadequate, as my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) knows better than I do, and something else is necessary. Recently, I believe, an officer of the department has visited the United States and has brought home a report with many important suggestions concerning a new building. But we do not deem it advisable to ask for that credit again this year. If, during the year, some definite plan can be arrived at—for in this as in other matters immediate improvements are necessary—we will come to parliament next session and ask for an amount necessary to cover this very essential work. For this year, we think that the departmental buildings other than this one, will give us enough to do.

Mr. MURPHY. Did the hon. gentleman refer to an officer of his department or to an officer of the Printing Bureau as making a report?

Mr. MONK. I understand that an officer of the Secretary of State's Department has a very elaborate report on that subject. In fact, it was sent to me, but I have not yet been able to study it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Have sites been selected yet for the proposed monuments to Brown and McGee? I noticed that there was some discussion of the subject some time ago. Is it decided whether McGee and Brown will be placed with the other monuments around this building?

Mr. MONK. I do not think that an absolute decision has been arrived at with regard to that matter. I believe that the former Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) expressed the idea—which appeared to be concurred in—on a public occasion, that McGee's statue had its natural place on what is now being called the plaza.

Addition to the Eastern Block, $220,000.

Mr. MONK. That is to complete a work actually in progress. The building is covered in and is being finished.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What branches is it intended to place in that building,—Finance?

Mr. MONK. I think the Finance Department will have its share there. But I would not like to incite any of my colleagues to make raids as yet. Our wants are very great; there is ample demand for all the space that will be available. I would ask my hon. friend to leave that question in abeyance.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I desire to make a suggestion. Having sat in the Council for five years, I am bound to say that the chamber for His Majesty's Canadian Privy Council is utterly inadequate for the work to be done. I think a part of the new building should be devoted to the work of the Privy Councillors. It is time we should have a room for the ministers proper to their work. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will admit that the present Privy Council room is totally unfit for the work carried on there.

Mr. MONK. Certainly, there is a great deal in what my hon. friend has stated. And some of my colleagues have expressed to me the same opinion.

Well, it is a very old chamber, full of memories. I am very conservative myself, and I believe in leaving things as they are as much as possible. My hon. friend is aware that that old building in Downing street from which the greatest empire in the world is administered, has remained for many years with inadequate accommodation, the same as it was when the foundations of that empire were laid. However, the inconveniences my hon. friend has pointed out certainly exist. As soon as the block is further advanced we will see if proper accommodation can be provided for the Privy Council.

Mr. McKENZIE. Perhaps the minister would give us some idea as to what we are to understand by the estimates that we passed a short time before the holidays. We passed estimates for public works all over the country. In the natural course of things those votes would lapse at the end of the fiscal year. There is a difference between the estimates passed in December and the book that is presented to us now. Are the estimates we passed last month to be continued and kept alive, after the lapse of time at the end of the present year? The difference between the estimates we passed last month and the present estimates is very striking. In my own county, I find very few works that were in course of construction carried into the present estimates. I would like to know what is to happen to the estimates we passed a short time ago.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must know that the estimates passed last month were those for the year 1911-12. The estimates now under consideration are for the financial year beginning on the 31st of March next. The five-twelfths we voted last year were not, in many cases, expended, as it was considered inadvisable to begin the work until the whole appropriation was voted. No certainty existed as to when the remaining seven-twelfths would be appro-

priated. When it was made available, the season was so far advanced that most of the works could not be proceeded with. In such cases the amounts are often set down again as re-votes. But the whole subject of voting an appropriation for a public work which has not been begun, had to be reconsidered before the reinsertion of the vote in the estimates for the coming year. In many cases the amounts appropriated for 1911-12 were only sufficient to begin the work. Where the works were begun, a sufficient amount has been added to the re-vote to complete the work for the year 1912-13. Where the work had not been begun the government had to consider, in preparing the estimates for the next year, whether it would be advisable to go on with those works, and the whole question was reopened. In many cases my hon. friend will find that where the work was begun we have continued it. The estimates of last year dovetail to a certain extent in the estimates of this year, but not in all instances.

Halifax Quarantine Station on Lawlor's island—new buildings, repairs and renewals, $25,000.

Mr. MONK. This vote of $25,000 is asked to be taken for erecting new buildings, and repairs and renewals to the existing buildings at the Lawor's island, Halifax, quarantine station. The estimated cost is as follows:

Laboratory..	$ 4,500
Residence for medical superintendent.	5,000
Residence for assistant superintendent..	5,000
Residence for captain..	2,500
Residence for engineer..	2,500
Improvements to existing buildings...	5,500
Total probable cost of proposed works	$25,000
Deduct assumed expenditure prior to 31st March, 1912..	1,500
Revote applied for in main estimates..	3,500
Balance under new vote..	$20,000

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Who makes the request for the new building on Lawlor's island?

Mr. MONK. It is for the Department of Agriculture that we are carrying out this work, which is urgently needed. The quarantine requirements everywhere are very insufficient at the present moment.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think I will have to ask the minister to allow this item to stand until a future date. I am not very thoroughly acquainted with all the facts in connection with this proposal to build a new quarantine station on Lawlor's island, but I do know that some of the medical men in the employ of the Department of Agriculture in connection with immigration say that this is an unsuitable place for a quarantine station. I believe it is regarded as an error by some of the leading business men of Halifax and by prominent members of the Halifax Board of Trade. It frequently happens that the water between Lawlor's island and the mainland during the winter season is frozen and access to the island is thus prevented. If that is correct it is obviously a matter for consideration as to whether the quarantine hospital should be placed there when one reflects upon the fact that the immigrants reaching the port of Halifax arrive there during the winter months. It has been said, I do not know how seriously, that the proposal to erect a new quarantine station on Lawlor's island was put forward partially by the desire to get rid of the office of one of the medical attendants in connection with the immigration service. Of course, that would be an extreme penalty to pay for the removal of an officer whose partisanship cannot be proven or suspected by living beings down in the city of Halifax. I do not present that as a fact myself, but at least upon general considerations I would like the minister to allow the item to stand. I do not think that the Department of Agriculture has given the matter sufficient consideration as yet.

Mr. MONK. Certainly, if my hon. friend wishes the item to stand it can stand, the more so as I do not see my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture present, but I can assure my hon. friend that the idea he has expressed, that possibly all this expenditure is being incurred in order to get rid of some officer of the service there, is absolutely a dream.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I notice that there is a house for a doctor; it looks suspicious.

Mr. MONK. All this was worked out before ever we came to take office; in fact, the foundation of this calculation is to be found in a letter containing a request from the hon. Mr. Fisher, the previous Minister of Agriculture, dated the 22nd March, 1911, in which he states:

That in view of the possible introduction into Canada of Asiatic cholera during the coming season he is of opinion that a bacteriological laboratory should be provided at once for the Halifax quarantine station.

These estimates have reference to the establishment of this bacteriological station. Of course, I cannot for a moment discuss with my hon. friend the advisability of keeping the quarantine station on Lawlor's Island. My hon. friend is more familiar with the locality than I am. But I can assure him that all this was prepared before the present government took office and we are merely carrying out

the calculations and demands that were made upon the government previous to our taking office. If my hon. friend wishes the vote to stand——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like it to stand.

Mr. MONK. I have no objection.

Item allowed to stand.

Lunenburg public building—fittings, $2,000.

Mr. MONK. This vote is asked to be taken to make provision for changing the location of the screen and fittings required in the Lunenburg post office, also to provide for a lavatory on the ground floor. The vote is asked at the request of the Post Office Department.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to ask the minister if any request has been made to him for the dismissal of the caretaker of the Lunenburg post office?

Mr. MONK. I could not tell from memory, but I do not think so. I will make a note of it and I will let my hon. friend know, but I do not think there has been any demand.

Wolfville public building, $26,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Permit me to ask the minister if he is prepared to define the policy of the new government with regard to the erection of public buildings. We have had in the past a great many complaints from hon. gentlemen who are now on the government benches that these public buildings were given as rewards for political favours, that they were erected in small towns with a small population and trifling business, whereas larger towns with a greater population and more business were cut out altogether because they happened to be represented by a member of the opposite political faith. I would like to know from the minister if he is prepared to deal with this question, to define a policy which will carry out the principles that he and his party advocated while in opposition, that public buildings should be erected where the public requirements call for them, irrespective of any favour to any person and that the smaller places will not necessarily be looked after until the larger ones are served. If he has any information to give us on that important question this will be a very suitable time to let the committee hear what his policy is going to be. It might enable us to avoid a great deal of discussion and difficulty in the future.

Mr. MONK. I presume my hon. friend has not asked that question in connection with this vote, because this public building seems to have been decided upon by the late government as far back as February, 1909.

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, it has no connection with this vote, but it has reference to the general policy.

Mr. MONK. They passed an order in council for the acquisition of the site. I certainly find my hon. friend's question a very natural one, but I am not ready this evening to propound any policy in connection with the erection of public buildings. Nor am I prepared to criticise the policy which has obtained hitherto, because I have sought vainly to find any principles of the late government upon that very important subject. I do not believe that any rule of any kind existed. Public buildings were erected where it pleased the late government to erect them, sometimes in suitable places and sometimes in places where, it seemed to me, there was no justification at all for them. In face of that policy, or rather of the total absence of policy, it will be necessary for the present government to become more familiar with the question before propounding any rules, but I think I have seen enough to be able to say that the adoption of some general rules is absolutely necessary. What these rules should be we have not had time so far to determine.

It must be obvious that for a number of years past some places where public buildings were absolutely necessary have been entirely neglected. For instance, the public buildings in Toronto are absolutely inadequate to the needs of that city. It is impossible to conceive how the government has for years past neglected the crying wants of Toronto while they found money to erect public buildings in places where the revenue did not justify it. If the principle were laid down that a certain population and a certain revenue and certain other conditions had to be present before a building were erected, I believe a great deal of money would be saved to the country. I am not in a position after so short a time in office to say that the question has been carefully studied and that we have been able to arrive at a guiding principle in that respect. I hope that when the government has more leisure a more definite policy will be laid down than has been the practice in the past.

Mr. McKENZIE. In last year's estimate a provision was made for the errection of clock towers in the public buildings at North Sydney, Sydney Mines and Baddeck, on the report of an officer of the Public Works Department. The moneys were voted and I believe they could have been expended within the year, but nothing was done. The appropriation for these three places in my riding is dropped from the present estimates, nothwithstanding that two similar items for Kentville and Windsor are continued. I would like the min-

ister to tell me for what reason this discrimination has been made. I hope it does not follow the principle of the Day of Judgment that one will be taken and two will be left. Why should Kentville or Windsor be favoured when a town like Sydney Mines with ten times their population, ten times their business, and ten times their activity is slighted. Mr. de Witt, an officer of the department, reported in favour of the tower clocks being erected on these buildings in my county. I am glad the chief architect is present, because I want to call specially to his attention the neglected condition of the public building at North Sydney. The report of the officer asking for these repairs is before the minister. The windows of the post office and customs building are in a deplorable condition, rain and snow pour in, and the occupants of the offices are rendered very uncomfortable. Requisitions have been made time and again for these repairs, but nothing has been done, and I now publicly ask the minister to attend to the matter. While I was supporting the late government I frequently visited the department asking for these works, and I always found the chief architect courteous and willing, but some way or other these buildings continued to be neglected. I again urge on the minister the desirability of carrying out the recommendation of Mr. de Witt in connection with the tower clocks.

Mr. MONK. I shall make a note of the recommendations made by my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie). The amount required for these repairs was voted last year, and if they are so essential and urgent as represented by the hon. gentleman I do not know why the vote was not applied to them. If it is possible to afford a remedy for the conditions indicated before the vote lapses I will see if it can be done. In a great many cases we had to provide for the continuation of works which we did not initiate, and where work was not begun with the money voted, we assumed in some cases that the work was not essential. However, the representations of my hon. friend will be considered.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Has a site been purchased at Port Hawkesbury, Inverness county, for the erection of a public building?

Mr. MONK. There is no site bought nor any vote asked for.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). An appropriation of $3,000 was brought down in the supplementaries for the purchase of that site.

Mr. MONK. Nothing done so far. No site has been purchased.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is speaking about a clock. I know that the hon. minister (Mr. Monk) has a tender feeling for clocks. When on this side, he was always asking for a clock at Lachine. There is a building in the course of erection at Marieville, county of Rouville. That building was ordered, before I became a member, by the former Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur). The people of that locality have been asking for the last few months that a clock should be provided for that building and I make a warm appeal to my hon. friend not to complete it without that very necessary adjunct. He will remember that I helped him considerably in his many requests to the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) when he was endeavouring to get for the community of Lachine a clock in the tower of their public building.

Mr. MONK. Somebody deceived me very badly in that matter, because Lachine did not get the clock. It was not the fault of my hon. friend, but unfortunately he was not the incumbent of the Department of Public Works, and I did not get my clock.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it there now?

Mr. MONK. No, but there will be one. The vote for Marieville we shall come to shortly, and it will then be opportune to discuss the matter of the clock.

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). I would ask the hon. minister to let the items for Nova Scotia stand, as some of the members from that province are not present, and go on with the items for Quebec.

Lachine post office, $4,000.

Mr. MONK. This is to redeem the promise made by my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. CLARE. I would like to ask whether there ever has been an order in council passed fixing the places where the orders for clocks are to be placed. The late Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), during the elections, made a promise to the town of Berlin regarding the clock, and I understand the clock was to be bought in that town without regard to competition.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I did not make that promise at the time of the general election. I paid a visit one summer to the town of Berlin, and I saw that clockless tower and was ashamed of the government, and I thought the people there were entitled to a clock, and they got it before the election.

Lévis, armoury and gun drill hall, $70,000.

Mr. MONK. This is under contract. It is some of the work of the late government which we are endeavouring to complete.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But the hon. gentleman was most emphatic in his speeches against militarism and now he is providing the province of Quebec with armouries for guns.

Mr. MONK. But this is not militarism. This is for the defence of our native heath. Militarism and defense are quite different. My hon. friend has often expressed that idea within my hearing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I should like to hear the hon. minister make that explanation in the province of Quebec.

Maisonneuve post office, $40,000.

Mr. VERVILLE. Is it the intention of the department to proceed with the work? This amount is sufficient to commence the work, but not to complete it.

Mr. MONK. The idea is to proceed with the work as soon as possible. There is a plan for the postal stations all over the island of Montreal, and this must be in pursuance of that plan.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that the municipality of Maisonneuve was quite willing to give the Public Works Department the site and a square surrounding it in order to enhance the appearance of the building. There is enough ground at this site to erect, if not a palatial building, at least one that will be a credit to the great city of Maisonneuve, which has a population not far from 25,000.

Mr. MONK. We are anxious to carry out any suggestions in regard to the æsthetic improvement of the locality that may be made to us. The site was purchased in 1910 from Mr. Morgan. If there is any arrangement by which the municipality will improve the surroundings of the proposed post office, we will see that the hopes held out by my hon. friend are realized before we go very much into the expenditure.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I remember the circumstances of the sale of that site to the Public Works Department, and I remember also the delegation which came to Ottawa, headed by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville). The mayor, Mr. Michaud, stated that the city would provide a little park around the building in order to enhance its appearance.

Mr. VERVILLE. Quite a long time ago a proposition was made to the Maisonneuve city council to the effect that if the government would put up a building costing $50,000, the city council would furnish land worth about $15,000. That was on paper. The city council which was so anxious at that time, was rather slow about getting the land, and I as the representative of the riding was asked time and again, 'Why don't you have the government furnish a plan?' Of course, my answer was, 'Why don't you furnish the land?' Finally, I thought it was unfair to ask the citizens to contribute $12,000 or $15,000 for land. The government has of course purchased the site, which is a square on Ontario street about 100 feet by 120 feet on Mr. Morgan's farm between the lacrosse grounds and the building on the left. There will be a boulevard starting at the building and extending to the river, with a street 60 feet wide on each side, and there will be a park at the head of that street. The site is a very good one, and the people seem to be well satisfied with it. I have told the people of Maisonneuve that in the selection of a site it was not they who had to be pleased, but the Post Office Department. I believe that site was purchased a year ago at a very low figure. I am sure nobody could purchase a piece of land there at the same price to-day. If the land was purchased at a low price, it was with the expectation that the government would put a fairly good building. As far as I am concerned, I am satisfied with the plan proposed. It will be a very good building. I understand, from the answer given by the Minister of Public Works some time ago, that this vote of $40,000 is for the preliminary work, because I know that it is impossible to construct the building for that money. It will be a monument if it is constructed according to the plan.

Mr. MONK. I do not know whether the municipality ever intended to give the government the site my hon. friend has referred to; but whether they so intended or not, it was not given. The site was purchased in 1910 from Mr. Morgan.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At what price?

Mr. MONK. It was $8,437.50 under order in council dated 20th September, 1910. There are four streets around that site, and when the time comes to build, we shall do our best to make a suitable structure.

Marieville public building, $15,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will implement his promise there and give us a clock. The people are clamouring for it.

Montreal general post office—enlargement, additions and alterations, including fittings, furniture, &c., and alterations to old building, $200,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When is it expected this building will be ready for the public?

Mr. MONK. I do not know. It is a most extraordinary thing how long government buildings take. There are fine buildings alongside that have been begun, finished and occupied while our work is going on. I

heard that the late government's policy was to make that construction last as long as possible. Of course I do not believe that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was due to the fact that we had three or four hundred men there whom we could not place anywhere else. So we had to build by piece-work. We have a good contractor, but he needs a little——

Mr. MONK. He needs stimulation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He must be stimulated.

Mr. MONK. We are doing our best. The inconvenience is very great. The contractor has promised to deliver two flats, I think, almost immediately, and we are doing our best in the department to hurry him up. And I think he also is making great, unusual efforts.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not wish to say more than I should say, but speaking as a Montrealer, and as a representative from the district of Montreal, I think my hon. friend in the immediate future should look for a new site for a post office. The postal business of Montreal is increasing so much that the time is not far distant, when the present building, even with the additional accommodation to be afforded will not suffice for the work. The hon. minister (Mr. Monk) must remember that the British mails centre in Montreal. On certain days the building is full of boxes, baskets, and parcels of all kinds, and the people simply cannot move. If my hon. friend will compare the figures of the post office of to-day with those of ten years ago, or even five years ago, he will see that the postal business in Montreal has doubled, if not trebled. When we obtained from the Post Office Department in Great Britain a reduction on British magazines and newspapers from 8 cents a pound to 2 cents a pound, I myself went to Rimouski in the summer two or three months after the new arrangement came into operation; and where I had previously seen something like sixty or seventy, possibly a hundred, bags and baskets of magazines and newspapers, I saw now nine hundred and a thousand. And all this enormous increase centres in the Montreal post office. So that when you have the British mail coming in the building is blocked. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) can easily learn what the business men of Montreal have to say on this matter, and I am sure that he will come to the conclusion that it would be better to look out for a site.

Mr. MONK. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the accommodation in the Montreal post office, even with the additional space now being provided, will be inadequate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), knows better than I do, for he has been Postmaster General, how far the solution of the problem he has just indicated is to be sought in making a larger main post office, and how far in providing suitable postal stations all over the city to which the mails can be taken from the receiving station—in other words whether there should be concentration or distribution of the work. At any rate, I am quite sure that the accommodation is not sufficient, but will need to be increased before long.

Montreal new barracks, $100,000.

Mr. MONK. This is a revote.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I see by the press that when my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was present at a dinner—quite a historic dinner—with his colleague, the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes), the question of the location of the new barracks came up. At first it had been decided that the barracks should be on the south shore of the St. Lawrence between Longueuil and St. Lambert. I am sorry that the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Rainville) is not in his place. I understand he has been advocating that scheme during the elections and that he expected that his friends in office would give him the barracks for some site within the section I have indicated. But the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes), said that having motored through the city a whole day he had found that there were hundreds of available sites, and that he would certainly not move the barracks to the south shore, but would leave them to the good citizens of Montreal. I do not know whether the Minister of Militia has made a selection of a site, but I am pleased to hear that the barracks will be located in Montreal. However, I am sorry for the hon. member from Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Rainville) who has made these promises to his electors. But an interview was published with the Minister of Militia in which that hon. gentleman said that, in order to soothe the hon. gentleman's feelings, if he could not give him the barracks he would cause the Minister of Public Works to spend the money on the boulevard between Longueuil and St. Lambert. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), is aware that that interview between the Minister of Militia and the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres was published.

Was my hon. friend consulted about that? Has he made any such promise, and does he intend to implement such a promise? I understand that the barracks are going to Montreal. We will have barracks in Montreal for the loyal citizens of Montreal, the Nationalist party included; on the south shore a boulevard was promised by the Minister of Militia and Defence, and are we going to have that?

Mr. MONK. I am afraid I cannot speak authoritatively for the government upon that question. However, if the Minister of Militia stated that if the barracks were taken away from Longueuil there would be compensation for the people by doing some work on the boulevard, I think that is a very good idea, and I approve of it. But nothing has been decided. The late government had about decided to establish those barracks in my own constituency, without any suggestion of my own, because I was not permitted to make any suggestion on any subject during the fifteen years I represented the county, sitting on the same side where my hon. friend is sitting now. But at Northmount, Côte des Neiges, the government had almost closed a purchase for a site for the barracks. Does my hon. friend know that there was an option taken for that site? Why they left that site and subsequently determined to build at Longueuil I do not know. Perhaps my hon. friend knows what new current of opinion set in which led them to change from Northmount and to build at Longueuil. My hon. friend knows more about that than I do. But I think nothing was decided definitely, even as to Longueuil, and I am inclined to believe that the late government was moving back towards the island of Montreal for the barracks. The Minister of Militia expressed, in my hearing at Montreal, the opinion that the island of Montreal would be more suitable for the barracks. I have reason to believe that all the militia men of Montreal share that opinion, and it seems to be the most reasonable opinion. But nothing has been finally decided. My hon. friend who takes such an interest in military matters may rest assured that everything will be done to make the position of Montreal strategically a safe one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend himself takes a great deal of interest in military matters.

Montreal—new customs examining warehouse, $300,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the government decided to build on the Grey Nunnery site?

Mr. MONK. Yes, that is a very good site.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Who is the architect?

Mr. MONK. The plans are being prepared at headquarters where we are in immediate contact with the Customs Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think I can say without offence to any one that the best architect in Montreal, in fact in the province of Quebec, Mr. Marchand, has been retained for the preparation of those plans.

Mr. MONK. I believe there was some negotiation with him, perhaps he did prepare a sketch. But I think the matter of the erection of an examining warehouse should be under our immediate direction here, where we can get suggestions, and have a plan which is the result of experience.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understood that besides building the examining warehouse, the customs house would be moved. Is that a fact?

Mr. MONK. I hope so, in the near future.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that the customs authorities in Montreal are in a sad plight, they have no more space, and they have applied to the Department of Public Works to move to a place on McGill street which is more central.

Montreal—postal station 'F' at Westmount, $50,000.

Mr. CODERRE. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works if this sum of $50,000 is all that it is intended to spend on that building. I have been told by the architect, Mr. Piché, who prepared the plans last year, plans which have been approved by the late government, that the erection of that post office at Westmount according to these plans would certainly cost $70,000. I would like to know, therefort, if voting this sum would mean that the government would spend no more for the erection of that building?

Mr. MONK. I may say in reply to my hon. friend from Hochelaga that we do not expect to be able to get a suitable building for the sum of $50,000. In fact, according to the estimate of Mr. Piché, the architect, it will cost $70,000. For a place such as Westmount, I think $70,000 is not an extravagant sum.

Mr. CODERRE. Nothing is too good for Westmount. I would like to ask the minister another question. The site for that building was purchased and paid for by the government I think in 1909. It is at the corner of Strathcona and Victoria streets. But I am informed that the Westmount council and the Citizens' League have petitioned the Department of Public Works and the Post Office Department to change the site of that building. The people there seem to think that a site should be chosen on Green avenue, about the corner of Western avenue, which they consider is the most central place of the whole town, and the most suitable for a post office. I visited the department a few days ago, but received no definite answer on the subject. The lot has been purchased and paid for.

I would like to know if the government has consented to make the change. If the location is changed, could that sum of $50,000 be applied to purchase another site?

Mr. MONK. I think that under this vote, if it is found that the site is not suitable and does not meet the requirements, it would be possible for us to dispose of this site and acquire another one. As a matter of fact, strong representations have come to us from the municipal authorities and corporate bodies of citizens in that vicinity to the effect that this site is not the proper one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How much has been paid for this site?

Mr. MONK. $16,000, at the rate of $1.40 a foot.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But it is too near the Montreal end of Westmount. I quite understand my hon. friend's anxiety about it, and I hope that with this vote he can do it. I quite remember the circumstances of this sale made to the Dominion government by the gentleman who owned that lot. Generally, when a post office is to be erected, the Department of Public Works consults the Postmaster General and I usually gave Mr. Ross, of Toronto, authority to go about quietly and see what lots could be obtained at a reasonable figure. The great trouble when a public building is to be erected is that the amount of the vote is eaten up by the price of the site.

Mr. MONK. And the costs.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the costs, certainly. My hon. friend will find that out in the general routine of his department. He has to be very careful to see that he shall not be mulcted in the long run. Well, I sent Mr. Ross, who was not known to the hoi-polloi in Montreal, and he came back with figures which were simply appalling. We had to select a rather inferior site because we had to be governed by the price. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is not the best available site, but if he tries to get a better site he will be met by an exorbitant price. My hon. friend is quite right in advocating a change of site.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). This item is, I feel sure, controversial; we have done a considerable amount of work this evening, the minister, I know is quite tired, and anxious for a rest; therefore I trust that he will now move that the committee rise.

Mr. MONK. The committee has been very obliging, but could we not finish these Quebec votes to-night? They are not controversial.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It will take too long.

Mr. MONK. We will just finish Quebec and leave Ontario for another day.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If we pass the next item that will finish Montreal.

Mr. MONK. Most of these are revotes —finish the Quebec business.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You must hear more about Quebec, I am sorry to say.

Mr. MONK. We would do good work if we finished the Quebec votes to-night.

Napierville public building, $15,000.

Mr. R. LANCTOT (Laprairie-Napierville). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works upon the building that his department intend to erect at Napierville. I wish to know if his department will erect that building upon the land bought last year? Moreover, I would like to know if the hon. minister has entered into negotiations with any persons in Napierville about that site. Does the minister know that some people have asked for a change of site?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) In reply to my hon. friend, I will state that this is a vote of $15,000 for a public building in town of Napierville, on St. Luc street. The site cost $1,000. The work will be proceeded with immediately. Does the hon. gentleman desire to know whether the site has been changed?

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation.) I wish to know whether the hon. minister is aware that negotiations have taken place with the people of Napierville concerning a change of site?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Not to my knowledge. I never heard anything of that. Oh, I beg the hon. member's pardon; there has been some question of a change of site; representations were made that the proposed site was not the best that might be chosen; but nothing has been decided.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation.) I should say for the information of the hon. minister that when the question arose as to the purchase of this site, a public meeting convened by the parish priest was held in the vestry and that it was unanimously decided that the site chosen was the most appropriate one; the former government, therefore, purchased it.

Then, in the estimates of 1911-12 was inserted an item of $27,000 for the building of a protection wall from the town of Laprairie to the bridge of the St. Jacques river. Five-twelfths of this amount were voted during the last session and expended in the course of the summer. The balance was voted during the present session be-

fore the Christmas vacation. I perceive that the minister has placed nothing in the estimates to cover this expenditure. What was voted in December will lapse on the 31st March next and the $15,750 necessary to complete the work will not be forthcoming next spring. If the amount is not inserted in the present estimates the work cannot be completed next summer, and the expenditure already incurred will become useless. Does the hon. minister intend to include that amount in the supplementary estimates for 1912-13 ?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) The hon. member is mixing up the vote for public buildings with that required for wharfs in the province of Quebec. He should, I think, keep both separate.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation.) As both matters concern my constituency, I thought that I might follow the example of certain other members of the opposition and take advantage of the opportunity to put the question.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I do not exactly complain of that, but it seems to me that in considering the estimates some method is necessary and that we should avoid skipping from one chapter to another. In any case, I will remind the hon. member that since a few years the country has expended more than one hundred thousand dollars for the protection of lands in Laprairie, whereas at Verdun, in the county of Jacques Cartier, on the opposite side, where exactly the same conditions exist, not one cent has been expended by the government, in spite of the report of the engineer, Mr. St. Georges, made at the request of the late Minister of Marine, Mr. Préfontaine, recommending the same works there as on the Laprairie side. The conditions, I say, were absolutely the same. In consequence of this refusal, the municipality of Verdun was obliged to spend large sums of money. Therefore, while on the Laprairie side the government was spending large sums of money, the Verdun shore was left absolutely without protection. This may have induced the present government to reason in this manner: We will consider whether this is an equitable treatment, for if we do anything on one side of the river, we should also consider the requirements of the other shore.

I do not say that these works will not be carried on, only the hon. member would have been well advised had he sustained at the time the cause of Verdun.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation.) I regret that the hon. minister did not attend the political meetings that took place in the county of Laprairie in 1908, when the Hon. Simeon Beaudin, now a judge of the Superior Court, was a candidate against me. He accused Roch Lanctot of only obtaining very small morsels, crumbs in fact for his electors, whereas, if elected, he would secure the completion of all these works within the year. It would not be with $5,000 or $10,000 that they would be helped, but with hundreds of thousands. As for the county of Jacques Cartier, I have never objected to its obtaining the amount necessary for its protection, but I was not the member for Jacques Cartier. I may state here that everyone in my county is favourable to these works, not excepting the local member, Mr. Patenaude. Everybody desires that they be continued and completed at the earliest possible date if we are to hope to obtain the international route going from Laprairie to Rouse's Point.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Foster (Toronto), House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 17, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

OTTAWA CITY FEDERAL DISTRICT.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the government aware that by a referendum which took place on the 1st of January, 1912, at the city of Ottawa, the electors declared, by an overwhelming majority in favour of the principle of creating the national capital into a federal district, to include within its boundaries the city of Ottawa and as large an area of the surrounding country as may be necessary to enable the said district to be planned, developed and beautified to the best advantage; the said district to be governed by a commission; the members of the commission to be paid and a proportion of them to be nominated by the government of Canada, but the majority to be elected by the people resident within the district; the government of Canada to contribute a fair proportion of the necessary revenue, and representation in parliament, and the provincial legislature for the district to be continued?

2. If so, what steps is the government going to take to carry same into effect and when?

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN. The government have not had, so far as I am aware, any notice of the referendum referred to, though references to it have been observed in the public press. In the absence of such official notification, the question has not been under consideration.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any government patronage in the way of advertising or printing been given by the present government to 'L'Evenement,' 'Le Devoir,' the 'Quebec Chronicle' or 'La Patrie'?

2. If so, what is the amount involved in each case?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2.

'L'Evenement'—

Customs	$ 25 00
Interior	349 44
Militia and Defence	22 50
Naval Service	24 85
Public Works	46 50
Post Office and $14 per month.	48 75
Railways and Canals	1,151 50
	$1,584 54

Indian Affairs, account not rendered.

'Le Devoir'—

Interior	$393 12
Public Works	96 12
	$489 24

Indian Affairs, account not rendered.

Quebec 'Chronicle'—

Customs	$ 25 00
Indian Affairs	30 60
Interior	349 44
Marine and Fisheries	30 60
Militia and Defence	72 00
Public Works	169 65
Post Office and $14 per month.	21 00
Railways and Canals	287 00
	$985 29

Naval affairs not yet rendered.

'La Patrie'—

Indian Affairs	$ 24 48
Interior	509 60
Militia and Defence	28 80
Naval Service	25 56
Public Works	136 56
Railways and Canals	3,100 00
	$3,825 00

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION DEBT.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the total debenture debt of the Montreal Harbour Commission?

2. What amount is owing to the public, and what amount to the Dominion government?

3. What rate of interest is payable to the government?

4. Is there any accrued interest overdue? If so, how much?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. $16,707,000.

2. To the public, $1,872,000; to the Dominion, $14,735,000.

3. $9,195,000 at the rate of 3 per cent per annum; $5,540,000 at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum.

4. Interest due the Dominion on the 1st January, 1912, not yet paid $218,430,99. The commission state that all interest due the public up to the 5th January instant has been paid.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER GREIVER.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any complaints been formulated against Mr. Solomon Greiver, lighthouse keeper at Newport, Gaspé?

2. If so, what is the nature of these complaints, and by whom were they formulated?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Political partisanship.

(b) Two petitions signed by sixty-three residents of Gaspé.

MARINE DEPARTMENT INQUIRY—GASPE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Who has been appointed to preside at the inquiry of the Marine Department in the county of Gaspé?

2. What salary is paid to the commissioner in this inquiry?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. W. A. E. Flynn, Esq., barrister, Percé, P. Q.

2. The remuneration not to exceed $15 for each full day's attendance and reasonable moving and living expenses.

PETITE LAMEQUE WHARF.

Mr. TURGEON:

Is it the intention of the government to provide for the construction of a wharf at Petite Lameque, Shippegan island, for which an appropriation of $8,000 was voted in the estimates for the fiscal year of 1911-12?

Mr. MONK:

Tenders are now being advertised, and on receipt of same, careful consideration will be given the question of proceeding with the work.

LEASED PRIVATE BUILDINGS.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Has the government leased private buildings for the use of public officers?

2. If so, what amounts have been paid during the financial year 1910 and 1911 for rental of the said buildings?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.

2. In Ottawa	$153,469 39
Elsewhere throughout Canada	71,305 97
Total 1910-11	$224,775 36

PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, OTTAWA.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. When did the government purchase the property situated between Rideau, Sussex, St. Patrick and Mackenzie streets?
2. What is the total amount expended in the purchase of these properties?
3. For what purpose were they acquired?

Mr. MONK:

1. Between 22nd August, 1908, and 15th August, 1910. Properties purchased extend as far as the Royal Mint, beyond St. Patrick's street.
2. $597,200.
3. For the purpose of constructing a new departmental building thereon.

LABOURERS' RECRUITING AGENTS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many recruiting agents of farm labourers has the government in Quebec, Ontario and the maritime provinces?
2. What are the names of these agents and what commission have they received?
3. Have these agents made any report?
4. Is the recruiting work under good control?
5. Does the government know the number of farm labourers placed in Quebec, Ontario and the maritime provinces?
6. Has this system produced good results?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Ontario 81, Quebec 16, working in all provinces 9.

*2. See list. Commission of $2 upon each immigrant placed at farm work or each female immigrant placed at domestic service.

3. Yes. They report each individual placed.
4. Yes.
5. Yes. 6,902 were placed in calendar year 1911.
6. Yes.

*CANADIAN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT AGENTS.

In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, who will secure free of charge, situations as farm help or domestic servants in their localities for all emigrants desiring such positions.
Corrected to Jan. 15, 1912.

Pprovince of Ontario.

County.	Name of Agent.	Railway Station and Post Office Address.
Brant	Gilbert Hanmer	Burford Ont.
"	Robert E. Featherston	Paris "
Bruce	E. F. Boyle	Paisley "
"	Geo. H. Mooney	Ripley "
"	Robt. Neil	Tara "
"	R. H. McKay	Walkerton "
Dundas	Wesley Hamilton	Chesterville Ont.
"	S. W. Van Allen	Mountain "
Durham		
"	Edward Power	Port Hope "
"	David Armstrong	Millbrook "
Elgin	S. M. Morris	Rodney "
"	Wm. Atkin	Springfield "
"	A. D. Carley	West Lorne "
"	C. H. White	Aylmer West "
Essex	H. O. Daykin	Leamington "
Frontenac	Jas. F. Knapp	Kingston, 333 Johnston st.
Grenville	E. L. B. Cornell	Kemptville Ont.
Grey	R. H. Fortune	Ayton "
"	E. Mountcastle	Dundalk "
"	Jas. Sword	Owen Sound "
"	Thomas Douglas	Meaford "
Haldimand	G. H. Harris	Caledonia "
"	Alex. Mitchell	Cayuga "
"	Andrew Rogers	Jarvis "
Halton	John C. Campbell	Burlington "
"	Robert Milligan	Georgetown "
"	David Hartley	Milton "
Hastings	John H. Carr	Belleville "
"	Jas. McAlpin	Marysville "
Huron	F. S. Scott	Brussels "
Kent	George Johns	Bothwell "
"	E. B. Richardson	Tilbury "
"	Rob. Armstrong	Whitebread "
"	John McArgy	Chatham "
"	Geo. Thompson	Blenheim "
Lambton	W. S. Fuller	Watford "
Lanark	Alex. McLean	Carleton Pl. "
"	Henry Taylor	Perth "
Lennox	H. Hunter	Napanee "
Lincoln	John Scott	St. Catherines "
Huron	Jas. W. Bone	Marnoch "
"	Wm. McQuillan	St. Helen's "
"	Wm. Patterson	Auburn "
Argenteuil	E. C. Whinfield	Calumet, Que.
Arthabaska	Léon Samson	Stanfold "
Brome	A. W. Westover	Sutton Jct. "
Drummond	Alfred Millar	South Durham "
"	Chas. Manseau	Dru'mondville "
Deux-Montagnes	Jos. Legault	St. Hermas "
L'Assomption	Max. Janson	L'Assomption "
St. Johns and Iberville	J. Aug. Latour	Iberville "
	Alph. F. Gervais	St. Johns "
Middlesex	J. H. McKay	Ailsa Craig Ont.
"	Wentworth McGuffin	Thorndale "
"	Henry Hardie	Mount Brydges "
"	James Healey	Strathroy "
Norfolk	Thos. E. Alton	Port Rowan "
"	John Allego	Simcoe "
"	C. R. Smith	Waterford "
Northumberland	Jas. D. Haig	Cobourg "
"	W. R. Taylor	Colborne "
"	E. Terrill	Wooler, via Trenton Ont.
Ontario	George Rose	Port Perry "
Oxford	George Law	Drumbo "
"	James Stirton	Ingersoll "
"	Pierce Irving	Woodstock "
Peel	James Stork	Bolton "
Peterboro	Geo. H. Howsen	Peterboro "
Prescott	Thos. A. VanBridger	Plantaganet Springs "
Simcoe	Geo. Warnica	Barrie "
"	William Jermyn	Bradford "

County.	Name of Agent.	Railway Station and Post Office Address.	
Simcoe.....	W. H. Manning..	Coldwater	Ont.
"	Jas. B. Henderson	Orillia	"
"	Benjamin Cheesman.....	Stayner	"
"	James Boake.	Thornton	"
Stormont....	David J. Gallinger	Cornwall	"
Victoria.....	Morgan Johns....	Lindsay	"
Welland.	Leslie V. Garner,.	Welland	"
Wellington,..	Wm. Peterkin. ...	Arthur	"
" ..	Scott Cowan.....	Palmerston	"
" ..	Wm. Young.....	Guelph	"
" .	Harry Catley.....	Mount Forest	"
Wentworth..	T. H. Corman....	Stony Creek	"
York.....	T. F. McMahon..	RichmondHill	"
"	C. W. Davidson..	Mount Albert	"
"	James Mair	Oak Ridges	"
"	Victor A. Hall....	King	"
Russell	T. Scott.....	Sutton West	"
"	W C.Cameron...	Metcalfe	"
"	A.. F.Stevenson..	Russell	"
Megantic ...	Samuel de Champlain.....	St. Ferdinand	Quebec.
Missisquoi..	C. P. Taber.....	Cowansville	"
Richmond...	Geo. McCracken..	Danville	"
Stanstead....	H. E. Colt,.	Coaticook	"
"	John F. Belisle....	Coaticook	"
Vaudreuil....	Emmanuel Rourke	Rigaud	"
Vercheres....	Ernest Chicoine...	Verchères	"

Emigrants going to or west of Winnipeg, who desire situations as farm help or domestic servants, should be given cards of introduction to J. Bruce Walker, Commissioner of Immigration, Winnipeg, Manitoba, and 'advice form' should be sent to him by the booking agent as soon as ticket is sold.

Booking agents must distinctly understand that in no case are they to give cards of introduction to parties desiring work other than farm labour, or in the case of females domestic service.

Emigrants and employment agents will both be assisted by the booking agent mailing device form to employment agent as soon as ticket is sold.

Booking agents are requested to immediately destroy all previous lists of employment agents and to carefully preserve this list for reference until such time as they receive one of a later date.

W. D. SCOTT,
Superintendant of Immigration,
Ottawa, Canada.

1. The Salvation Army, Toronto.
2. Mrs. A. M. High, Toronto.
3. Mrs. Jane Bradford, Montreal.
4. E. Marquette, Montreal.
5. Mrs. E. F. Francis, Montreal.
6. Mrs. S. McArthur, care John Blatherwick, Winnipeg.
7. Mrs. Helen Sanford, Winnipeg.
8. Mrs. A. M. Edwards, Vancouver.
9. Mrs. L. G. Rothwell, 390 Daly avenue, Ottawa.

MR. EUGENE BALDWIN.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

For a copy of all letters, reports or other documents, relating to the removal from office of Mr. Eugene Baldwin, late of the customs service at Coaticook, Quebec.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs). This is included in the motion of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) passed a few days ago, in which he asked for all documents in connection with dismissals up to date.

Mr. CARVELL. It may be the end of the session before the return I moved for has been brought down and the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) would like the papers in this special case as soon as possible.

Mr. BORDEN. Strictly speaking, two motions could not be moved with reference to the same subject matter, but under the circumstances this might pass and the larger return will be expedited.

Motion agreed to.

LOBSTER TRAPS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, recommendations, ministerial instructions, and any other document, from the Department of Customs, relating to a temporary change in the customs tariffs upon the twine used in the headings of lobster traps.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There are no documents other than those I read to the House the other day, namely, the two circulars sent out by the department, in one of which there was a clerical error which was afterwards corrected. However, I have no objection to this.

Mr. CARVELL. I know that the hon. member who placed this notice of motion on the Order Paper saw copies of letters sent the hon. minister regarding the interpretation of that clause. There must have been letters or telegrams in this connection.

Motion agreed to.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that a Select Special Committee should be appointed by this House to make an inquiry into an Old Age Pension System for Canada, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time.

He said: This motion has been standing on the Order Paper for some little time in order that hon. members might become familiar with so important a measure and also because the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), has a similar resolution on the paper, and he asked me to allow mine to stand until he got back here on the 17th. As we both are interested in the

same resolution on the same matter, I agreed to do so, but evidently he has been unable to get here to-day, and as, under all the circumstances, this seems a favourable opportunity for bringing the resolution to the attention of the House, I venture to move it, seconded by the hon. member for Pictou. I may say that there have been, and probably will be, the usual objections to a measure of this description. Some people seem to think that Canada is exempt from the usual rule that scientific treatment of economic subjects is the best treatment. We have imported many good ideas at different times from the older countries, but I doubt if there be any which is a better one than this. In Germany where they have raised everything to the status of a science, the old age pension system is working in perfect order. That system has also been introduced, as no doubt every hon. gentleman is aware, into the United Kingdom, and is found to work well there. It has also been introduced into old France, probably the most prosperous country in the world, and there too it has been found to work perfectly. It is about to be introduced into the United States, and our American neighbours consider that they are exceedingly progressive and energetic in the handling of these subjects. Therefore, I think it will be admitted that this matter deserves every consideration in this Dominion.

The object which is at the basis of the old age pension system is to do away with promiscuous poor relief. Its intention is to raise the people, the poorest and least provided for, to the status of ordinary independent citizens, so that instead of being, as heretofore, the wastrels and strays of ordinary everyday life, looking here and there for rescue and possibly reclamation, instead of being at the beck and call of those who may be charitably or uncharitably inclined—instead of being in this promiscuous ill-considered, unholy and wholly unscientific condition, they will be brought into some reasonable and proper condition by a system of relief such as is contemplated by the old age pension scheme. It is found that people of this class are raised into a sense of security and independence by the old age pension system and acquire an independence of character which they never knew before. That is the very essence of self-respect. We are aware that pauperism in the old country has increased alarmingly of late years. We are aware that it has increased to an extent which has become appalling.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Proportionately to the population or an absolute increase?

Mr. BURNHAM. I understand from the returns that it has increased in proportion to the population.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My information is exactly the opposite. It is that there has been a gradual decrease of poverty in England in proportion to the population from the time of Charles the Second.

Mr. BURNHAM. I understand differently. At any rate one thing is certain, and that is that the prosperity of England is greater now than it ever was at any period, and we would have the right to expect that pauperism there would have decreased. My hon. friend will agree with me, however, that in this expectation he has been disappointed.

Some time ago I had the honour of introducing into Canada the Children's Aid movement. It met with some objections. One of these was, why not let the people alone? Why interfere with a man and his family? In other words why not let the poor children go as heretofore without anything in the shape of protection or supervision. It is only necessary in order to show the indifference that these objections concealed, to say that it is only recently that the age of consent was raised in this civilized country to a reasonable age. This idea also came from the old country. I may say that so good have been the results of the Children's Aid movement, that much of it has been incorporated in the Criminal Code.

The very same system or principle of treatment is contemplated in the Old Age Pensions Act with regard to poor people. Those conversant with the condition of things in Canada must be aware that at the present time charitable institutions are being multiplied daily and their resources are being taxed to the utmost; in other words, promiscuous charity is becoming both widespread and alarming. We can possibly stand that, because we are a young and vigorous country, but the morals and well-being of the people cannot stand it, and it is surely well for us to see what is going on around us the world over and to fall in with the scientific treatment of this question in a vigorous and proper way. Some people urge that this means the spending of a vast amount of money. They ignore in the first place the set-off in the relief of the people from the enormous burden of promiscuous charity. But what does the probable burden amount to? As near as I can ascertain, the number of people in Canada to-day who would come within the purview of old age pensions is about 30,000. The number of people 70 years of age or over is of course vastly greater than that; but no old age pensions Act contemplates the payment of a pension to people who are not in need of it; they must have very limited resources and be otherwise in a condition to warrant it. The principle upon which the whole system

works is the principle of rescue. If we reject old age pensions we are deliberately rejecting something intended as a modern, progressive, scientific substitute for indiscriminate charity and poor relief. In Ireland the people have been greatly relieved and helped by the old age pensions system. It is a very simple thing when you come to understand its working. All that poor people have to do, when their names and claims have been approved, is to go to the post office, hand in their little paper and get their weekly pension, and go away and relieve their own necessities themselves. I have statistics to show that the decrease in outdoor relief, in Scotland and England, especially in England, has been tremendous. There is no doubt whatever, from all the reports that have been handed in, that the change from workhouse relief to the far better process of pension relief has been productive of good results, and that is what we are looking for. I have the reports of the Local Government Boards of England, Wales and Scotland. They did all that I asked for in sending me material from England, but more than I asked for in sending me material from Scotland, where great interest, perhaps even greater interest than in England, is taken at any rate in answering questions. Sir George McCrae, the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, in his letter says: 'The pension system has, I am glad to say, worked smoothly in Scotland.' I emphasize this fact in order that we may give due heed to the experience of others. I fancy that in Canada we are very prone to rely upon our own virility and stamina, perhaps a little too much so. I may say that the Old Age Pension Act of 1908 in the United Kingdom was brought in with pretty stiff qualifications, but it worked so well that in the amendment of 1911 those qualifications were very greatly relaxed. To take one example, in 1908, if people got poor relief they could not have pensions; but in 1911 they were allowed to have a certain degree of poor relief as well as a pension.

Some people have the idea that a system of old age pensions is a very large affair. It is not anything of the sort. In the first place, the people must be British subjects and qualify as British residents; and they must not be disabled by reason of imprisonment, idleness or misbehaviour from receiving a pension. The machinery of the movement consists in the appointment by local councils, such as municipal councils, of what are called pension committees. The government appoints pension officers. These two authorities have the right to decide who shall have pensions and who shall not have pensions under the Act. There is always an appeal allowed to the superior pension officers and to the Treasury Board. In England a person must have reached the age of 70 years, and must, for at least 20 years, up to the day of the receipt of any sum on account of the pension fund, have been a British subject and have had his residence, as defined by regulations under this Act, in the United Kingdom Thirdly, the means of a person, as calculated under this Act, must not exceed £31 10. Applied to Canada, according to the statistics which I have been able to gather, the total annual fund for a very respectable beginning would be about $2,250,000. That would have the effect of giving the people of over 70 years of age coming within the stipulations of this Act, a pension running from half a dollar to probably $1.50 a week. In other words, they would be provided with a good basis upon which to continue their own existence in their own way, immeasurably superior to houses of refuge or things of that sort even though they do not come under the head of promiscuous charity. But a careful reading of the reports issued by the Local Government Board in the old country will show that the relief officers agree that the accurate statistics which have been gathered by the pension officers and the complete and orderly way in which they have gone about their relief business, has produced an abundantly good effect; so much so that while charity has become systematized, it has become systematized in the proper way, waste has been very largely eliminated, and the character of poor people has been very greatly benefited.

It is quite evident from the comments upon the motion by leading old country statesmen that they are perfectly satisfied. in fact delighted with the movement, it is having such an excellent effect upon the people. In moving this resolution I am availing myself of the privilege, not of naming the committee but simply of proposing that there shall be such a committee in order that we may proceed slowly, without too suddenly committing ourselves, in the development of a great and beneficial movement. I am well aware that nothing in these things is so detrimental and so injurious as undue haste; and I have endeavoured to guard against that. I have already pointed out that in the old country there is a central pension authority to look into claims. Pension committees meet in the regular way, like a commission for the management of waterworks or anything of that sort. But, instead of having behind them only the force of their own good intentions they have the authority of parliament. We know that in the face of all sorts of disorganized—not unorganized but disorganized—charity people are very apt to weary in well-doing and, while missing the opportunity to help those whom they

should assist, become the prey of professional charity-seekers. The only possible way to guard against this in a movement of a general character is for the government to take hold and maintain systems and business like methods. There has been of late years, I am aware, a tendency towards the introduction of the socialistic state in modern politics. That is due to the fact, of course, that the masses have seen what is good for themselves and the classes have been inclined to ignore these remedial measures whilst devoting themselves to the great development of industrial enterprises. We have been amazed at the wonderful progress in trusts and mergers, at the appalling accumulation of wealth; but we do not seem to be at all amazed at the accumulation of poverty. So long as we ourselves are not directly concerned, we are apt to regard with but casual emotion the submerged tenth and to think that because the Good Book says 'Ye have the poor always with you' we must always have them with us. But that is not the meaning of the words; but whether it is or not it does not in any sense stand in the way of our developing remedial measures on scientific lines. The report of the inspector for the district of Dorset and Southampton says:—

A further comparison—that of the returns for the last week before the removal of the pauper disqualification for an old age pension, and for the first week after such removal shows a decrease in outdoor relief in the latter week from 24,670 to 17,519, or 7,151, and a decrease in the number of 'not able-bodied' poor relieved from 14,817 to 7,754 or 7,063—this represents a decrease of 29 per cent of the total outdoor relief, and of 47 per cent in the 'not able-bodied' relief. In some unions the decrease in the 'not able-bodied,' &c., is as high as 60 per cent and 70 per cent.

An investigation of the blue-book reports shows that all through the same impression prevails. There are a few cases in which men are not able to gauge it properly. Besides, the amendment to the 1908 Act only came into force in 1911, and they have not been able to collect statistics sufficient to warrant them in giving an opinion. But in every other case they have hastened to say that the diminution of our outdoor relief has magnificently justified the introduction of the old age pension system.

As I have said, these are the days when we must pay attention to the great movements for the development and reclamation of the people. It is only in this way that good feeling can be developed in a community, and only in this way can the state do justice to itself. For, after all, what is the state but the co-ordination of all the means of administration and development by which the industries and movements of the people may be supervised in such a way that they shall not be, as they were long ago, moving here, there and elsewhere merely of their own accord, but will be under the guidance and supervision of the various boards and organizations which are appointed for that purpose? Why, it is only recently that we have had even a conservation movement. Fancy! The people of this country did not until recently wake up to the necessity of the conservation movement. They thought that when they paid their doctors' bills that was the end of the health movement. That idea continued until somebody showed them how extremely futile it was. We have been under the impression that we could lay waste the country, burn our timber, strew the land with all sorts of slush, and yet the day of reckoning would never come. But it has come already. Conservation of health and wealth and good morals, and to that general end the conservation of the means of industry, all lie within the purview of government. So, it is for us to say whether or not the time has come for the substitution of old age pensions for indiscriminate charity. Indiscriminate charity is such a grievous waste, and is so contrary to the principle of individual independence and the spirit of manhood that for this, if for no other reason, we should reject it and reject it at once. We have examples, great and illustrious examples, in the German nation, the French nation, and the motherland—an example shortly to be followed, I believe, by the United States—examples from which we must derive great profit, and whose records we can study and use for our guidance.

It is not incumbent upon us to launch out upon this scheme in any extreme way. We can do it tentatively, we can do it quietly, as quietly as we wish and we can proceed as rapidly thereafter as we find advisable. I contend that, that being the case, to reject or set aside this motion is to reject or set aside the very principle of the movement, not simply because the means are not available, because, as I say, for a mild beginning the means must be available. The principle is an abiding principle, and one which I hope will commend itself to the members of this House. I have, therefore, much pleasure in introducing this resolution.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the thanks of the House are due to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burnham) for again bringing this matter to its attention. He has evidently given the subject a great deal of thought, has accumulated considerable information and has presented his views for our consideration in a very clear and useful manner. The subject is one which naturally enlists our sympathies, because there are few more pathetic spectacles in life than helpless old age confronted with privation and poverty. The real question, so

far as Canada is concerned, is whether conditions here are such as to require what is admitted to be advanced legislation of this sort, and whether, if so, public opinion is as yet ripe for it. So far as I am aware, there has been no public agitation in Canada either politically or through the press or otherwise, for legislation on the subject of old age pensions. It must be remembered that in Great Britain, where the old age pension system exists, that legislation was preceded by an agitation extending over almost a generation. Agitation of that kind is necessary before legislation involving such a large expenditure can or should be adopted. While any legislation which has been adopted in Great Britain should commend itself to our attention, I am of opinion that we should not favourably consider it until we carefully compare or contrast if necessary the social and economic conditions existing in Great Britain and in Canada.

I think it is not an extreme statement to say that in Great Britain, in the past, poverty has been the inevitable lot of vast masses of the population. In very many instances this has been through no fault of the citizen himself. The causes for this condition have been many. They are stated to include unemployment, sweated industries, physical deterioration and excessive drinking. So precarious and so unremunerative has been employment in Great Britain that there could be no assurance, even to the sober, thrifty and industrious, that they would be able to raise their families and to lay by a pittance for old age, and under those circumstances the workhouse has been the inevitable goal of great numbers of respectable, sober and industrious people—industrious if they had only had the opportunity.

Owing to the stigma and contumely which would naturally attach to the receipt of charity under conditions such as these, it is not to be wondered at that in Great Britain an agitation sprang up for old age pensions which have now been established, and I think there is very much to be said in favour of that legislation. If we admit the principle of pension for those who have served the state on the battlefield, then where, owing to economic conditions prevailing, a man has failed and honestly failed in the industrial strife it might be considered even a matter of right, if he could not otherwise be decently provided for, that the state should step in and pension him when he attained a certain age—and it must also be remembered that old age itself enters as a factor into the creation of poverty. In other words, a man whose powers are waning is unable to help himself and, under the economic and social conditions prevailing in Great Britain and on the continent, it might very properly be a subject of legislation that men who have lived sober, honest and industrious lives, who have done their best to raise their families and take care of them, when they have attained the age of three score years and ten or earlier if their powers fail them, should be made an allowance from the state sufficient at least to meet the necessities of their existence. It must also be remembered, in considering the matter from the political standpoint, that in Great Britain a very large percentage of the population might reasonably feel that some day they might have to avail themselves of old age pension relief and consequently there resulted a political movement in Great Britain based upon a very substantial body of public opinion such as is not at all available in the beginning of such a movement in this country to-day.

Let us consider the case of Canada. In the first place, there is little or no unemployment in Canada. Canada to-day is among the most favoured nations of the earth. I am not sure that Canada does not occupy the leading position in the world to-day so far as unemployment is concerned. Our industries are thriving and our artisans are nearly all employed; wages are good and while the price of living is high our artisans and workmen, speaking generally, are self-respecting citizens quite capable of taking care of themselves. In the event of sickness or accident depriving a wage earner of his power of work or old age interfering with his efficiency and leaving him no longer able to take care of himself, we find the need supplied by provincial and municipal charity, and by the filial piety of the sons and daughters of Canadians. I desire to pay this tribute to my own countrymen that I know of no people among whom the natural affection of sons and daughters is more likely to take care of aged parents than Canadians. It is a great credit to the sons and daughters of Canada that they are so ready to take care of their parents and to take care of them well.

Then in this country we have very few sweated industries, and we have, as I have said a condition of abounding prosperity. I think that with reasonable thrift it is possible for any industrious, sober artisan to raise his family and to provide something for his old age, and as I have said, in the event of sickness or accident age is usually well taken care of and cared for in such a way that no stigma attaches to the recipient of the charity afforded by provincial and municipal agencies. I think that it is within the facts to say that on the whole the poor in Canada are well looked after, and it is on this account as contrasted with the conditions in Great Britain that there has been no widespread

movement, as I have said, for the old age pension in Canada.

The old age pension system in Great Britain provides from one to five shillings per week to those over 70 who can qualify, as stated by my hon. friend the mover of this resolution. From one to five shillings a week might fairly suffice in Great Britain to support a mere existence, but from one to five shillings a week would not support a mere existence in Canada. I think that when the matter was debated some three years ago in this House it was pointed out that the equivalent of five shillings here would be $3 per week.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Does the hon. minister mean to intimate that five shillings is the largest sum paid under the old age pension system?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The information I have, subject to correction, and I shall be very glad to be put right if it is incorrect, is that five shillings is the amount allowed to those over 65 years of age who can qualify.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I am quite sure that ten shillings is paid in some cases.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). In some cases?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Well, that is possibly so.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). We would naturally look to a minister dealing with a question of this kind to give the House accurate information and to show that it is correct.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes, you would. Well, I think I am reasonably sure and probably the hon. gentleman will be good enough to correct the information authoritatively and from documentary evidence if it is wrong. This is the information I have obtained from one of the departments and also from having looked the matter up. Possibly the hon. mover of this resolution will be good enough to say if it is correct that from one to five shillings a week is allowed in England.

Mr. BURNHAM. That is the information contained in these Acts and regulations which I have received from the local government board. It is contained in the schedule.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think I have taken reasonable care to verify this statement and even if I had not the comparison I make is between the cost of living in Great Britain and the cost of living in Canada. In 1908, when this matter was made a subject for discussion in this House, they estimated that about $3 per week would be the equivalent of five shillings in Great Britain. I do not venture to say whether that is correct or not; I simply state that, as a matter of fact, when the question was debated here before that was one argument used to show that a very much greater charge per capita would be imposed in this country than in Great Britain.

In connection with this movement, it has been argued that the giving of old age pensions would impair thrift. I must say, from what I have read in regard to the operation of the Act, that I should be disposed to believe that it does not impair thrift; and that a comparatively small pension such as is given in Great Britain, would not in any way destroy or impair the instinct of thrift if a citizen should chance to possess it. In connection with the Canadian aspect of the matter, I desire to draw the attention of my hon. friend and of the House to the Dominion Annuities system which, I believe, was established with the idea that it might forestall such legislation as we are now discussing, or render it unnecessary to enact such a law. It is very interesting to observe at how low a cost an annuity can be provided for a man of 65 or 70 years of age and I propose to give a few illustrations from one of the publications of the department in regard to this subject. There are two plans and under the first plan, which is called plan 'A,' in the event of death before the first payment of the annuity falls due the total amount which the annuitant has paid in, with 3 per cent compound interest, will be repaid to his legal representatives. Now, the way it works out is this: A man beginning at 20 years of age and paying 25 cents a week—that is $13 a year—until he is 60, will receive at 60, a life annuity of $129.51. A man beginning at 25 and paying 25 cents a week, which is $13 a year only, until he is 60, will receive, at 60, a life annuity of $99.34. A man beginning at 30, and paying 25 cents a week until he is 60, will receive, at 60, a life annuity of $74.73, and so on beginning at 35, 40 and 50 years of age. Under plan 'B', where the same annuity is obtainable for smaller payments and where there is no return in the event of death before the annuity becomes due, a man beginning at 20 years of age and paying 25 cents a week, which is $13 a year, until he is 60, will receive, at 60, a life annuity of $176.38. A man beginning at 25 and paying 25 cents a week until he is 60, will receive, at 60, a life annuity of $132.35. A man beginning at 30—I hardly think he is likely to begin at 20—and paying 25 cents a week until he is 60 will receive a life annuity of $97.35. Take it in another way, first under plan 'A', which I have mentioned, and then under

plan 'B.' In order to produce an annuity of $65 at the age of 65, which is equivalent to $1.25 a week, or to the five shillings legislation of Great Britain, a man would have to pay, starting at the age of 25, $5.40 per annum. Let us say that $65 in this country is not nearly sufficient to support more existence, let us multiply it by three in order to give an annuity of $195 per annum. Beginning at the age of 25 he would have to pay $16.20 per annum, at 30, $21.27 per annum, and at 35, $28.41 per annum in order to produce an annuity at 65 of $195. I merely call attention to this to show that under our present legislation, the means whereby those who are reasonably thrifty and provident may provide against the necessities of old age.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How many have availed themselves of this annuity plan since it has been in operation?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am unable to answer that offhand as my hon. friend will readily understand.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) could tell how many have availed themselves of the annuity plan.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell my hon. friend exactly, but a very fair number.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I can get that information.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, I think it may be got in the blue-book.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). But I do believe that if the annuity system were properly advertised and brought to the attention of the public——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds)——the system would be more generally acted upon. It appears to me, prima facie, to have many advantages. In the first place, there are no lapses except in the case of plan 'B.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. Many facilities are given.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Let us assume that is so; at all events, that only maintains the argument that I have been advancing here.

Many questions arise that may properly be the subject of inquiry by a committee such as that asked for by my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) and which I expect would be able to collect a good deal of valuable information for the House on this important question. And it is an important question for notwithstanding that we are proud to speak of the prosperous condition of Canada, still this is recognized in all countries as being what is called advanced legislation. It can hardly be said to be a new question, because it is already an accomplished fact in Great Britain and, as I understand, in Germany and France, and it is now being considered by the United States.

A great deal of information will, however, be required by us. We shall want to know how many there are of sixty-five years and over amongst our population, and how many of these are likely to become the recipients of old age relief in the event of our enacting such legislation. Then, the question would arise as to whether such a charge should be borne by the Dominion or by the provinces to which we give per capita subsidies. It will also be fit to consider whether it is opportune to interfere with provincial, municipal and private charities. Then, in Canada, more than sixty per cent. or over half of our population, are of the farming community, and from what I know of our farming community, they are prosperous, industrious, and thrifty, so that I cannot imagine that many of them would have to look forward to relief in old age under such legislation as is now proposed. Therefore, so far as our farming community, our business people, and our prosperous labouring classes are concerned, the question arises as to whether public opinion is at all ripe for such legislation. Of course, it is in my opinion a great advantage to us to have this question brought before us and it is highly desirable that whatever information my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) and his committee may get shall be available for our guidance. We will then be able to know what number of the aged would be likely to become recipients, what the charge upon the public treasury would be, and what would be a fair pension as compared with that granted in Great Britain.

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). It would be very difficult for a committee of the House to get that information in the absence of statistics to start upon.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). A committee was appointed in 1908, which I believe did not present a report, but there was a very interesting debate in the House in connection with it, and I gather from the report in Hansard that Mr. Ralph Smith took the view that old age pensions in this country should be universal and that every person, no matter what his means, on attaining the age of sixty-five or seventy should be entitled to receive an annuity so that there might not be any stigma, I think that was how it was described, upon the recipient.

I do not understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) has any such idea in his mind. On the occasion of the debate to which I have referred, the Hon. Mr. Field-

ing estimated that there were 270,000 people in Canada who had attained the age at which pensions might be granted, and he estimated that the annual charge would be something like forty million dollars. Of course, that is not what my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) means. He simply has in view a plan which apparently has been a success in Great Britain, whereby only those who need relief will be applicants for it, and will be entitled to receive it. I am inclined to think that in Canada the number of such persons would be comparatively small. Then again, on the question whether public opinion is or is not ripe for such legislation, we have to consider whether we wish to announce to the world—unless it be found absolutely necessary to do so—that in Canada we have come to that stage when it is necessary to enact old age pension legislation. Canada is looked upon as amongst the most prosperous countries in the world, as a country in which the immigrant is certain to improve his lot, and, if he is sober and industrious is certain to achieve comfort if not a competence. Under these circumstances the public might probably ask if it were wise for us to advertise that it had become necessary for us to establish an old age pension scheme. This whole question is, of course, one which enlists our sympathies and I must compliment my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) upon the generous enthusiasm he has shown in the cause of the aged poor. I can assure him that I do not lack sympathy in such a cause as this, and it may perhaps be well to keep it before us, because the time may come when such legislation will be necessary, and then, any information that will enable us to come to a just conclusion would be welcomed. I think the committee should be granted as moved for by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham).

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I find that 340 persons have purchased immediate annuities, and 213 have purchased deferred annuities during the three or four years that the law has been actively in existence. The amount of money purchased under the former is $83,300, and under the latter $464,730.

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). I am glad that the Minister of Finance has granted the committee moved for by the hon. member (Mr. Burnham). The Minister of Finance has referred to social and economic conditions, and he has said that he does not expect that at the present time such legislation would be necessary in Canada. Well, he and I move amongst different classes of the people, and I come in contact every day with a different element from what he comes in contact with. I know for a fact that this legislation has been asked for, not for ten or twenty years, but so long as I can remember, by those who are in need of it. In answer to the statement that this legislation has not been asked for, I may say that we are passing legislation every day which has not really been asked for, and we are protecting the trusts and mergers, who are really forcing a large number of the population to ask for such legislation. I have always been in favour of old age pensions, and I always will be, for those who are in need of them. Sometimes, we are giving pensions to those who do not need them, and I do not begrudge them their pensions. We are pensioning our judges, because they are not in a condition of health to continue their work on the Bench, but sometimes they are in health enough to do other work

We pension our civil servants who are receiving high salaries, and our municipal servants also, in the larger municipalities, receive pensions. These men receive as a rule high salaries, whereas the labouring man, who has put in fifty years of hard work, helping to build up the country, and who has been receiving a much lower wage, has nothing in his old age, and frequently has to turn to some public institution for charity. Should this committee be named, I am confident it will gather a large amount of information which will show the necessity for the old age pensions and that such necessity has been felt for a long time. If there has been no agitation, the reason is obvious. There is really very little public opinion in the country except what is promoted by the newspapers. But how is it possible for the labouring men to get the newspapers to make an agitation in their behalf, especially against the opposition of a very strong element which is all powerful with the press? I am very pleased that a committee has been appointed. I have no doubt it will do very effective work, and be able to make a good report, and be the means of bringing to light much valuable information obtained from those who have made a study of the question.

Mr. PARDEE. How many of these lecturers are now employed with regard to the annuity system?

Mr. FOSTER. None.

Mr. PARDEE. It has always appeared to me that this system would be largely taken advantage of if it were made known to the people. While, as the Minister of Finance has said, our farming communities are very prosperous, that is no reason why the annuity system should not be explained to them, and why they should not be induced to take advantage of it more than

they do at present. There is no reason why this system should not apply with equal satisfaction to the rural parts as to the populous centres. There are many communities in the country where, if the people knew the advantages of the system, the easy payments which will come back to them in years, they would take advantage of it. My own opinion is that the dismissal of the lecturers is not a step in the right direction, and that the system should be brought more before the people than it has been in the past. When we consider the figures given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, according to which only 348 have availed themselves of the one system, and 214 of the other, making in all only 500 people with an assurance of $500,000, we must admit that this result is altogether out of proportion to the number of years in which that annuity system has been in force. It is a good system, and one likely to ward off the old age pension scheme, and I submit that every effort should be made to make it public.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston). If my short experience in this House had not taught me there must be something in repetition, I would not raise my voice this afternoon to register my conviction in favour of the resolution moved by the hon. member (Mr. Burnham). I feel that I would be false to conclusions that have moved me very much for the last few years if I did not take this opportunity of placing before the House the reasons why in my judgment a committee should be formed to press forward with energy the task entrusted to them. The Minister of Finance has said that so far as he is aware, Canada has expressed no opinion in favour of an old age pension system. There may be a certain amount of truth in what the hon. gentleman says, but I think a close analysis of this question will show that the reasons are historic as well as economic, and perhaps to-day we have reached a condition that might be described by the historic expression 'the parting of the ways'. It is perhaps but natural that in a new country where the natural resources are rich and to a great extent unexplored, the legislation demanded by the people should be simply police regulation, the opportunity of working out to the full individual effort, the securing of freedom of life, and protection of property. There is enough for all, and none need suffer except from want of effort.

But as the country becomes more settled more is demanded by the people. Assistance along the line of opportunity is demanded, and I think in Canada we have about reached that stage in our natural development. We have reached it for economic reasons, owing to the fact that the influx of population is from the country to the city. The tremendously complex industrial activity in this country has swept away the small factories, and the great centralized industries are in the manufacturing centres that supply the wants of the people. Cheapness in production is at all times the standard of efficiency, and soon as a man has reached that time in life in which he cannot do a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, he is set aside as too old for work, and is practically useless from the industrial point of view. I think there is no more pitiable sight—there is perhaps only one equally as pitiable on the streets of our cities as compared with the man who wants work and cannot get it, and that is a sight of the man who is too old to work satisfactorily and is cast aside in the rush of industrialism. There is not one of us who has taken any active part in the charitable work of our cities who has not been moved by the many cases of men and women who have been industrious, thrifty, and hardworking through a long period of life but who are by necessity forced on their children for support, or else into our almshouse or houses of industry in their old age. The problem becomes acute for the reasons I have outlined. In the old days, when we had a proportionately greater agricultural community there was always a corner in the kitchen and a sup to drink and a bite to eat for the old people when they got beyond their working days; but under our modern industrial system, in our crowded cities, when the cost of living has increased to such a tremendous degree, the effect is that the old men and women often become a burden on their children. And the great—I do not know exactly what word to use—the great love that parents have for their children many a time makes the father and mother leave the home of the son or daughter and seek the almshouse and the poorhouse rather than be a burden on them. The Minister of Finance suggested that possibly an old age pension would work against thrift. 'Thrift' is a fine sounding word, but we must define it. There is a distinction between parsimony and economy, and what one may consider thrift, another may consider extravagance. I doubt very much if the workman is thrifty who hoards his earnings rather than give his children the opportunity of a fair education which they should have with its resultant possibility of advancement. My idea of thrift in the working class of this country is a thrift that spends wisely and well that which comes to the hand of the workingman so that his children may have a better opportunity than he has had. I think, Sir, that we utterly fail to grasp the true trend of legislation of this country if we sit idly by and believe that police regulations alone are going to suffice for the advancement of our people.

We have got beyond the days of mere individualism and have come to the days of so-called socialism. Socialism, Mr. Speaker, is a broad term. I would like to define it as I understand it. It is not socialism which takes from a man what he has saved, which robs him of the fruits of his labour, but that socialism which gives every man a chance, which says that the man who is down shall not necessarily be kept down all his life for want of a fair opportunity. We see it in our legislation to better the food supplies of the people; we see it in education, in the provisions of the law which enable school boards to establish night schools and schools for the training of backward children; we see it in the Workmen's Compensation Act, which implies that great industrial concerns must be supervised, and that in the cost of production there must be taken into account not only the breaking of machinery and the wearing out of boilers, but also the breaking of a man's arm or the loss of his life—that when men's lives are sacrificed on the altar of cheaper production, compensation must be provided for those who are deprived of their bread-winner. I am very much in favour of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). Every man must be in favour of making old age as comfortable as possible. Whether the question is practicable or not I am not in a position to say. The experiment has been tried in New Zealand and found effective, it has been tried in Australia and has worked well; it has been introduced in England and promises to work well there. The final question for solution in connection with it is, where is the money to come from? But before that question need be asked, there are one or two questions for which answers must be found. The first is: Is it advisable from the Canadian—the national—point of view to establish this system? Another question is: Is it advisable from the point of view of the worker? These two questions being answered—if in the affirmative—it seems to me that the Canadian nation is big enough to solve the financial problem. With bounding revenues and growing prosperity Canada should not lag behind in the march of social regeneration. The hon. Finance Minister stated that in England the pension rate was from one shilling to five shillings a week, and doubt was thrown by the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) upon the correctness of these figures. I sent to the library for the statutes from which I find that one shilling per week is the lowest rate and five-shillings per week the highest, which shows that the statement of the Minister of Finance was perfectly accurate. If we were to have legislation of this kind in Canada at all, we should have it in the early stages of our industrial development, and I feel sure that if a committtee is named and it takes up the question honestly and earnestly and goes to the root of the matter, it will do much to simplify the working out of this great problem in the early stages of our national development, before our industrial centres become too greatly congested and industrial conditions become so acute that it will be absolutely necessary to promptly relieve want. Let us hope that something may be done so that the man who has spent his life in work and sometimes hardship, or the woman who has given the best years of her life to the care of her children may not become paupers in old age and spend their declining years in obnoxious surroundings, but may be enabled to spend them at home among their children in some degree of comfort.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, there is always a great danger of a man being misunderstood when he puts himself in any sense in opposition to what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance called the generous enthusiasm of my hon. friend who introduced this motion. I am quite sure, however, that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, if the Minister of Finance will apply to him for advice, which he is so well able to give him, would tell him that if he wants to be a success as a Minister of Finance he will cut out that generous enthusiasm towards people who want to spend the public money very early in his career. It is a quality which does great credit to my hon. friend as a man, but is a dangerous quality in a Minister of Finance—I had almost said it does great credit to his heart, but perhaps not so much credit to the financial portion of his head. The question of state aid to any given portion of the inhabitants of a country is a very large question. As my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has said, pensions have been very popular with certain portions of the community. I was brought up in a school known as the individualist school, which my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) tells me is now extinct. Well, I may be an obsolete survival, but I imagine that for all that is best in individualism we have perhaps more illustrations in Canada than in any other country in the world. I do not agree with my hon. friend that individualism is extinct. In the old country the pension system was carried so far that they had what were called perpetual pensions, and it was a part of the work of that great individualist who represented Northampton, Charles Bradlaugh, to destroy them. Those perpetual pensions were brought down from the days of Charles II., and were conferred upon the children of

aristocrats whose families had a somewhat curious origin, into which it is not necessary for me to go. Individualism has gone to the length of abolishing those perpetual pensions, though, as my hon. friend from Maisonneuve pointed out, pensions are still given to men like Lord Cromer. Personally I am a good deal of an individualist. I do not look on pensions of any sort with any degree of favour. If there are to be pensions, it seems to me that they should be given to the poor rather than to the rich. That, I think, would commend itself to any person who wanted to think accurately and reasonably. But we have to approach this question of state aid very carefully. My hon. friend from Kingston defined the state. Well, I think I have a simpler definition which I have culled from my reading of Prof. Charles Sumner, a distinguished man who taught at Harvard University until a few years ago. He says the state is everybody else outside of those who are being supplied with some particular thing; the state is 'the other fellow'; and of course the state is a very good thing to go to on the part of the man who wants to get anything.

As I have pointed out the wealthy have been most successful in this respect. I believe it is one of the misfortunes of a protectionist fiscal system that in time the poor come to imitate the wealthy. Professor Sumner, in the same writing to which I have referred, pointed out that while only wealthy manufacturers now, under the fiscal system, were getting relief through the tariff, in time the poorer people would learn the trick of the manufacturers, and he foretold—and after all it is difficult not to believe a successful prophet—that one of the results of this relief of wealthy manufacturers by the state would be that the other fellows, that the poor, in time would apply for relief and that Socialism was the natural outcome of protectionism. That was not the teaching of a benighted free trader from England, but of a great professor in the great protected country to the south of us, the United States, and it would almost appear as if his prophecy was being fulfilled in Germany, according to recent events in that country.

To a few of the statements made by my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) in a measure backed up by the Minister of Finance, I would like to take a qualified exception. I think my fellow Canadians, for I am a Canadian now, will understand me when I say that there is nothing on which I feel more strongly than on misrepresentations, I think in most cases perfectly innocent, of the old country, and its conditions. I think we should endeavour to have accurate information of what is going on in the old country. Since I came to Canada nothing has struck me more than the colossal want of accurate information about conditions in the old country unless it be, when I have returned to the old country, the equally colossal lack of accurate information on the part of the old country about Canada. Mr. Asquith, who presumably knows something about the old country, he has lived there all his life, and has risen to a position of the highest eminence, made himself responsible a few years ago for the statement that in the United Kingdom, they keep the densest population in the world in the greatest average degree of comfort in the world. I throw out that statement, giving my authority, the highest it is possible to quote, as a guard against careless statements about the amount of poverty and unemployment in the old land.

We had an interesting category of the causes of poverty in the old country. If a man works hard in England at whisky he will become unemployed, and there are a large number of people in the old land who work very hard at that kind of thing. The consumption of alcoholic liquor leads to the expenditure of the sum of $800,000,000 annually in Great Britain. That does not qualify a man, as I understand the scheme, for an old age pension there; a man must be a sober man. But in many cases the production of poverty by that expenditure does not stop with the man who does the drinking, that is the misfortune of that kind of habit.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), who I quite appreciate is the last man to say anything unfriendly to the old land, went on to draw a contrast in favour of Canada, and he said that unemployment was practically unknown in Canada. I must say that that statement rather startled me. I have been reading in the newspapers recently that there were 2,000 men in Ottawa seeking government jobs at the present moment.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). That is a change of employment.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). They only wanted change of employment? I should think that the men who are losing their employment to give these 2,000 men a chance would be glad to know where they are to get employment. I have seen a few of them, and they are extremely anxious, they seem to fear that they are going to take up the unemployment being deserted by the other lot.

However, I think that exaggerated statements about conditions on the other side of the Atlantic are calculated to do only harm, and I am sure that everyone here wants accurate information. I was under a misapprehension as to the sum paid. I rather think that in part of his statement

my hon. friend was wrong, at least in a Bill sent around to me the age is 70 instead of 65. I believe there are recent amendments to the Act, and if the motion for information required any justification to me it would be in the somewhat hazy condition in my own mind about what has actually been done on this subject.

With regard to the merits of the question, I do want to endorse what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said about the very different conditions that prevail here and those that prevail in the old country. In England and Wales they keep somewhere in the neighbourhood of 560 people to the square mile. In Canada, I think we have 1¾, not quite 2 people to the square mile. The statement of these two simple facts shows that the opportunity here for a man to get on and keep out of the condition in which he needs relief, is immeasurably greater than in Great Britain and I feel that a statement of that kind and a study of the conditions would lead us to be extremely careful about embarking on this scheme simply because it has been adopted of recent years in Great Britain. What I feel on the general principle is that if you go indefinitely along the lines of helping men to do what they should do for themselves you will inevitably, in the end, undermine the virility and the strength of your people. I have said upon many a platform that there is no country in the world which, from climatic conditions, from the great heritage of territory into which we have come and of resources of every kind, has a better chance of having for its ideal the building of a strong, virile, self-supporting, independent people than this country of Canada, and I think that governments and politicians should hesitate before they proceed to measures which would in any way interfere with that destiny of the country because, after all, the highest destiny of Canada must be found in the character of the people which she builds up in successive generations of Canadians.

I would like to give an example of the difference in opportunity in this country and in Great Britain. One of my oldest friends in this world and a near neighbour of mine in western Canada came to this country at 57 years of age. He came, I think, in the year 1889. He is now in his 80th year. He brought with him £400 ($2,000) and his family and he proceeded to do what so many Britishers do when they come over here; in two years he lost sight of his £400. He was not quite on to the methods of trade in the west, and he found himself, in his 60th year, without anything. He took a homestead, his sons did the same, and to-day, in his 80th year he is a contented, hearty, pleasant old gentleman, a splendid Grit and a good Free Trader—

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer).

but that is by the way. He and his two sons own, without incumberance, 640 acres of land and 200 head of cattle, and there is no happier man in the world. He tackled what would have been a certain prospect of the workhouse in England at 60 years of age and that is his position to-day. If he had been of a whining or weakly disposition and there had been the facility for it I suppose he might have sought an old age pension and retired upon the magnificent sum of $3 a week for the rest of his life.

I cannot help thinking that he has done more for Canada by doing as he has done, that he has set a better example to those of succeeding generations. Government, in my judgment, ought to be careful to do nothing to prevent success in life and avoid the possible production of failure; and one of the worst things about charity, whether private or government charity, if it is not of the very wisest kind and wisely administered, is that it produces the very evil which you want to do away with. I, as a private member, do not feel that I am under any need to show the caution which I enjoin on my hon. friend the Minister of Finance; so I should like to say that I admire the generous enthusiasm of my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham). And I hope I share it. I hope I am not less sympathetic than those hon. members who have spoken more strongly in support of this scheme than I can conscientiously do. But while I profess an equal sympathy, I think perhaps I am a little more cautious in my thinking on economics. My hon. friend will not misunderstand me, if, as I sit down, I repeat my advice to him, that, when he is likely to be carried away in the direction of generous enthusiasm he should make a friendly call on my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), who, while he is good-hearted, has also a long experience in handling finance, and an experience also of the office that my hon. friend holds, and I am sure that hon. gentleman will show him how to avoid the dangerous tendencies of youth when he is inclined to spend too much of public money.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville). I do not intend to speak on this question to-day. I merely rose to notify hon. members that one of the gentlemen who has made a very special study of this question, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is prevented from being here to-day by the snow blockade on the Intercolonial railway. I know that he intended to speak on this debate, and I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) to agree to the adjournment of the debate in order to give the hon. member for Pictou an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). That would not preclude others from speaking in the meantime.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). I desire to add a few words to the excellent speeches which we have heard here this afternoon on this subject, which is one of the greatest social topics engaging the attention of almost every modern civilized country in the world. I desire to compliment the mover of the motion (Mr. Burnham) on his excellent speech and on the clear and incisive manner in which he has set forth his case. I desire also to call the attention of the House to one statement of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), that the Manchester School of Economy is not dead since we have recently had a demonstration of it in action. I would also call attention to the feeling manner in which the leader of the late government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said 'hear, hear,' to that statement. I know that he said it in a very feeling way, because, beyond question, it was the work of the Manchester School in action that placed the right hon. gentleman on the other side of the table. The hon. member from Red Deer said that the Manchester School was not dead. On this side we hope that he will succeed in reviving the Manchester School whenever a general election comes round; for to do so will be of great benefit to the Conservative party. Another thing the hon. gentleman said was that he hoped he was a Canadian. I was beginning to doubt whether he was really a Canadian or an Englishman, or not, after hearing him eulogize the United States day after day ever since the session began. I hope we shall all agree to accept his word for it. I am sure we can accept his word for it that there is a colossal amount of ignorance with reference to matters in connection with England;—I think he displayed that when he questioned the accuracy of the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) a moment ago.

Now, with reference to the question of old age pensions and of poverty in England, statistics show that in free trade England 35 people out of every 1,000 are recipients of charity of a public nature. And no doubt in that country the question was so serious that the government had to take some action. We all know that every country, especially our own, is now passing through a period of transition. We passed through a period of political transition a few months ago, and beyond question we are passing through a period of social transition now; and it will be for us to consider the manner in which we are to approach the very important question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burnham) has brought before us. Many of us who study questions of this nature, study them through the medium of books published in the old country where the idea of the relationship of individuals to the state is altogether different from the idea that obtains on the American continent. We must bear in mind that in Europe the state is virtually the Executive and all acts or privileges held by the people proceed from the Executive. In America the idea that prevails is that the people are the Sovereign, and, therefore, we who represent the people here are representatives of the people and not the appointees or servants of the Executive, as the idea prevails in England. For that reason, when we take up a social question of this kind, we must consider it from the standpoint of individual responsibility, knowing that there is no responsibility attaching to the state to do anything for the individual in respect to charity. Now, so far as Canada is concerned, there is no question that old age pensions will bring about conditions that might be injurious to our prevalent ideas of thrift and individual responsibility. Every man born in this country, or who has lived in this country for more than a year or two, has learned the elementary lesson that he must make provision for himself during a certain portion of the year at least. A large proportion of our people are not employed in the winter; therefore, in summer they must provide the means to enable them to live during the winter. That all makes for individual thrift; and the idea that predominates with every Canadian is a feeling of responsibility to make ample provision for himself in his old age, and for his wife and family, if he happens to possess them. That is what has brought about the successful conditions which have made us the greatest nation of individual wealth-owners in the world. I think that statistics will show that the individual Canadian has more money in the bank, that the average wealth of the individual Canadian is higher than in any other country in the world.

It might be a very serious thing for us to place on the statute-book any Bill of a nature that will tend to destroy that independent spirit which makes a man continually strive to put aside his savings so that in his old age he may have something to comfort him. It would be unfortunate if his individual responsibility should be destroyed, if he should go on and live a reckless life in the expectation that when he became old the state would take care of him. However, at the same time we must all realize that all nations to-day of any consequence have old age pension laws upon their statute books. The first nation to take this step was Germany.

In 1891 Germany adopted an old age pension law and that has virtually been the model Bill for other countries. England for a hundred years had been discussing this question, ever since the days of Owen when great reforms were discussed and many introduced and carried through. Men like Paine and others have written on the question of old age pensions and these are the men who laid the foundation possibly of the modern idea of socialism. But, it was reserved for a later age to bring in a Bill of this kind. So Great Britain now has an Old Age Pension Act. I desire to place on 'Hansard' just very briefly a résumé of the laws that obtain in other countries with respect to old age pensions, so that when this question comes up again for discussion we may have some data on which we may go. In Germany the state provides a portion of the pension. The individual and his employer have to pay a certain amount of premium. Therefore, this makes for a joint responsibility. Let us see what they have done in Denmark. Denmark adopted the old age pension system about the same time as Germany. The system in Germany was instituted in 1891 and it has been further extended in 1902 and 1908. This is the system in vogue in Denmark: Recipients of public assistance must be over 60 years of age, they must be of good character and for five years previous to receipt must have had their domicile in Denmark without receiving public charity. Such public assistance may be granted either in money, or kind, or by residence in an institution, such as an hospital. The assistance given, whatever it may be, must be sufficient for maintenance, and for attendance in case of illness. The actual amount is determined by the poor-law authorities, but all private assistance amounting to more than 100 kroner (£5 13s) a year to taken into account in measuring the poverty of the applicant. The cost of assistance is met in the first case by the Commune in which the recipient is domiciled. That is to say that the municipality pays the pension, but half the amount is afterwards refunded by the state.

A wise check is thus placed in that way upon individuals receiving old age pensions from the state because their own neighbours have to pay a certain amount of it, and they will see that the state is not defrauded.

The next nation to adopt this system was France. In 1910 France adopted this system of old age pensions.

It is a contributory system, embracing all wage earners, with the exception of railway servants, miners and sailors on the special reserve list of the navy. It applies also to small land owners, tenant farmers, and farm labourers. All are eligible for a pension at the age of 65, if in receipt of less than £120 a year. The actual rente or pension is calculated on the basis of the total obligatory contribution, together with a fixed viagère or state annuity. Male wage-earners are required to contribute nine francs a year, and females six francs, the employers contributing a like amount. The largest pension obtainable is for life contributions and amounts of 414 francs. A clause in the Act permits wage-earners to claim the rente at the age of 55 on a proportionately reduced scale without the viagère. The total cost of providing pensions in 1911 is estimated at over £5,500,000.

The next country we find adopting the old age pension system is New Zealand. New Zealand is a country of very advanced socialistic legislation. It is one of the most progressive of the great dominions under the British Crown. It has very advanced legislation with regard to labour questions, land tenure and old age pensions. In that country they have had to reduce the amount of land that any single person can hold. We find that in the Argentine Republic, whilst every individual is provided with land, and other assistance upon settling in the country there is a check placed upon his acquiring of too much land and bringing about the same condition of affairs as that which has obtained in Europe for so many generations, and which it is virtually a survival of the feudal system which must ultimately be ended so that the proper proportion of the people may go back on the land again as they did in France in the days of Napoleon the Great, or immediately after the revolution. We may have to adopt a similar law. New Zealand's Old Age Pension Bill was introduced in 1898, it became law almost immediately.

The claimant must be 65 years of age, a resident in the colony and to have so resided for 25 years, so that they may know that all recipients of the pension are citizens of the colony. That will also prevent people coming from another country and by residing in New Zealand for a year or two becoming pensioners. They must be free from conviction for lesser legal offences for 12 years, and for more serious breaches of the law for 25 years previous to the application. They must be of good moral character, and have a record of sobriety and respectability for five years. Their yearly income must not exceed £52, and they must not be owners of property exceeding in value £270. Aliens, aborigines, Chinese and Asiatics are excluded. The pensions are for £18 per annum, but for each £1 of yearly income over and above £34, and also for each £15 of capital over and above £50, £1 is deducted from the amount of the pension. Applications have to be made to the deputy registrars of one of seventy-two dis-

tricts into which the colony is for this purpose divided. The claim is then recorded and submitted to a stipendiary magistrate, before whom the claimant has to prove his qualifications and submit to cross-examination. If the claim is admitted, a certificate is issued to the deputy registrar, and in due course handed to the claimant. Payment is made through the local post office as desired by the pensioner.

That is something along the line of the idea brought forward by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville). I understand that there has been very little pension fraud perpetrated in New Zealand. The authors of the measure state that it is a great success, while some, of course, claim that it is not designed to relieve poverty, but rather to further it. There is a difference of opinion upon the results of this pension law in New Zealand. The state of Victoria has also an old age pension system which was put in operation in 1900. There pensioners receive 10 shillings per week on fulfilling the necessary conditions. The necessary conditions are these:

The pensioner must be 65 years of age, or permanently disabled; must fill up a declaration that he has lived 20 years in the state; has not been convicted of drunkenness, wife desertion, &c.; that his weekly income, and his property do not exceed a given sum (the regulation of this and other details is entrusted to the Governor in Council). It appears to me that this question having arisen in other countries, and advance legislation having been adopted with regard to it, this country should be well up in the forefront in the matter of modern legislation, which, while making for and encouraging individual liberty of action and responsibility, at the same time would eliminate from the statute-book anything in the nature of charity.

Indiscriminate charity has led to a great many abuses, and has caused the people in other countries to look to the government for a means of living whether they deserve it or not. I trust that we Canadians will always live up to the idea that it is well to provide something for the rainy day. I am pleased to think that so far as the idea of filial love is concerned, and the obligations of the younger to the older generation, amongst no people in the world is that instinct so strong, as it is with Canadians. The committee moved for by the hon. member (Mr. Burnham), will, without doubt, produce beneficial results, and I am sure it will present to the House a report which will throw light on this social movement which is exercising the minds of so many people. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), has made reference to 5,000 people wishing for government positions, and no doubt there are an equal number lying awake at night wondering if they will hold the positions they have, but these are things that occur, unfortunately, after few elections. I believe Sir, that the dominant note of this parliament should be to inculcate in the minds of the people individualism and independence of the state, so that we may long continue free from that system of bureaucracy and indiscriminate state charity which unfortunately has become a necessity and sometimes an abuse in other lands.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). If there is no one else who wishes to speak at the present time, I will move the adjournment of the debate so as to allow an opportunity for some members who are absent to take part in it later.

On motion of Mr. Foster, the debate was adjourned.

BRITISH PREFERENTIAL TARIFF.

On the order being called, for the proposed resolution—Mr. Pugsley—

Whereas, by section 5 of the Act 6-7 Edward VII, it is provided that 'On and after a date to be named by the Governor in Council in a proclamation published in the 'Canada Gazette,' the British preferential tariff shall apply only to goods brought into Canada by ship direct to a Canadian seaport.'

And whereas that portion of the Transcontinental railway between Moncton and Lévis is now nearly completed;

And whereas, by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and the Grand Trunk, connecting with the Transcontinental at Lévis, and the Intercolonial and the Canadian Northern systems, goods arriving at Canadian seaports both in summer and winter, can be expeditiously carried to all the settled sections of Canada;

And whereas, it is desirable that such proclamation should be issued at an early date; and that reasonable notice thereof should be given;

Therefore, be it resolved that, in the opinion of this House, the Governor in Council should fix a date not later than the first day of July next on which said section 5 of the said Act shall be brought into force.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I desire to withdraw this motion, and I shall briefly state my reason. The resolution reads that the Transcontinental railway will very soon be completed between Moncton and Lévis, and my idea was that the proposal in the resolution with reference to the British preference should go into effect when the Transcontinental railway is completed between Moncton and Lévis and connections thereby made with the Grand Trunk system to all parts of Quebec and Ontario. Since I put the motion on the paper the minister has stated that that portion of the Transcontinental would not be completed until 1913. and in view of that I ask to with-

draw the motion. If I should be here another session, as I hope to be, I will again propose it.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Not during the present session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Motion withdrawn.

DOGFISH SCRAP.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, recommendations, petitions, ministerial instructions and other documents in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the price of dogfish scrap.

Mr. HAZEN. There is no limitation to the time covered by this motion, and I am informed by my officials that if it is passed in its present form the return will be very voluminous. If there is any particular feature of it that my hon. friend wishes to call attention to I shall be pleased to get him the information with regard to that.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I limited the resolution to information respecting the price which was fixed at twenty dollars a ton for a long period until changed recently, and I should think the correspondence would not be voluminous with respect to that. However, the motion can be amended so as to cover the period from the 31st March, 1911, to date.

Mr. CURRIE. As the motion reads, it covers the price of dogfish scrap all over the world. Why not limit it to Canada, if that is all that is wanted?

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

INQUIRY IN THE CASE OF WILLIAM ROY, ASKED BY H. BOULAY, OF SAYABEC.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimousiki) asked:

For a copy of all papers, reports, correspondence and messages respecting a report made in 1904 by H. Boulay, of Savabec, against William Roy, sectionman at Amqui, Intercolonial railway, and of all that has been subsequently done to give effect to that report.

(Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am asking for a copy of certain papers and reports so as to throw some light on the Liberal adminstration between the years 1896 and 1911.

In 1904, the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) was at the head of the Department of Railways, and I was at that time but a farmer in the county of Rimouski. I would like to learn from the hon. member the reason of his conduct upon that occasion, regarding a citizen of the county of Rimouski who happens to be to-day the member for that county, to the great surpise, no doubt, of the hon. member for Westmorland. I stand to-day in his presence and I think the occasion is well chosen to remind him of his conduct in 1904 and ask him to explain it, if he thinks he can do so.

These are the facts: During the electoral campaign of 1904. I visited Causapscal in the company of Mr. Wm. Price, then a candidate in Rimouski, and who has since occupied a seat in this House as a member for Quebec West. During the speeches delivered by the candidates, a hand-car from the Intercolonial railway, carrying several employees of that road, came in from the parish of Amqui. Among them were several bullies. All these employees were paid so much a day by the people of this country to work on the railway and not to work for the Liberal candidate. I took no part in the discussion, I was only a spectator at the meeting, and after the speeches were over, I went to the station waiting for the first train to take me home. I was followed by one of the employees of the Intercolonial, a man in the employ of the hon. member for Westmorland who was, at that time, Minister of Railways and Canals. The man was drunk, going even so far as to threaten me. Being under the impression that the administration of the railway, under the direction of the hon. member for Westmorland had the duty to protect the public; supposing that all law-abiding British subjects could rely on the protection of the laws in this country, I did not stoop to answer the insults of that man. I simply said to myself: I will make a report to his chief, and justice will be done.

I was quite wrong in my expectations. I expected too much from the fairness of the then Minister of Railways, and here is the proof. I made a full report, relating all the circumstances, to Mr. Pottinger, who was at the time the general manager of the Intercolonial railway. Mr. Pottinger is well known, not only in the province of Quebec, but by those all over Canada who have anything to do with the Intercolonial railway. He is a gentleman, in the fullest acceptation of the word, beloved and respected through the length and breadth of this country. I am glad to avail myself of the present occasion to pay him this well-deserved compliment. Mr. Pottinger, with his usual fairness granted the inquiry and a date was fixed for the hearing. I was present at the appointed date, but only to find out that a message, an order, had been received from Ottawa, from the hon. member for Westmorland, who is now in his seat. The purport of the message was simply this: 'We will not grant an inquiry to Mr. Boulay who is a Tory; he has no

claim to the protection afforded by the law and by the regulations of the Intercolonial railway; in spite of his report relating all the circumstances of the case, and notwithstanding that we are bound to protect him, we decline to grant the inquiry.' That was done in the face of the written and expressed rule that says: All employees reported for drunkenness will be dismissed or suspended.

What was the result? Has that man been suspended or even reprimanded? Not at all. Until November last, up to the date of his dismissal, he was never interfered with; he was given full opportunity to assail me on all occasions, and he did not fail to do so during the last election, in company with two other men employed in the same section.

If the hon. member for Westmorland has any excuses to offer for his conduct on that occasion, I would be glad to hear them now that after having waited seven long years, I am his colleague in this House. That is the reason why I am asking for those papers.

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not follow my hon. friend very closely but I understood him to complain of some difficulty that arose while I was Minister of Railways and that the complaint came to the department and was not investigated. I cannot recall the circumstances, and I have not the advantage of being in possession of the papers which are of course to be found in the Department of Railways and Canals. The impression on my mind was that there had been an altercation between some party, with which the department had nothing whatever to do; but that because one party had assaulted another, the complainant felt that the department should intervene and try out the right between these two individuals. I am under the impression that, on behalf of the department, I declined to enter into any inquiry into difficulties that had arisen among the employees or between the employees and outsiders. I did not think that the department should resolve itself into a police court to determine any such matters. The records of the department will show what was done. I cannot recall that there ever arose in the department, during my jurisdiction any question of a political nature regarding any employee, and I think I am safe in saying that no man was dismissed between January 1904 and 1907 because of any political partisanship. Whenever a dismissal did take place it was on the report of the officials without regard to any political consideration. I understood my hon. friend to complain that a dismissal was not made in this instance because of an altercation which took place between Mr. Wm. Roy and somebody else.

I must have had good reason for not dismissing the man, and I do not feel that the time of the department should be taken up with investigations with regard to any assault committed either by an employee of the department or by any individual not in its employ upon an employee. If I had the papers before me I could refresh my memory, and I am satisfied that the position taken by myself and the department in the matter would be justified by the facts. Certainly the intention of the officers of the department was to see that justice was done to any employee and to any of the patrons of the line.

Mr. MONK. It is quite natural that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways should not remember the circumstances of this particular case. I merely rose for the purpose of saying to my hon. friend from Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) that the government will bring these papers down in my hon. friend's own language. But perhaps I may be allowed to say further that I do not think my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has quite understood the gravamen of the charge made by my hon. friend from Rimouski, and the reason he puts forward for asking at this late date for the production of these documents. It is not a question of a difficulty between two individuals or of private relations between an employee of the government and my hon. friend from Rimouski, who at that time occupied no official position whatever. The question is this, as I understand it from the statement made by my hon. friend: At the time my hon. friend from Westmorland was Minister of Railways, a meeting took place at Causapscal on the line of the Intercolonial railway. My hon. friend from Rimouski, as a private individual, attended that meeting, but took no part in it. On his way back from the meeting, on the train and at the station, the man mentioned in this motion, in a state of absolute intoxication, was pouring insults and injuries of all kinds upon my hon. friend from Rimouski, discussing political matters, and insulting him without any reason or provocation whatever. After this incident my hon. friend from Rimouski lodged a complaint with the Department of Railways and asked for an investigation, alleging these facts and offering to prove the truth of this accusation; but he never received any reply. At any rate, the investigation which he demanded was never granted, and the man was kept in the employ of the government in connection with the Intercolonial railway, he remained an active partisan, and in the last election he continued the same system of active participation until a change of government came about, when, on the express demand of my hon. friend, he was dismissed from the service. My hon. friend, for his own justification prob-

ably in his own division, is anxious to have the whole report brought down, in order to show that in 1904, on this particular occasion, as well as ever since, this man has been an active partisan. I take this occasion of repeating what I have stated already, that whatever steps we take jointly on both sides of the House to improve the Civil Service, unless we punish severely by dismissal all civil servants who violate the rule that they must not take an active part in politics, I think we shall fail of any improvement in the service.

Motion agreed to.

MR. JOHN RUTHERFORD, LANDS AGENT.

Mr. KNOWLES moved:

For a copy of all letters, resolutions, telegrams and other communications or memorials in connection with the removal from the Moosejaw Land Office of John Rutherford, lands agent.

He said: I would like to add to the motion the following words 'and the appointment, either temporary or permanent, of a new incumbent of the office.' I sent a copy of this to the Minister of the Interior a few minutes ago and he did not take any exception to it.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DISMISSALS IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved:

For a tabulated statement showing the number of dismissals in the Post Office Department since the first day of October, 1911, in the nine provinces of the Dominion. Also the names of the postmasters so dismissed, the locality, the cause of dismissal, the names of the petitioners praying for such dismissal in each case, and the names of the petitioners opposing said dismissals.

Mr. BORDEN. In the absence of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) I think it would be better to allow this motion to stand. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) is going into a number of particulars which are not usually asked for or given in such cases. So far as the number of dismissals is concerned, there is no objection to that, or to the names of the postmasters dismissed, the localities or the causes for dismissal. But I am not so sure about some of the other particulars and would ask that the hon. gentleman allow it to stand for the present.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Mr. MONK.

PARCEL POST CONVENTION BETWEEN CANADA AND FRANCE.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of the Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, and all papers connected therewith.

He said: I understand that the postal convention has been in force for a few weeks. In fact, the schedule has been published in he newspapers. I have received several requests from boards of trade and chambers of commerce asking for copies, and I think it would be wise to have it widely published so as to let people know what rates they are called upon to pay. Secondly, the object of the motion is to learn whether the French government has agreed to allow the convention to be signed by the Postmasters General of the two countries. Objection was raised when I was in Paris last year that such a convention partook of the nature of a treaty and could only be signed, in the case of Canada, by the British Ambassador in Paris. I then stated to the French authorities that the postal convention under the postal union laws were generally signed by the respective Postmasters General of the countries concerned. But the question remained in abeyance for a while. I would like to ascertain whether this particular convention was signed by the Postmaster General of France or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. I know it was signed by myself as Postmaster of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN. I have no doubt that if the Postmaster General were in the House to-day, he could give the information at once. I have no special information on the subject myself. There is no reason why the motion should not pass; and possibly, in advance of the papers being brought down, the Postmaster General may be able to give the information that is asked for.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN OFFICES IN LONDON.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the High Commissioner of Canada and the government, or any member thereof, with reference to the lack of accommodation at the Canadian Offices, 17 Victoria Street, S. W., and the desirability of the erection of suitable offices in London for the High Commissioner and his staff and the Immigration Branch, befitting the dignity of Canada as an integral portion of the British Empire.

He said: For many years the office at 17 Victoria street has been the rendezvous for all Canadians visiting London. They meet there and receive their correspond-

ence and so the office has been a very great convenience. The impression one receives on visiting the office for the first time is not favourable. The exterior of the building is gloomy. The offices are in the centre of a large row of buildings and you would expect to find there a wholesale house rather than the office of the High Commissioner for Canada. The interior is very little better; it is dark and gloomy, the rooms are cut up and the accommodation utterly inadequate. The reading room, which is supposed to contain the Canadian papers, is very small and dark. No doubt the office is conveniently located for the officials, as it is close to the English government offices, but it is not sufficiently central to be a convenient meeting place for visiting Canadians. The Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway, the Montreal 'Star,' and the Toronto 'Globe,' have offices right in the heart of London, some of them in magnificent buildings. These offices are near Trafalgar square, which, as every one knoks, is a landmark in London, whereas to reach the High Commissioner's office it is generally necessary to take a conveyance. So inconvenient is the office of the High Commissioner that many people from Ontario and from other provinces as well, now make use of the office established by the government of Ontario in the Strand. While that office is not commodious, it is a credit to Ontario and is in a very central position. Many Canadians also make use of the offices of the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway and the great Canadian newspapers, where they find magnificent rooms elegantly furnished with attendants who are able and willing to give information to visitors.

In deciding where Canada should erect a building in London, we may well notice what has been done by other Overseas Dominions. The Commonwealth of Australia has secured a magnificent site on the newly opned street, Strand-Aldwych, where they purpose erecting a building to cost, with the site, something like $3,000,000. In a despatch from Melbourne the 'Standard of Empire' says of this building:

> The purchase of the Strand site for £364,000 for the purpose of building thereon offices to house the High Commissioners and the various States Agents-General in London, having been approved by the House of Representatives, it only remains for the Senate to sanction the proposal. It is regarded as certain that there will be no opposition from this quarter. It is not certain as yet whether New Zealand will agree to share the building which is to be erected, but it is known that an intimation that the presence of the New Zealand High Commissioner would be welcomed has been conveyed to the Dominion government.

The same paper published a cut of the building, showing a magnificent structure right in the heart of London, and says:

It is hoped that the Commonwealth Government Buildings, which, as already stated in the 'Standard of Empire,' will cost, with the price of the land, £600,000, will be started on the Strand-Aldwych site about the middle of next year. It will probably take two years to complete.

In the way of preliminary arrangements, all that remains is for Sir George Reid, the High Commissioner for Australia, to fix the actual purchase money with the county council and sign the contract. The plans prepared by Mr. Alfred Burr, F.R.I.B.A., have already received official sanction.

The new building will be much more than the mere official headquarters of the Commonwealth Government. For instance, it will contain on the ground floor a large hall for the exhibition of Australian produce. This alone will cover an area of 12,000 square feet, and its achitectural features include two massive domes. On an upper floor provision is made for a spacious lecture-room, where people can learn from those who have experience of the country what are the advantages and prospects in any particular State.

There will be four entrances to the building. One will be about the middle of the Strand frontage, with another in a corresponding position on the Aldwych side. There will be a third entrance at Melbourne place, where the Victoria building now stands, and the fourth will open out on to the corner of the Strand and Aldwych. Handsome staircases will lead from each to the upper floors.

The accommodation will be sufficient for the Commonwealth Government and the five States in addition to Victoria, whose building is already standing. These are New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania. There will also be room for New Zealand, if, as may be the case, the authorities of that Dominion desire it. The whole block will be in the style of the existing building at the corner of Melbourne-place. It will be in Portland stone, and will contain eight stories. At the Strand-Aldwych corner a high dome will form an interesting landmark in the neighbourhood.

The Commonwealth offices will be arranged on the first and second floors at the Strand-Aldwych corner of the building. The rooms will be lofty and well lighted, the ventilating and heating arrangements will be on the latest and most approved style, and in the general equipment the building will bear comparison with any of the public offices in London.

In view of what our youngest sister is doing, leading the way as she has led it in other cases where we have lagged behind, I think it is up to this parliament to decide what we are going to do. We often boast of being the brightest gem in His Majesty's Crown and yet we as Canadians, when we go to London, as many do, cannot help but feel a little humiliated to realize that we have a building so little suited to the needs of the people who visit that country in

keeping with the high position Canada holds in the Empire and which lends so little dignity to the office of our High Commissioner in that great city the heart of the empire. The question arises here; What are we going to do? Are we going to be satisfied with the building we have, or are we going to erect a building in keeping with the dignity of this country in some central spot in London? I do not say that we should erect a building on the Strand near where the Australian Commonwealth are erecting their magnificent edifice, but I do believe that, either in close proximity to the Australian building or else at some place near Trafalgar Square, Canada ought to erect a building that would be in keeping with the needs of our people and the dignity of our country. There is, to my knowledge, a site very close to where our immigration offices are situated in London. I may say in passing that the government have in London an immigration building in addition to the High Commissioner's office. That building is very well and very centrally located. I would urge the government to secure a site very close to where our immigration building is at the present moment. I understood when I was in London from the gentleman who is in charge of the immigration work there that the rental of the building was very high and that it would almost pay the interest on the cost of a first-class building. Whether that is so or not, I contend that Canada ought to acquire at the earliest possible moment a site not far from Trafalgar Square and erect thereon a building in keeping with the needs of the country that would be a land mark in London for all Canadians and those seeking information regarding Canadian matters. I believe that such a building ought to contain a large hall, just as it is proposed that the Australian building shall, for the permanent exhibition of Canadian products, lecture rooms, and offices for all Canadian employees that we have in the old country, that it ought to be the centre of Canadian work, and I trust that the government will see its way clear to move in this direction and to provide a suitable building for the High Commissioner in London which will possess the same accommodations as those of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk buildings, among which are large and spacious waiting rooms supplied with all the Canadian papers, and where there will be attendants, who will be ready and willing to direct Canadian visitors. Everything that can be done ought to be done to make the visit of Canadians to London as pleasant as possible, and the High Commissioner's building at the present time is utterly unsuited for this purpose. I believe that the time has come when Canadians ought to take a long step forward and place Canada in as good a position as any other part of the British Empire in London. I feel as a Canadian that we ought to occupy perhaps a little better position. I believe that the government would be justified in spending $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 if necessary to provide a suitable building that would be a landmark in London, so that all Canadians who go there will have no difficulty in finding out where the Canadian building is, that it may be so constructed that people will all recognize it as the Canadian building and that any Canadian going there will have no difficulty in finding the home of the High Commissioner. I have no intention of taking up any more of the time of the House but I just wish to move this resolution.

Mr. BORDEN. Before the motion passes I would like to say that I have listened with a great deal of attention to the matter which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bradbury) has brought to the attention of the House and I desire to add also that it is a question thoroughly deserving of consideration. The proposal of the government of the Commonwealth of Australia to erect a very handsome building in the Strand, I think, was brought to my attention in a casual way some time ago. I have not any very detailed information as to the character of the building to be erected nor in regard to the other details of the proposal. It seems apparent, however, that the building which Australia intends to erect is to be a very fine structure indeed, a building in which all the work of the Australian Commonwealth in London will be transacted and in which all the officers of the Commonwealth who are appointed for the purpose of discharging duties of one kind or another in connection with the affairs of the Commonwealth in the mother country will be gathered.

It is perfectly true that the accommodation provided at present for the High Commissioner is perhaps not thoroughly suitable; it is equally true that the officers of the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior in London are housed some distance away, and one can readily see that there might be considerable advantage in following the example of the Commonwealth of Australia and entering upon the project of erecting in the city of London a building that would be worthy of the very high place Canada occupies in the British Empire. Two of the great railway corporations, the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, have erected very fine structures in or near Trafalgar Square, and these buildings are obviously of advantage, not only to these corporations them-

selves but to the whole Dominion, in that they bring to the attention of all who visit London, the importance of this country, by reason of the great undertakings these companies represent. Apart from the advantage of the convenience, there would be other advantages from having a great building erected in some suitable place in which all the officials of the Dominion might be suitably accommodated, and in which they could carry on their work more effectively than has, perhaps, been possible up to the present. The matter has not yet come before the government in a definite form, and before any proposal could be submitted to the House it would be necessary to obtain a great deal more information and to give the subject very careful attention. I express my thanks to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bradbury) who has brought this matter to our attention, who has placed before us a good deal of information as to the proposals of the Australian government, and who has very truly pointed out to us the advantage which would accrue from the course he has suggested. There is no objection to the motion passing and the matter will receive the consideration of the government. If any hon. gentleman has any views to express in regard to the desirability of entering upon such a project I hope he will let us hear them.

Motion agreed to.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of the report of the Board of Engineers appointed for the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge, and of the plans prepared by them; of all notices calling for tenders; of all tenders received; of the report of the board on the same; collectively or individually, to the Minister of Railways; of the report of the said minister for the acceptance of tenders, and any orders in council awarding contracts for the building of the said bridge.

He said: In the latter part of December last a press despatch appeared in most of the Canadian newspapers, which read:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's late government came in for sharp criticism at the annual meeting of the Cleveland Bridge and Engineering Company, which was the only British concern to tender for the construction of the railway and road-bridge over the St. Lawrence. After the receipt of the tenders the managing director stated divisions among the commissioners arose, resulting in the resignation of the chairman. The Canadian government accepted a tender of about £1,800,000 from a Canadian competitor for a railway bridge only, which did not conform with the conditions of the specifications. The action of the Laurier government was an outrage, as had the other competitors taken liberties with the specifications the £1,800,000 bridge would not have been the cheapest.

It would be premature to offer any observations upon this despatch. It was copied in all the newspapers, and comments were made on it in some of them, reflecting rather severely upon the government, the suggestion being made that a wrong had been committed against one of the tenderers. The only way in which this matter can be ventilated is by bringing down all the correspondence and papers. This is the object of the motion and I would ask the minister to expedite the return as much as possible.

Mr. MONK. Would my right hon. friend add the word 'specifications' after the word 'plans.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. The reason I ask for this is that I have been informed that the specifications mentioned a fixed price of nine cents per pound for the steel that was to enter into the construction of the bridge and all the tenders were supposed to conform to that price, whereas, the party who received the contract got it at a price about two cents per pound higher which of course would make a great deal of difference. I do not know if that is true, but if true, it would to a certain extent justify the complaint made by the other tenderers that they had not been afforded an opportunity of tendering at a higher price than the price of the steel mentioned in the specifications.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would be happy to have the word 'specifications' added, I want all the papers to be brought down so that we may have a true understanding of the matter and see where the wrong, if any, is. I would be sorry to prejudge the matter now.

Mr. BORDEN. There is no reason why the motion should not be passed. The despatch to which my right hon. friend has called attention came under my notice at the time, but I have no observations to offer with regard to it, because I have not had an opportunity of investigating the matter. I agree with my right hon. friend that any comments had better be deferred until we have all the papers before us.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ST. JOHN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. PUGSLEY moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals, or any official thereof, and the St. John Railway Company, or the municipality of the city and county of St. John, on the subject of the granting of permission to the St. John Railway Company to lay its rails across

the track of the Intercolonial railway at or near the Haymarket Square in the city of St. John, N.B.

He said: For about a year, and perhaps longer, there has been a controversy between the St. John Street Railway Company and the Department of Railways and Canals, with regard to granting permission to the street railway to cross the track of the Intercolonial which runs from the main line round the western side of Courtenay bay to what is known as the Ballast Wharf, which is the deep water terminus of the Intercolonial. I have seen statements in the St. John newspapers in which the manager of the Street Railway Company complained of the request of his company not having been granted. He makes the statement that the department has insisted, as a condition of granting permission to cross the track of the Intercolonial railway, that the Street Railway Company shall undertake to provide, at its own expense, a block signal system, and also bear the expense of protecting the crossing, not only in respect of the present railway, but of all tracks which the Intercolonial railway may construct across that street in the future. I have also seen the statement that the department insist that the company shall become responsible for any accidents at the crossing.

Mr. HAZEN. When was the application made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Upwards of a year ago. The reason I make these remarks is because the matter is one in which the people of St. John, particularly that portion of the city which may be regarded as the suburban portion, and also people living on the eastern side of Courtenay bay, take a deep interest. The crossing is a level one. The people feel keenly the necessity of having the street railway extended out to that portion of the county.

Mr. BORDEN. Is it a question as to the sufficiency of protection?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but as to the burden to be imposed on the Street Railway Company. If the statement made by the manager of the street railway is correct, I really do think that the Railway Department is too exacting. It ought to be borne in mind that the Intercolonial railway has paid nothing to the municipality for the right to cross the streets, and in these days the operation of an electric railway and to use the streets in settled portions of the community is a very proper one. Therefore, when the electric railway company applies for permission to cross the track of the Intercolonial railway, that permission ought to be granted on very reasonable terms. I know that when some years ago the electric company proposed to cross the Intercolonial railway at Mill street, there was no difficulty at all in getting the permission. The manager went to Moncton, and in the course of a very few days permission was granted. There must be some unusual difficulty thrown in the way of this crossing. I do not at all blame the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane), because I presume the matter heretofore has been treated purely as a departmental one, and has been pending about a year. I would ask the hon. minister to look into the matter personally, in view of the urgency of the case, and its importance to the people concerned. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), knows the situation very well, and I am sure will do everything possible to remove the difficulty which for a year or more has existed between the Street Railway Company and the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. HAZEN. I think it is somewhat premature to discuss this matter until we have the facts before us. I do not know the facts beyond what has been stated by my hon. friend; but it seems singularly strange that the Street Railway Company, if it was really in earnest and desirous of meeting the wishes of the citizens of St. John, should have allowed a year to elapse without getting this matter settled in some way or other. I cannot believe that the officials of the department in the past or present, would be so unreasonable as to place in the way insurmountable difficulties. I have seen statements in the press giving as the reason why this extension was not made that the county councillors of the parish of Simonds were not disposed to give the street railway the permission it required, unless the company would agree to terms which it was impossible for them to accept.

I would be sorry to see anything thrown in the way of the Street Railway Company extending its lines, because the universal opinion in the city of St. John is that it has not been progressive, as have street railway companies in other communities, in the way of giving the people an opportunity to go out to the suburbs in the summer, and in the winter as well, which would have been given if the management of the street railway were progressive and had the interests of the community at heart. I therefore sincerely hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals will take this matter up with the view of having an arrangement made, which, while fair to the department and in the public interest will also be fair to the street railway company, and that this matter may be expedited while the street railway company is in the mind to extend its line out by the Marsh road to the parish of Simonds, which is very much desired by the citizens of St. John. It would seem to

me, my attention having now for the first time been called to the papers, that all that the Railway Department should in principle demand all conditions similar to those which the Railway Commission of Canada would impose if the street railway wanted to cross the track of the Canadian Pacific railway, or any other railway, subject to the control of the commission. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Railways will do what he can to see that this work is expedited and that reasonable terms are imposed on the street railway company.

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens). Will the hon. minister kindly state what extensions he thinks the street railway company should make?

Mr. HAZEN. I am very glad to tell my hon. friend what I think. I think they should extend the line in the first place to Milledgeville, which is a great resort for our people. It is the headquarters of the Kennebecasis Yacht Club, and many people go there in order to cross to Bayswater and other points on the other side of the river. I also think it should extend its line out by the Marsh road to the parish of Simonds and Little River. I think, further, that it should ultimately have an extension to the town of Rothesay, so that the people may have means of reaching that popular summer resort.

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens). I have no doubt that the hon. minister has no intention unfairly to reflect on the management of the company to which he has referred. We all agree that the extension to Milledgeville should be made; but the hon. minister knows that the men who control the entire block of land there have refused to sell it. A few years ago a prominent man from Montreal went there for the purpose of acquiring that property, so that a town plot could be laid out, with streets and sewerage and everything else which would be necessary to people getting lots and building on them. The hon. gentleman knows that it would be practically impossible to extend the line to a point where all the land is owned by one concern, and where no one could purchase a lot.

Mr. HAZEN. Has not the railway company, by its charter, the absolute right to run through Milledgeville, just as it has through the streets of the city, without acquiring lots from anybody?

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens). My hon. friend knows as a practical man that to make the extension to Milledgeville simply to carry people out on a few fine afternoons, is not a project that would commend itself to any practical railway man. You must have permanent residents at the place to which the extension is made in order to make it financially successful. If there were a town laid out where people could get lots, so that there would be some prospect of the extension being profitable, I am quite sure that it would be promptly made. My hon. friend also suggested an extension to Rothesay. He knows how impracticable that would be, as it would for the whole distance run parallel to the Intercolonial railway, which gives train accommodation every two hours, selling season tickets for $10, and what are called pupil tickets to anyone who wishes to take lessons of any kind. With the small number of summer residents there, he knows as a practical man how impossible it would be to extend the system to that point and make it pay, with the Intercolonial railway competing. With regard to the extension proposed, I think the late government are to blame for not giving the permission. I think onerous terms were imposed on the railway that should not have been imposed. The track which the street railway company desires to cross is a branch track which is only used as a switch in order to carry freight cars down to the ballast wharf. As the railway company got permission to go on these streets, it seems to me that it would be unfair to require it to provide a watchman there. There is no watchman at the present time. It seems to me that there ought to be some fair order made that could be met by the company.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is no objection to the papers with reference to this matter being brought down. I may state for the information of the House that the lease which was prepared and offered to this railway company was according to the terms laid down in an order in council passed on the 9th of July, 1911, so that the hon. gentleman who is moving for the papers must have had a hand in framing that order in council. The papers have only been put into my hands this morning. If the company wants to cross the tracks of the Intercolonial railway, I do not see that the Intercolonial railway should be put to any expense in the matter. I do not want to be onerous, and I will go into the question and try to work it out on its merits.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad my hon. friend has called attention to the order in council, but I may say that I never had the matter brought to my attention and did not know when the order in council was passed; but I did know that the Railway Department for the past year had adhered to the view that these conditions should be complied with.

Only a very short time ago, and since this government came into power, if the newspaper reports are correct, the secre-

tary has written a letter to the manager of the Street Railway Company stating that he has been directed to say that the department adheres to the view which had been expressed by it some months ago. Therefore, I take it, the view of the department up to the present has been the same as for the past year. I think that ought not to make any difference. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) ought to look into the matter personally, because of the importance of it. And if he thinks the departmental action is not reasonable, I feel sure he will take steps to induce his officials to make reasonable terms with the Street Railway Company. I think there is just one respect in which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) is in error. He says he does not see why the Intercolonial railway should bear any expense in connection with the matter. That might be true if the street railway company were asking permission to cross the right of way of the Intercolonial railway. But that is not the case; the street railway company is simply asking permission to occupy one of the public streets of the city with its tracks. The Intercolonial railway has not paid a cent to the municipality for the privilege of occupying the public streets. It seems to me that both ought to be regarded as in the same position, and the Intercolonial railway authorities ought not to say that all the expenses incident to the crossing should be borne by the street railway company.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman would not want us to do better than he himself recommended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It happens that I did not recommend it. The hon. minister ought to know, that this being a departmental matter, it would originate with the board of management, and not engage the attention of the government.

Mr. COCHRANE. There was the order in council.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the provisions of the order in council are what I am informed they are, and what the manager of the street railway company says they are, I think it ought to be changed. And had the matter been brought to my notice, I would have urged my colleagues to make the change. Now that this is brought up, I hope the hon. gentleman will not simply throw himself back on the order in council passed on the recommendation of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham). An order in council is not like the laws of the Medes and Persians; it may be changed. I should rather have expected that my hon. friend would take the opportunity to find fault with the late government, and would try to do better, and deal more liberally than his predecessor.

Mr. HAZEN. Would my hon. friend from Sunbury and Queens (Mr. McLean) tell what the cost to the Street Railway Company would be of doing what the order in council required, apart from any danger involved, and also if it is true that the order in council seeks to make the Street Railway Company liable for damages that may occur, because there have been accidents in that locality.

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens). I cannot speak definitely as to the amount. But I have been informed that it is very large. There would be the expense of a watchman, and the cost of a diamond crossing there would be considerable. And the liability for accidents occurring there whether through the negligence of the railway——

Mr. HAZEN. Did the order in council require that?

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens). Yes, all accidents that might occur at that point. My hon. friend will see that the expense is heavy. And he is a fair man, and I am sure will look at it in a fair way. And, as he is a fair man, I am certain that he makes the statement he does concerning the extension because he is wrongly informed. He knows—take, for example, the extension at Carleton—the street railway company are doing there what no other street railway company in Canada or on the continent is doing. That is, they maintain in Carleton a separate system, and a man can cross the ferry or cross the suspension bridge and take a transfer to ride in Carleton on the one 4 cent fare if he buys twenty-five tickets. So,it will be seen that the street railway company have, as far as possible, performed their obligations to the public and this proposed obligation should not be imposed upon them. Further, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen) knows that when this company was taken over it was a bankrupt concern, that even the bonds did not pay ten cents on the dollar. He knows—for he has taken the trouble to look into the statements of the company—that the street railway part of the company practically has never paid anything to the shareholders but barely pays interest on the bonds that are an obligation on that part of the system. So, the street railway has not been a paying concern in the sense of paying dividends; and further it has met all its obligations to the public by making all the extensions possible.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all documents relating to the purchase and repair of the post office at Berthier-en-haut.—Mr. Barrette.

For a copy of all petitions, requests, letters, recommendations, orders in council or other papers or documents in the possession or under the control of the honourable the Postmaster General or the Post Office Department, relating to the dismissal of John M. Rogers, postmaster at East Roman Valley, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all petitions, letters, telegrams and other documents in the possession of the Department of Public Works relating to the dismissal of Roderick Sutherland, Caretaker of the public building at Canso, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the King vs. The Burrard Power Company, and of all orders in council for the transmission to the government of the province of British Columbia of the administration of all water rights in the railway belt; together with a copy of all correspondence between the government of British Columbia and the government of Canada with regard to the same.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Before the House adjourns, may I ask what business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. First, Bills and then Supply, taking up first Public Works or Customs, I am not sure which. There is one item remaining in the estimates of the Minister of Customs.

SNOW BLOCKADE ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he has any information concerning the train which left Halifax on Monday last, but which has not yet reached Montreal.

Mr. COCHRANE. I believe the line is clear to-day. I had a telegram this morning from Mr. Brady that the snowploughs were working, the lines were open, and the trains were moving rapidly.

House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 18, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. White (Renfrew).

Bill (No. 68) respecting Queen's College at Kingston, and to change its name to 'Queen's University at Kingston.'—Mr. Nickle.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Queen's Theological College.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Keewatin.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 71) respecting a certain patent of the Spirella Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Blain.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Barnard.

THE USE OF FLAGS.

Mr. BRADBURY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) respecting the Use of Flags. He said: the object of this Bill is to prevent the defacement of the national flag. Every hon. member of this House must have noticed the use that is sometimes made of the Union Jack as an advertising medium. Travelling along our streets, we may sometimes see a large Union Jack with the name of some hotel or some other advertisement printed across the face of it. It is also frequently used at auction rooms or to advertise auction sales. The object of the Bill is to prevent the flag being defaced in these ways.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am a little surprised that my hon. friend does not go further with his Bill. I think it must be within his knowledge that the Union Jack has been put to baser uses than those to which he refers. I think there should be a provision in his Bill against the defilement of the flag in political contests.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. During recent years, particularly in the last election, there were published in the city of Montreal, and distributed all over Canada, copies of special newspapers, on which was printed the Union Jack and beside it the Stars and Stripes, and under both were the words, 'Under which flag?'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friends seem to gloat over the idea that the flag should be put to such base uses. It seems to me that there is no political party in Canada which has a monopoly of the Union Jack, and if there is any political party in Canada which attempts to assume exclusive control over the flag they should be penalized by law, and there should be provision in the Bill introduced by my hon. friend forbidding any man or any party or

any coterie of men defiling the flag in that way or trampling it in the dust. I know that in the past it has been sometimes said in certain sections of the country that in order to breathe the air of liberty people were compelled to bore holes through that flag. That day is now happily past, and we should have one flag for all parties, and those who would attempt to usurp its use exclusively should be placed under the ban of the law and made to suffer penalties which I do not at this moment attempt even to characterize.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have noticed that in September last—

Mr. SPEAKER. At this stage of the proceedings it seems to me hardly proper to carry on a debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a motion, Mr. Speaker, before the Chair, and on that motion I presume I can speak. I noticed in a newspaper published in September last that a gentleman in the employ of the government made use of an expression somewhat in harmony with the patriotic remarks of my hon. friend who has sought to introduce this Bill, in the course of which he said:

I appeal to every loyal citizen of the empire to resent this insult to our flag, to our honour and to our children.

And yet, Sir, for having used this expression and expressions like it, that gentleman has been dismissed from office by this governement.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

THE LABOUR GAZETTE.

*Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has the government made any dismissals of any correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette'? If so, how many have been dismissed, what are their names and where are their residences, respectively?
2. Does the government intend to replace them?
3. Does the government intend to suppress the names and residences of the 'Labour Gazette' correspondents in future?

Mr. CROTHERS. When I was placed in charge of the Labour Department I asked my deputy to make a report on all the servants in that department, stating the age, the date of appointment, the salary, the character of the work assigned, and the manner of the performance of it. No change has been made in the department since. I also asked the officer who is in charge of the publication of the 'Labour Gazette' for a like report respecting the correspondents of that publication. He made a report, reporting that a few correspondents were incompetent and a few others inattentive and careless, and I gave instructions to have all those who were reported as incompetent and inattentive to duty notified that their services would not be required after the 1st day of January. There was no reference whatever to their politics. I did not know as a matter of fact the politics of any one of them. Of course, I suspected that, having been appointed by the late government they were all Liberals, but that question did not enter into the matter at all. Now, I prefer not to publish the names of those gentlemen. I would be perfectly willing to show them to my hon. friend in private, or if he takes the responsibility of insisting on it, I suppose he has the right to have them published.

Mr. VERVILLE. I put the question on the Order Paper because it has been rumoured in the newspapers that from now on the names of the correspondents are not to appear in the 'Gazette.' When the hon. minister states that all the men who were dismissed were incompetent, I am sure that he has been misinformed by his department.

Mr. CROTHERS. My hon. friend is mistaken. I did not say they were all dismissed for incompetence. I said that the officer reported that some of them were incompetent and some of them were inattentive to duty, and those notified that their services would not be required after the 1st of January belonged to one or other of these classes.

Mr. VERVILLE. I know of one dismissed who is in neither class.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not permissible to raise a discussion on a question.

Mr. VERVILLE. The hon. minister has raised the question, and I would like to answer him.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question should be simply asked, and it is for the minister to give the answer he sees fit.

Mr. VERVILLE. I shall bring the matter before the House when we go into Supply.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY STATION AT TRURO.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Were tenders asked for the construction of an Intercolonial station at Truro, N.S.? If so, who was the lowest tenderer and what was the amount of the same?
2. Has a formal contract yet been entered into with the lowest tenderer?
3. When will construction be commenced?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. (a) Yes. (b) Frank B. Wilson. (c) $132,770 bulk sum, and schedule prices, for four items (if required) viz.; excavation and back fill, trenches and catch basins. Concrete including forms, setts. Supplying and laying 12 inch vitrified clay pipe. Cast iron covers and frames of catch basins—amounting to $2,380, upon estimated quantities.
2. No.
3. Not known.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY. CONDUCTORS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) :

1. Is it the policy of the Department of Railways to promote Intercolonial Pullman car porters to the position of Pullman car conductors?
2. Did the Prime Minister of Canada, in the year 1908, or in any other year at Halifax or elsewhere, declare it as the policy of the Conservative party to promote Pullman car porters to the rank of Pullman car conductors?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.
2. The department is not aware.

ANNUITY BRANCH LECTURERS.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. When the honourable Minister of Trade and Commerce stated in this House on the 1st day of December, 1911, that 'in some cases some agents of the Government Annuities Branch had charged to the department lectures which had never been delivered,' did he have in mind Mr. Theophile J. B. Lisgar, of Northern New Brunswick?
2. Did the said Theophile J. B. Lisgar give good satisfaction in his accounts with the government?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). The name of Mr. Theophile J. B. Lisgar of New Brunswick was not in my mind when I made the statement I did in the House. With reference to the second question, so far as I have examined the case, the information given by my department is that the name given here as Lisgar should be Leger, and that Mr. Leger performed his services satisfactorily.

FERDINAND THERRIEN.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any charges been made against Ferdinand Therrien, Inland Revenue officer at Nicolet, Quebec?
2. If so, what is the nature of said charges?
3. Has any investigation been ordered by the Minister of Inland Revenue?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes.
2. Offensive political partisanship.
3. Not yet. The advisability of so doing is under consideration.

MR. HECTOR CHAUVIN.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has Mr. Hector Chauvin, K.C., been appointed to investigate charges of political partianship against certain officials?
2. In which department is the investigation taking place?
3. Who recommended Mr. Hector Chauvin to act as commissioner?
4. What is his remuneration, and is he to be paid by fees or by a monthly salary?
5. Is Mr. Hector Chauvin, the defeated Nationalist candidate in Labelle county at the general elections of 1908?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. Department of Public Works.
3. By the head of the department.
4. $15 for each day's service when employed.
5. No record in department.

MICHEL CAMPEAU.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has the Department of Public Works dismissed Michel Campeau as caretaker of the post office at St. Louis du Mile End?
2. If so, by whom was his dismissal requested?
3. By whom has he been replaced?
4. What were the reason or reasons that suggested the said dismissal?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. By Mr. Villeneuve and others.
3. Honoré Paquette.
4. Political activity and other reasons.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved that to-morrow the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act by providing that when a person is a member of either House for more than thirty days during any session, though a member for part only of such session, he shall not be subject to any deduction from his sessional allowance for any day on which the House did not sit before he was elected or appointed, or after he ceased to be a member, as the case may be.

Motion agreed to.

THE INQUIRIES ACT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 19) to amend the Inquiries Act.

Mr. DOHERTY. Before the committee rose, there were before it two amendments to this Bill. One, moved by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), was to add a sec-

tion providing that any person whose conduct is being investigated before the commission shall have the right to be represented by counsel. The second proposed that all the words after the word 'inquiry' in the 11th line be struck out.

With regard to the first amendment, I promised to take it into consideration, and see to what extent we could meet the views set forth—views in which, so far as they sought to provide that anybody against whom any charge was made, should be represented by counsel, we fully concurred. I desire to say to my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that I would be willing to accept his suggestion modified as follows:

That the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following section: The commissioners may allow any person whose conduct is being investigated under this Act, and shall allow any one against whom any charge is made in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.

This differs from the amendment proposed by my hon. friend to this extent. It gives the absolute right to any one against whom any charge is made in the course of the investigation to be represented by counsel, and gives discretion to the commissioners to authorize any one whose conduct is being investigated to employ counsel.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That change in the amendment meets my view.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). The hon. gentleman would withdraw his amendment and substitute this one.

Mr. DOHERTY. With regard to the other amendment proposed, I said the other evening that after consideration I did not see my way, nor did the government, to accept the amendment That amendment would do away in toto with the power of the commissioners who may be named to depute any of their powers to any person. That we were not prepared to accept. I now propose an amendment to section 1 of the Bill which goes a certain distance towards meeting the suggestion. I beg to move that the Bill be amended by inserting in line 14 thereof, after the word 'persons' and before the word 'to' the words 'when authorized by order in council' and by inserting in line 24 thereof, after the word 'to' and before the word 'issue' the words 'take evidence'. The effect of the proposed amendment would be to make the last portion of the section which deals with power to authorize and depute read as follows:

And the commissioners may authorize and depute any such accountant, engineer, technical officer or other expert or any qualified person, when authorized by the order in council, to take evidence and inquire into and report to the commissioners upon any matter within the scope of the commission, as may be directed by the commission, and such persons shall, in the execution of the power so deputed and authorized, have the same powers which the commissioners have to take evidence, issue subpœnas, enforce attendance of witnesses, compel them to give evidence and otherwise conduct an inquiry.

The effect of the two amendments is that there shall be no deputation or delegation of power to take evidence and consequently of power to subpœna witnesses and compel answers except when such delegation of powers is authorized by order in council. This amendment, I think, meets the objection, so far as it is a serious objection, to the delegation of this power of examination of witnesses with its consequent power of compelling attendance, etc. By this the Governor in Council is made directly responsible for every instance in which the power is deputed to any person to carry on an inquiry of this kind.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does this empower the commissioners to make the appointments or must that be done by the government?

Mr. DOHERTY. The power to name accountants and experts would remain in the hands of the commissioner, but if they are to be authorized to carry on an inquiry involving the examination of witnesses, etc., it would be necessary that that delegation should be authorized by the Governor in Council, and, of course, one of the matters that the Governor in Council would have to consider in such a case would be whether the person named was a proper person to whom to depute these powers. There could be no delegation of the power to summon and examine witnesses and compel their answers except with the direct approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then why not name the party to be appointed in this way by the order itself?

Mr. DOHERTY. What difference would it make? The commissioners may name the accountants and experts to assist them, and this power of authorizing the conduct of inquiries includes the power of authorizing these accountants or these experts.

So far, therefore, as they are concerned, when it is a matter of delegation of powers to them in the particular manner with which we are now concerned, they will have to go to the Governor in Council for his approval before getting these additional

powers. Now, with regard to the cases where it was a matter of authorizing other qualified persons to carry on this investigation in this manner, it seems to me it is immaterial whether the commissioners are authorized to name those qualified persons, and so authorizing them with the approval of the Governor in Council, or whether the Governor in Council may name such persons. It puts the accountants, experts and other qualified persons, so far as the original nomination is concerned, all on the same footing, and all of them are made subject to the approval of the Governor in Council before they get any power to carry on an investigation by means of the examination of witnesses, which involves the powers with which we are concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I grant to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that this is an improvement upon the Bill. Yet he will not be surprised if I say that so far as I am concerned, it does not satisfy me. The Bill as it is can be improved, as even at present it can be made to harass a subject of His Majesty in more ways than one. The Bill as amended may work in this way: Messrs Morine, Lake and Ducharme who have been named commissioners to investigate the public service, have been granted very large powers. They may to-day appoint an accountant, but as the Bill was originally presented, this accountant would have had power to go anywhere in the country and hold an investigation. The following day they might appoint an engineer, and that engineer also would have had power to go into any part of the country and hold an investigation and hear witnesses. The third day they might appoint a technical adviser, if thought advisable, who would have been given the same powers; the fourth day they might appoint another expert, who would have the same power. But in the amendment of my hon. friend there is some restriction put upon the power of the commissioners. If Messrs Morine, Lake and Ducharme appoint an accountant to hold an investigation, and the next day an engineer, and the third day a technical adviser, and the fourth day a technical expert, these men will not have power to hold an investigation, they can only give advice to the commissioners; they have no power to hold an investigation unless those powers so delegated to them by the commissioners are approved by the Governor in Council. That is the extent of the amendment of my hon. friend So far, it is a valuable improvement, I admit, upon the original Bill. But this amendment does not do away with an objection which was made from this side of the House, that this commission would have the power to institute any number of roving commissioners all over the country. This point was made by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), and I have heard no argument against it. I accept the amendment, I think it is an improvement on the Bill, but I do not think it goes as far as it should.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have had no clear and distinct information given to the House of the objects to be accomplished by this legislation; but I think we may fairly assume, in view of what we have observed is being done throughout the country to-day, and particularly in the city of Ottawa, that this Bill is brought in to accomplish a political party purpose, and that possibly the commission itself and subcommissions may be entrusted with the power of going on voyages of discovery to accomplish similar purposes. Now, the gentlemen who have been named as commissioners are seen every day here in the corridors of the House; they are frequently to be seen in the adjoining room No. 16, and I think we might naturally suspect that they are at least partisan in their political views. I do not say that they will not do justice in the accomplishment of their duties, because they are men of high position, one of whom has been a respected member of this House. But they are all strong partisans, that is recognized and admitted. I will assume however that they will have a sense of the responsibility attaching to the position to which they have been appointed, and that their partisanship will be somewhat curbed and restrained. But in the execution of the powers which have been delegated to them, there is a greater danger and a greater menace, because they still retain the power of harassing individuals and officials of the government throughout the country. Now, I think the objects of government are well known. I think the people of this country want good government, wise government, but they also want fair government. They do not want any party entrusted with the powers of government to exercise a jug-handled control over public officials, or other men engaged in the administration of public affairs. It, therefore, seems to me that there should be no legislation that would give cause for suspicion that the government of the day is not disposed to treat fairly officials who occupy positions in the departments. We must recognize a number of things; we must recognize that men have been appointed to positions in the service, both because of their fitness, and because of the fact that their friends were in a position to entrust them with these official positions. But we must assume that once they are appointed, they will do justice, that they will discharge the duties assigned to them properly, even though they were appointed by their political friends. Now, it is not fair to harass these men, to give a

commission power to go on voyages of discovery from ocean to ocean. If there are in the service any officials who have not properly performed their duties, some one must have a knowledge of such maladministration, or wrong doing, or any cases of negligence sufficient to warrant accusations being made.

With these accusations before the government, or in the possession of any department of the government, there might, fairly and justifiably, be men authorized by the government who would take the responsibility of inquiring into such charges. Then, the men accused will have an opportunity of answering, if they can answer. If they cannot they certainly must take the consequences and they must take them without the sympathy of their friends. But, to entrust to gentlemen who, presumably are being appointed because of their friendship to the government, and it may be because the government think they have other qualifications, the powers of delegating the authority which they have so indiscriminately, is going a step beyond anything that has characterized the administration of affairs in Canada up to this moment. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice veils, it is true, the horrid character of this proposition in a measure, by his amendment which shrouds it and does not give it such an ugly look, but there is under the shroud and veil the power to do wrong, the menace against men who have at least the right to be recognized as not being guilty until their guilt is proved. It strikes me that the amendment of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should have been recognized by the government and accepted because if it be true, as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says, that there is no such object in view, that simply all these possibilities of action are conjurings of hon. members of this side of the House and unjust conjurings, there can be no objection on his part to accepting the amendment of my right hon. friend. Further, as I stated, the amendment of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice in a way, takes off the ugly look, sugars the proposition, but I fear that within the velvet glove there is still the hand of steel, and that there is in this proposition, if the government desire to utilize it in that way, the opportunity to do a grave injustice to men of integrity, men whose only offence is that they hold public positions, to do an injustice to them that, I am sure the people do not want to have done, and I therefore, as one member of this House, would protest against the legislation that is now being enacted.

Mr. CROTHERS. Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who object so strongly to the proposed amendment forget that similar legislation has been upon the statute-books for twenty-five years. If they will look at the second part of the Inquiries Act giving power to the head of a department to appoint a commissioner to investigate the conditions in his own department, they will see that similar power is given to such a commissioner to delegate his functions to what you might call a sub-commissioner. You will find that in section 9 of the Inquiries Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That is all well known; it has all been discussed.

Mr. CROTHERS. Well, I will read it to you so that you will know it a little better perhaps, because what I am about to read applies to the second part of the Inquiries Act and not to the first. Section 9 provides that where a commissioner is appointed by the head of a department,

> If the commissioner or commissioners, deem it advisable, he or they may issue a commission, or other authority to any officer or person therein named empowering him to take such evidence and report the same to him or them.
>
> Such officer or person shall, before entering on any investigation, be sworn before a justice of the peace faithfully to execute the duty entrusted to him by such commission and shall with regard to such evidence have the same powers as the commissioner or commissioners would have had if such evidence had been taken before him or them, and may, in like manner, under his hand issue a subpœna or other request or summons for the purpose of compelling the attendance of any person, or the production of any document, book or paper.

So that the commissioner appointed by the head of a department under the second part of the Inquiries Act has, by the section I have just read, power to depute his authority to an officer or any other person whenever he deems it advisable and that officer or person so appointed by the commissioner has the right to subpœna witnesses and take their evidence just as the commissioner himself might do.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It is restricted though.

Mr. CROTHERS. It is proposed to restrict this. This is no new principle. It is acted upon in the courts every day. The judge desires a line run between lots 1 and 2, not being satisfied with the evidence which has been adduced before him. He calls upon a provincial land surveyor to run the line and the very first thing that that surveyor does is to subpœna two, three, four or five witnesses and examine them under oath as to the land-mark or as to where the corner-post is. He goes back to the court and gives evidence of what he

knows based upon the evidence he has taken as to the starting point, the landmark or the corner-post. That is done every day in the courts. Every day in the courts important questions are being referred to laymen who are not trained lawyers and they are authorized to subpœna witnesses, to examine them under oath and to report to the judge. We have had in our department 120 boards of investigation. In a great many of these cases there have been no lawyers, laymen have been appointed, they have subpœnaed witnesses examined them under oath, reported and made their awards.

Mr. EMMERSON. But that is the case of an arbitration.

Mr. CROTHERS. It is the case of an arbitration but the principle is the same.

Mr. EMMERSON. The arbitrators being chosen by agreement between the parties.

Mr. CROTHERS. Not all of them. I am simply referring to this aspect of it to meet the objection raised by the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that these men may not be trained lawyers. I am satisfied that this government for many years has yearly been wasting millions.

An hon. MEMBER. Not this government.

Mr. CROTHERS. I mean the late government. Of course, the new government has not had time. I am satisfied that many millions have been wasted year after year by the late government. An honest effort is being made by the new government to have the departments reorganized, to see where these millions have been squandered and to save to the people of this country the many millions—I do not hesitate to say many millions—that have annually been squandered. When an honest effort is being made to constitute a commission and give that commission power absolutely necessary to discharge the duties for which it is appointed we find our friends on the other side of the House, from the right hon. leader down, objecting to the very principle that has been on the statute-book for the last twenty years and during the time while they were in power.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make out that this provision may lead to mistakes being committed and to wrong being done, but so long as human nature is what it is so long will there be mistakes. Mistakes are made in courts of justice; the late government made mistakes in appointing judges; judges make mistakes and juries make mistakes; I believe innocent men have been hanged; mistakes have been made in electing some gentlemen to this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We see that on the other side.

Mr. CROTHERS. I was looking at the opposition benches when I made that assertion. But, because courts of law and juries make mistakes no one proposes to abolish courts and trial by jury. It is possible that the committee we have appointed will make mistakes, because to say they will not would be to say they are not human, and so we can only do the best we can. The measure would be shorn of its object were these commissioners not authorized to depute their power to examine witnesses. There may be men a thousand miles from here who may have evidence to give about a certain matter, and would you propose to bring them here?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The present law gives them power to send a commissioner to take the evidence.

Mr. CROTHERS. It does under part 2 which is confined to departmental investigation, but it is necessary to amend the Act so as to make that same power applicable to part 1. This is a proper provision and I have no apprehension there will be any abuse under it. We may safely assume that the men who have been appointed and the men who will be appointed, will be possessed of commonsense and will see that British fair-play is done, and no man's rights sacrificed.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The Minister of Labour has said that judges and juries have made mistakes and he assumed in his remarks that the government intended to appoint something in the nature of a judicial tribunal to carry on these investigations, but the Minister of Labour knows well that the commission which has been appointed is not a judicial committee in any sense of the word, but a highly partisan tribunal. It is idle for him to argue that that commission is going to be as impartial as a judicial body or a jury would be. I believe it is the duty of this parliament to safeguard the rights of individuals when they are to be investigated by a board of highly partisan officials. I would point out to the Minister of Labour that there is reason for this power being applicable to part 2 and not to part 1 of the section. It is a very different thing between a minister in his own department appointing a commissioner and giving him power to appoint a subcommissioner, and conferring that power on a roving commissioner such as is contemplated under the present Bill. This is nothing short of a roving commission of inquiry to be carried on by a biased partisan board, and it seems to be the

determination of the government to carry this measure in the drastic form in which it has been suggested. I would, however, ask the Minister of Justice if he has considered the propriety of striking out the words 'or any qualified person.' The Bill says that the commissioners may authorize and depute any 'such accountants, engineers, technical advisers or other experts, or any qualified persons.' I would suggest that these last four words be stricken out. There may be a difference of opinion as to who is a qualified person to take evidence and carry on the investigation and the expression is too broad.

Mr. CROTHERS. I direct attention to the fact that the word 'person' in section 9 of the existing law is not even qualified by the word 'qualified.' It says that this power shall be given to 'any' person and we propose to have a qualified person.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I am dealing with the section before the House. It enumerates different classes of persons and then if you add the words 'or any qualified person' it of course gives it greater breadth than is at all necessary.

Mr. DOHERTY. If I have correctly grasped the suggestion, it is that we should limit the choice of the commissioners to experts and that we should prevent the commissioners authorizing any other qualified persons to carry on an inquiry. I am surprised at this suggestion in view of the fact that the other evening hon. gentlemen opposite strenuously urged that we were doing exceedingly wrong in giving this power to examine witnesses to experts who might not know anything about the rules of evidence and could not consequently determine how the examination should be carried on. But they now ask us to limit the appointment to experts, such as accountants or other persons with technical qualifications. That would be tying down the commissioners to one special class even in matters which are purely questions of fact, involving no necessary technical or expert knowledge. I do not think that would be any improvement. The objection the other evening was that unqualified persons might be appointed, but, under the amendment I suggest, only those will be appointed who, in the judgment of he Governor in Council, are qualified to carry on these investigations. In view of the fact that the legislation we are seeking to amend gives the Governor in Council the authority to name the commissioners, we should not object to give them the authority to appoint these subcommissioners. What I desire is to have a fair investigation, and I do not see how we can go further than we have gone.

Mr. GUTHRIE.

My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) spoke of this Bill as an instrument to harass people. Well, every measure devised to find out whether any one has done wrong will no doubt be looked upon by the wrong-doer, or the person suspected, as a measure intended to harass. But any one who has not done wrong will not consider himself at all aggrieved because the people who employ him inquire into the administration of his office. When the director of a company says to his manager: I intend having an audit of the books and management, does any one suppose the manager could regard this as an attempt to harass him? And we have provided that if, in the course of the inquiry any charge develops against anyone, he shall have counsel. Unless we are going to throw up our hands and say we have no right to investigate our public business because such investigation may prove disagreeable to somebody, I do not see how we can be fairly accused of seeking to harass any one. Nor do I see that there is any great hardship if the commissioners select others to do certain part of the work which, under the Act, they can do themselves. I am quite prepared to accept any amendment that will provide that any investigation involving an imputation against anybody shall be carried on with the direct approval, and under the direct authority of the Governor in Council, but further than that I do not see that it is possible to go unless we are prepared to abandon the Bill, the object of which is to obtain a prompt and effective investigation.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If the minister's statement means anything it means that he desires to retain the words 'or any qualified persons,' because such language would enable the government by order in council to appoint people qualified to take evidence or to perform such services as may be necessary in the conduct of such an inquiry. If that be his object, his Act is not well drafted. There is no necessity for the words, 'accountants, engineers, technical advisers, or other experts.' They should come out and the only words that should remain are 'any qualified persons.' If the Act were passed as it is printed, the ordinary rule of 'ejusdem generis' would apply, and the only persons who could be appointed would be persons of the same general class as accountants, experts and technical officers. You could not appoint a man to take evidence who was not possessed of technical knowledge. Therefore, I would suggest that the words 'accountants, engineers, technical advisers or other experts,' be struck out, leaving the words 'any qualified persons.' Any court officer of any Superior Court in any province would satisfy me.

Mr. BORDEN. A good deal has been said in the course of the debate about the commission that has been issued, and I would like to say that there is nothing on the face of the commission nor in anything that has taken place in connection with it to justify the statement that it has been issued for the purpose of harassing any one. The commission was founded very largely on the terms of the one issued some years ago by the late government. It was desired to continue that inquiry, which certainly was not complete, and possibly to extend it in some respects. It is not for the purpose of making charges against anyone or investigating the conduct of anyone, except in so far as that conduct may come into question incidentally in the course of the work of the commission. The objections which have been made seem to me to have been met very fairly by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. It is already contemplated by the statute, as the right hon. leader of the opposition himself admitted, that accountants and experts should be appointed to assist the commissioners in their work; so that the Bill is only making more certain what he has declared to be already within the purview of the Statute. Then, so far as the appointment of persons to take evidence is concerned, this is spoken of as a roving commission. It is quite possible, I suppose, that the same result could be attained by issuing 14 or 15 departmental commissions to inquire into every department of the government. Would that be a wise course? I think it would be much more in the public interest that one general commission should be issued, with power to inquire into any department of the government, and the conditions which prevail generally in the public service. Objection was taken on the ground that it is not desirable to give to any person deputed by the commissioners to make inquiry, the power to take evidence. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour, has already pointed out that if this were merely a departmental inquiry, there is already pretty wide power to send, not a qualified person, but any person, to take evidence with respect to any particular matter; so that if we had 12 or 15 departmental commissions, each one of them might send out some persons to make a particular inquiry without any qualification stated, because that is the statute at present. But in order to meet the objections taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, has proposed certain amendments, and I will suggest another which would go further to meet their views; because we have no desire to make this Bill anything but perfectly fair to all concerned while giving to the gentlemen who have been named on this commission power to do efficient work in the investigation which has been entrusted to them. My suggestion would be to strike out of the fourteenth line the words 'take evidence and,' and to insert in the seventeenth line after 'persons' the words 'when authorized by order in council,' and in the twenty-fourth line, after the word 'to,' the words 'take evidence'; so that the latter portion of the section will read as follows:

—and the commissioners may authorize and depute any such accountants, engineers, technical advisers, or other experts, or any qualified persons, to inquire into and report to the commissioners upon any matter within the scope of the commission as may be directed by the commissioners, and such persons, when authorized by order in council, shall, in the execution of the powers so deputed or authorized, have the same powers which the commissioners have to take evidence, issue subpœnas, enforce the attendance of witnesses, compel them to give evidence, and otherwise conduct the inquiry.

The matter would be brought back to the Governor in Council before any one of these men could undertake to make an inquiry upon oath and, after all, that is no more than we have at the present time. At the present time the Governor in Council could issue a commission in respect of every department of the government, and by such commission could authorize the persons named therein to conduct such an inquiry upon oath. It seems to me, therefore, that the Bill, when so amended, would simply be a convenient form of enabling a general commission to do in a comprehensive way what might be done by a dozen departmental commissions if the Governor in Council saw fit to appoint such commissions.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the right hon. gentleman state in what respect his amendment differs from the amendment proposed by the Minister of Justice?

Mr. BORDEN. In this instance the accountants have no power to take evidence or conduct an inquiry on oath unless specially authorized by order in council. They may proceed to make an inquiry, and report to the commission, but when they come to make an inquiry on oath, and that has been the chief objection raised to this Bill, they must first of all receive the authority of the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council could give that authority to them apart altogether from the commission.

Mr. MURPHY. In what respect does that differ from the amendment of the Minister of Justice?

Mr. BORDEN. The amendment of the Minister of Justice did not omit the words I have proposed to have stricken out, 'to take evidence,' in the 14th line.

Mr. GERMAN. It seems to me that an Act of this kind places the power in the hands of a gentleman appointed by the government, perhaps strongly biased by reason of his political proclivities, to enquire into a man's conduct and to report to the main commission without the person whose conduct is being enquired into having any knowledge of the fact whatever. The amendment suggested by the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), has convinced me of what the intention of the Act is. I had thought of making inquiry whether the phrase 'to take evidence and inquire' would mean to inquire by taking evidence, or to take evidence, or to inquire without evidence. While I have no objection to the Bill in its general scope, I think it should be so worded that no man's conduct in his position as a public officer could be a subject of investigation or his position be placed in jeopardy without his having the right to a hearing. The Minister of Labour grew emphatic on the fact that courts and juries make mistakes. We all know that juries make mistakes, but the mistakes of courts and juries can be and are rectified by Courts of Appeal. Here there is no Court of Appeal; this commission is the final court. A man in British Columbia may be telegraphed to to inquire into the conduct of some officer in the service there, and he may conduct that inquiry in any way he sees fit. He may have a strong personal feeling of animosity against the person whose conduct is to be inquired into. He makes his inquiry to suit himself, he makes his report to the commission, and on that report the commission will act and perhaps dismiss this man from his position. There is no remedy in case an error occurs, and it should be made clear that no person's conduct should be inquired into without his being notified and given an opportunity to appear before the commissioners or the experts sent by the commissioners.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I take the observation from my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) without any qualification as intending to mean what he stated, that this Bill is simply intended to carry out the powers of investigation into the public affairs of the country. He has referred to the commission lately appointed which is intended to complete the work done by the commission appointed by the Liberal government some years ago. I might have something to say as to the character of the respective commissions, but I abstain from that to-day. I take the words of my right hon. friend literally. My hon. friend is aware that commissions of that kind, although the intention may not be to harass anybody, can harass persons. I have heard the complaint in this House and there may be a necessity of guarding the rights of the subject and making it impossible that any man's private affairs shall be unduly ventilated or his rights unduly harassed. The object of the amendment is to empower the commissioners to depute their power of conducting an investigation; that is, that the commissioners may call in experts to investigate technical matters. If the Bill were limited to that there could be no objection. My objection is that when the commissioners are empowered to employ experts the power should go no further; that is, that these experts should not have the power to investigate, but that the whole responsibility of the work should be assumed by the commissioners themselves. It is not according to the rules of evidence or the rules of fair-play that technical officers who have been brought in to give to the commission the advantage of their technical knowledge, should be empowered to do the duties of the commissioners themselves. Let the commissioners perform their own duty. Of course in the case of distant witnesses, there should be power to delegate the authority to hear evidence, but that is provided for under the existing law. I submit to the judgment and the fairness of my hon. friend that the power of investigation, with this exception, should not be deputed to anybody, but should be retained by the commissioners themselves.

Mr. BORDEN. It comes down to this in the last analysis, that if the commissioners who have been appointed should discover anything in a particular department which they think would require investigation by an expert, under the law as it is to-day, the Governor in Council could appoint an expert as a commissioner and send him to make an inquiry on oath into that particular matter. There is no doubt about that. All that we are doing now is to enable the commissioners to name a man who will make some inquiry into such a matter and if the commissioners think it is desirable that the person so employed should make an inquiry on oath, then instead of having a separate departmental commission, as we could have under the law at the present time, he will be appointed under this section.

Now, can any one say that there is any more probability of justice being done in the one case than in the other? The two cases are absolutely the same in the last analysis, except that I think this is a more convenient way of doing it than that which is afforded by the law to-day. The power of inquiry to-day is vested in the Governor in Council, if they see fit to exercise it in the way I have suggested;

therefore we say that the person nominated or suggested by the commission to make an examination, who may perhaps have begun an examination, shall not have a right to examine any person on oath or conduct an inquiry upon oath, unless he receives the authority of the Governor in Council. Now what, after all, can be the harm? It is a matter of convenience, and it is only for that reason that I am pressing it upon the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. Instead of delegating any such powers to an expert who has discovered what he thinks to be wrong, and needs to be investigated, would it not be fairer to delegate such powers, if you are going to delegate them at all, to somebody other than the expert who has been sent to make the preliminary inquiry? We all know that detectives get a theory, and then they seek to get evidence to substantiate their theory. An expert sent out to some distant point, say to an office of the Public Works in Halifax, is sent there to examine, to make an inquisition in a way, and he reaches a certain conclusion in his mind; for ever after he is interested in sustaining the conclusion he has reached. If he is authorized to sit in judgment on the conduct of the official involved in that department, it seems to me that the official is not getting fair-play. Some one else should be empowered to hold an inquiry and take evidence, and that an official is entitled to receive a statement of the charges made against him, whether inferentially or directly; and he should be brought before some other tribunal than the one constituted by the appointment of an expert.

Mr. DOHERTY. The hon. gentleman misapprehends what these experts or others who may be authorized to conduct an inquiry, are going to do. They are not going to pass judgment, they are going to make an inquiry and report to the commission, and the commission is going to report to the Governor in Council.

Mr. EMMERSON. They will report their conclusions.

Mr. DOHERTY. They will report the evidence they take, and with that no doubt their view of it, leaving the evidence itself to the commissioners, who will at their discretion accept or reject the view of these sub-commissioners.

Mr. GERMAN. The Bill does not say they are to report the evidence, they are simply to report. They make an inquiry and take evidence, and they can make a report to suit themselves without reporting any evidence at all.

Mr. DOHERTY. In the 14th line they are authorized to take evidence and inquire into and report to the commissioners upon any matter.

Mr. GERMAN. Why not add the words 'and report the evidence'?

Mr. DOHERTY. I have no objection. I do not think it is necessary to make it more clear, but I have no objection. I think the form of the amendment suggested by the Prime Minister would make it more clear than the words in the original form.

Mr. BORDEN. So far as this Bill is concerned there is absolutely no difference. In both cases the responsibility is on the Governor in Council. There is no need of any change. You might provide in the statute that the Governor in Council must always appoint a fair person, but that would not improve the matter in any way. The Governor in Council is always supposed to appoint fair persons, and we will endeavour to do that. I am sorry to hear some of the animadversions that have been passed in this House upon the gentlemen who constitute the commission. The leader of the opposition has said that he does not propose to go into that question to-day, and he may take some other occasion to do so, if he thinks advisable. All I am endeavouring to point out is that so far as an opportunity to be heard is concerned, this Bill does not make any change at all, but it does make a change to secure greater convenience.

Mr. EMMERSON. I appreciate what my right hon. friend has said, but the amendment suggested by him seems to lead to the conclusion that he proposes to have the expert make an inquiry and report, and this expert would then be authorized by the Governor in Council to hear evidence.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would ask the leader of the government why he could not get the same result by stopping at the 11th line of this amending Act, reading the amending section 11 with section 9 of the original Act. What does he want that he could not get by taking this new law down to the 11th line to the word 'inquiry,' and reading that with section 9 of the original Act. I think that covers the whole ground. I would like to say to the Prime Minister that I think there is some misunderstanding about these technical men. My experience has been that we have always wanted these technical men to give evidence, not to make inquiries.

If there was a question to-day of general importance with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway my hon. friend would not appoint the chief engineer, Mr. Leonard, to take evidence. He would have Mr. Leonard give evidence before some competent tribunal. In that way he would have the benefit of Mr. Leonard's judgment, and

not by appointing him a commissioner to take evidence of others. He could not then give his own evidence because it would be his duty to take the evidence of others, and it seems to me that all this commission require is the evidence of capable men taken before some competent tribunal. The power to summon and bring experts before the commission is a proper one. When the Minister of Justice has accomplished that I think he has done everything that he could want to do. This Bill, read with section 9 of the Inquiries Act, gives him all these powers. I do not see why, when you want the evidence of the expert, you appoint him as a commissioner. I think the expert should go before the commission and give his evidence. I want to get away from standing here and saying that I do not object to an inquiry of this kind without giving the fullest opportunity to the man whose conduct is to be inquired into to be present. I took the objection the other day when this Bill was up that it might possibly happen that half a dozen inquiries might be going on with regard to different phases of the same questions, and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) jumped to his feet, and said that that was pure and simple nonsense. Of course, nonsense that I, or any humble member of this House, might indulge in, might be harmless, but if we are going to put it into the shape of a statute it becomes serious. If what I said was nonsense that different phases of the inquiry might be going on simultaneously I would remind my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that the Minister of Justice says that that is in the statute, and that that is the purpose of it. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance had better tell his colleague the Minister of Justice not to be playing with such dangerous nonsense as drafting statutes, taking them before council, having them passed upon and bringing them into this House in order to have them enacted into law. That is what we are told by the Minister of Finance is nonsense. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) the other day asked the Minister of Justice what was the purpose of this Bill, and he replied that one of its main purposes was that inquiries at different places about the same matter could be going on simultaneously. I do not wish to be regarded as talking nonsense to this House. I would like the Minister of Finance, who is perhaps a younger man than myself, and certainly not as old a member of the House, to be a little careful about the force of words, and put in a little more time on the dictionary before he uses them again. As I understand it, the purpose of this legislation is to enable the commission to get every possible piece of information that is required, and I for one will not for a moment stand in the way of that being done. As far as departmental administration and the responsibility of a minister are concerned I do not think there is a member in this House who wishes in the slightest way to interfere with the full knowledge, judgment and common-sense that any minister may exercise in the management of his own department, or with his taking such steps as he may find necessary to secure proper administration in the department. But, when you travel outside of that, and constitute a court, I would appeal with every confidence to the Prime Minister who, from his experience, has. I am sure, formed high conceptions of the duties of courts, not to create a court to inquire into the conduct of officers in any department that will violate the principles of fair-play, and which will not secure to every individual whose conduct is under investigation the same fair-play that he would get in any other court in the land. That is all we ask and that is all we will hold the Prime Minister responsible for. This commission is spoken of as an instrument by which a Minister of the Crown will obtain information for the bettering of the administration of his department. As far as that phase of it is concerned I do not think that there is any objection from this side of the House. What method should hon. gentlemen adopt to secure that end? They may adopt any method they think proper and spread the jurisdiction as wide as possible if their object is to secure general information for the betterment of the adminstration of the departments, but, when we come down to another phase of it, where the conduct of any individual, possibly with a view to his dismissal, is concerned, we think that if he is brought into court and put upon his trial he should have the same rights as he would have in any other court of the country. I do not think that under the method proposed here he can possibly have these rights and for that reason I object to this measure as do other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think, concerning this Bill, that one might very truthfully use the words which the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) used in a statement issued to the public during the recent campaign in reference to the Canadian navy, that it was ill-advised, ill-considered and hasty, or something to that effect. It seems to me that the Minster of Justice has not bestowed the amount of care upon this Bill that he should have done. He has consented to several amendments, but taking it in its present form, the Bill can only be productive of harm and doubt. It ex-

hibits evidence of bad drafting. The right hon. Prime Minister told the House that the amendment as now before the committee and the statute as it at present stands differ very little, that they are practically the same and that the only change which the amendment contemplates is for the purpose of expediting public inquiries. If that is true it surely is incumbent upon the Minister of Justice and the administration to give some reason for this amending legislation. I think it is a fair test of amendatory legislation to ask the question: Why should the existing statute be changed? What circumstance or circumstances have created the necessity for an amendment to the statute which has been in force for a long number of years? I think the Prime Minister and the members of the government will agree with me that, generally speaking, it is unsound in principle to empower a commission, constituted for a definite purpose, to delegate that power away. I do not think it is businesslike to empower a commission to delegate their authority except for the reasons which are stated in the statute, just as under section 9 of part 2, the commissioner is empowered to delegate his authority to another commissioner who is empowered to take evidence when the evidence of a witness is sought who resides a considerable distance away from the place of the inquiry.

Mr. CROTHERS. It is not confined to that.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Yes, it is.

Mr. CROTHERS. No, it is not; read the section.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That is the only condition upon which that power can be delegated.

Mr. CROTHERS. Oh, no.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). This Bill, I presume, was introduced after the appointment of the Public Inqury Commission some time in December last. I assume that it was thought by some person that the powers were not ample within the statute to enable the commissioners to perform their work thoroughly.

It is evident on the face of the order in council appointing the commissioners that the duties of this commission can be carried out under the powers contained in the present statute. If the object of appointing the commission is to improve the public service that can best be done by leaving the inquiry entirely in the hands of the commissioners, and it is unbusinesslike and opposed to commonsense to grant these commissioners, under any circumstnces, the right of delegating their power. The duties of the commissioners as set forth are to inquire into:

1. The methods employed in the transaction of public business.
2. Control of expropriations and expenditure.
3. The construction and maintenance of public works and the carrying on of dredging operations.
4. The administrative methods and operations of the chief spending departments.
5. The administration and alienation of the public lands.
6. Discipline and efficiency of the departmental staffs.
7. Duplication of the same or similar work in two or more departments.

Under what heading in this enumeration is it possible to conceive of the necessity of delegating all or any of these powers? It would seem that the duties assigned to this commission may be performed very largely in Ottawa, and if they are not able to suggest reforms and the correction of abuses with the information they can get from the ministers, and deputies and departmental staffs, how do hon. gentlemen opposite expect them to make any report which will be of value? I submit that the ministry have not given to the committee a sufficient reason to warrant us in supporting this legislation.

Amendments (Mr. Doherty) agreed to.

Bill reported as amended, and amendments concurred in.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. BORDEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 58) respecting the Department of External Affairs. He said: The object of the Bill is to bring the Department of External Affairs under the Prime Minister, and there are many reasons of convenience and in the public interest why that should be so. The Bill has been drafted and introduced for that purpose.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT—PRIVATE SECRETARIES.

Bill (No. 60) to amend the Civil Service Act read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On Section 1,

Mr. BORDEN. This section amends section 39 of the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908, by providing that any person appointed private secretary to a minister may be appointed in subdivision B of the first division, or in subdivision A or sub-

division B of the second division. The subsections 2, 3, and 4 of this Bill I propose to strike out, as they are unnecessary, at all events at present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The object of the Bill is simply to give the private secretaries of ministers a rank and status which they cannot have at present under the law. I find no fault with that, and am ready to give the suggestion of the government favourable consideration. I know by experience that it is impossible to get the services of a private secretary, properly qualified to discharge the duties, unless we give more salary.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg to move that subsections 2, 3, and 4 be struck out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the reason?

Mr. BORDEN. The reason is that it would probably create some discrimination between the secretaries who would be appointed under this Bill, and those who already may have positions in the civil service, and may be selected by the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume that one effect of the Bill, taken as a whole, would be to improve the position of ex-private secretaries—that by reason of the provision for an increase to the amount of $100 per year for each year they have served, some measure of justice would be done them as compensation for the loss of the $600 salary which they would suffer on ceasing to be private secretaries.

Mr. BORDEN. If the committee are willing to amend this so that it will apply to private secretaries, whether appointed in this way or not, I have no objection. I thought possibly some objection might be raised by reason of this proposed discrimination. It was on that account that I proposed to drop the subsections 2, 3, and 4.

In the Bill as drawn there is a certain difference of advantage or possible advantage created in favour of a person who is brought in, not being already a member of the civil service, and it was for the reason that I did not desire any discrimination of that kind that I proposed that these should be dropped. If the committee are willing to approve an amendment in subsection 3 so that that discrimination should not arise, I shall be glad to reconsider the proposal I made a moment ago to drop these sections.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Without reading the sections very carefully, I was under the impression that it was intended now to improve the status of the private secretaries of ministers, and was also intended to improve to a certain extent the position of those who had been private secretaries and ceased to be such when the late government went out of office. If it is not intended to make any provision for the retiring private secretaries, it would seem that the provision made for the new secretaries is pretty handsome. A private secretary now appointed might at once receive $2,800 and $600 besides, making $3,400. That is a pretty generous allowance for a private secretary when you consider what the private secretaries under the late government received, I do not think in any case on their appointment more than $2,100. But under this Bill a private secretary could start at $3,400.

Mr. BORDEN. It would be possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a pretty generous allowance. I certainly would like to see liberal provision made for the new private secretaries, but I think we should also make provision for those who have been private secretaries of ministers for a number of years, and who, when they ceased on the 10th of October last to be private secretaries, had to submit to a reduction of $600 in their salary. I think my right hon. friend should give some consideration to them.

Mr. BORDEN. I suppose that could be accomplished by enlarging the words of section 3.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that my hon. friend beside me, or myself would be prepared to suggest any form in which it could be done, but I think the provision made to-day for private secretaries of ministers might very well be extended to former private secretaries. I would recommend that principle strongly to my right hon. friend. The position of a private secretary is one that is very peculiar. In the first place, no man can discharge the duties of that office unless he is a highly intellectual and well-educated man. He has no hope of reward beyond the annual increase of salary. Probably if he had given himself to any other avocation he could have done much better; but from a sense of loyalty to the minister with whom he is connected, he continues to be his private secretary, and when the minister goes out of office, he is stranded. I think that the members on both sides of the House will recognize that these men should receive better treatment than to be simply given the rank in the service which falls to them when they cease to be private secretaries. If the same principle were applied to all, I think it would be fair.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to add my appeal to those addressed by the right hon. leader of the opposition, and by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) to the right hon. leader of the government on be-

half of the private secretaries of the ministers of the late government. This Bill, I assume, arose out of the situation which developed when the late government went out of power. At that time several of the ministers had positions to which they might have promoted their private secretaries, and had the moneys voted for those positions; but upon their applying to the Civil Service Commission, one member of the commission declined to issue the necessary certificates entitling the secretaries to promotion. The result was that the ministers were obliged to vacate their respective offices without doing that which they would have liked to have done for their private secretaries, who had rightly deserved promotion, and that which had formerly been done for private secretaries. Like my hon. friends who have already spoken, I have no objection whatever to the private secretaries of the new government receiving this increased remuneration. These gentlemen, as the right hon. leader of the opposition has said, require exceptional ability and occupy positions of exceptional trust, and in my judgment they cannot be too well rewarded. But I would appeal to the right hon. leader of the government on the ground of fairness, that the treatment which he now proposes to extend to the new private secretaries should also be given to the private secretaries of the late government. In the case of my own private secretary, he had occupied that position under my predecessor and myself for a period of fourteen years, and I am strictly within the facts in saying that no person in the employ of the government of Canada rendered more valuable service during those fourteen years than that gentleman did. As a result of not getting his promotion, he is now in a position in the department which is not consistent with his ability and his long term of service. I say that without reflecting in any way upon my respected successor whom I was glad to see appointed to the position he holds. I felt that I should not let the opportunity pass without making this appeal to the right hon. leader of the government not only on behalf of the gentleman to whom I have alluded, but also on behalf of the private secretaries of the right hon. leader of the opposition, the former Minister of Labour, and the former Minister of Railways and Canals. I think these ministers were all in the same position as myself, in having had positions to which their secretaries might have been promoted, and for which the salaries had been voted by this House, but in each case we were unable to get the necessary certificates from the Civil Service Commission owing to the reluctance of one member of that commission to sign them. I trust that what has been said will induce the right hon. the Prime Minister to so amend this Bill as to cover the cases of these private secretaries.

Mr. BORDEN. I am sure the present government would be disposed to deal in the fairest possible way with the gentlemen who lose a certain part of their emoluments by ceasing to be private secretaries. I have no knowledge of their position in the civil service except in one instance that has been brought to my attention. What has been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly by the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), is worthy of consideration. As I have said, my suggestion to strike out these three subclauses was purely because it had been brought to my attention that the Bill, as drafted at present, created a certain discrimination between persons selected in the civil service as private secretaries, and persons selected from outside. The Bill as drafted undoubtedly means that those appointed from outside the service would be entitled to receive a certain consideration upon ceasing to be private secretaries whereas that consideration could not, under the terms of the Bill, be given to those selected in the civil service. It did not seem to me that that discrimination could be very well supported, and for that reason I suggested that the clauses should be struck out. The Bill may be amended so as to avoid that discrimination, and for that reason I would suggest a postponement of its consideration.

Progress reported.

REVISED STATUTES—FRENCH TRANSLATION.

Bill (No. 65), to correct certain clerical errors in the French version of the Revised Statutes, 1906—Mr. Doherty—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. DOHERTY. The first section of the Bill is to insert in the French version certain words which have been omitted. The section deals with the giving or procuring or the agreeing to give or to procure any office, place, or employment, in order to induce a person to allow himself to be nominated as a candidate, or to refrain from becoming a candidate in an election. In the French version the words 'agreeing to give or procure, or offering or promising to procure,' are entirely omitted. It is a manifest case of omission pure and simple.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There is a departure here from the usual system of amending a Bill. This Bill amends by inserting words, and the practice has been to repeal the section and substitute another.

Mr. DOHERTY. It may not sound as well, but it is not part of the bad drafting of the Minister of Justice, as the hon. member found in the other case, because the minister did not draft it, it has been placed in my hands by the officer in charge of this work. I do not know what advantage we would gain by repealing the section and substituting another, particularly when we are amending to supply an omission in only one version.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). While it is not very important, it is well to follow a system. We have followed the system of repealing and substituting sections where words are added, and I think it would be unfortunate to adopt this method of inserting words in making amendments.

Mr. BORDEN. This is not the first occasion on which it has become necessary to amend the French version of the Statutes. It has usually been done in this way. I agree that as a general rule the observation of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), is entirely correct. I followed it to-day in the Bill respecting the Department of External Affairs, by enacting a new Bill altogether.

On section 2,

Mr. DOHERTY. The English section, as it now reads, provides that all actions or suits for indemnity for any damages sustained by reason of the construction or operation of a railway shall be commenced within one year next after the time when such supposed damage is sustained or in the case of continuing damages after the cessation of such damage.

The French version leaves out the provision making the prescription run only from the cessation of the damages, and the amendment supplies that omission.

On section 3,

Mr. DOHERTY. The French version leaves out entirely this provision:

That nothing contained in this section shall apply to any mortgage upon real estate given by a joint stock company, or a corporation, or under any debenture issued by any such company or corporation.

On section 4,

Mr. DOHERTY. In this clause, the English version provides for certain rights in favour of creditors to the sum of $200; the French version says to the sum of $400.

On section 5,

Mr. DOHERTY. The English version reads:

Except in the Northwest Territories, any person dissatisfied with an order or decision of the court, or a single judge in any proceeding.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax).

The French version leaves out "the court," and consequently the right of appeal from a judgment of the court.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE PUBLIC ARCHIVES.

Mr. BORDEN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 66) respecting the public archives. He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go on with the Bill in committee to-day, but I think that possibly it might have its second reading, and I shall be prepared to give full explanations in committee. The object of the Bill, as I explained upon its introduction, is to establish the archives under the authority of an Act of parliament and to give a certain status to the Dominion archivist. The work of the archives has been carried on in a somewhat systematic and effective way during recent years, but there seems some need of legislative provisions being enacted in connection with it. To bring that about this Bill has been introduced.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is there not an archives branch now under Dr. Doughty?

Mr. BORDEN. I may say to my hon. friend that it has been carried on up to the present without any Act of parliament and perhaps not in such a certain and effective way as it might possibly be if some Bill of this character were placed upon the statute-book. I do not know of any Act of parliament that defines the duties of the archivist or deals with the matters under his charge. For that reason it was thought desirable to bring this subject to the attention of parliament.

Mr. MURPHY. When does the right hon. gentleman intend to proceed with the Bill in committee?

Mr. BORDEN. To-morrow, if convenient.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

At Six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—REGINA CITY CENSUS.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw). I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, who is not in his seat, but who will probably notice what I have to say in 'Hansard', a matter with regard to the incompleteness of return No. 73, brought down in answer to a motion moved by me on the 29th November, and which

asked for the documents, &c., in connection with the taking of the census in the city of Regina. The minister has placed on the table what is called a supplementary return because it refers to certain things which must be mentioned in the main return, but, while this supplementary return has been brought down I have been unable to find after diligent search any first return, and I presume the latter was mislaid in some way before it reached the House. Anyway, the return brought down has no connection with the return asked for in the order of the House. The papers in the supplementary return concern the taking of the census in the electoral district of Regina outside of the city of Regina, and refer to the prosecution and punishment of certain enumerators; my motion distinctly asked for papers in connection with the 'City' of Regina. I hope the minister will bring down immediately the real return called for with regard to the taking of the census in the city of Regina. In this supplementary return there is one telegram which bears no date, and although that does not concern me, I trust that the real return when brought down will be carefully prepared so that it will deal with the census in the city of Regina, and the complaints against the correctness of that census, and that the papers will be in every respect complete.

CORRESPONDENTS OF THE 'LABOUR GAZETTE'.

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). Will the Minister of Labour be kind enough to tell the House, and the country what correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' have been dismissed, and by whom have they been replaced. The minister told us this afternoon that certain correspondents were removed for incompetency, and other reasons unconnected with politics. The political aspect of this does not concern me, but I can tell the minister that I know that men who were absolutely competent have been dismissed. I refer now, more particularly, to J. F. Girard, who lives in my constituency, and who on several occasions had been asked by the department to make special reports, and who was considered competent to do so in addition to his ordinary work as correspondent. Of course, from a political point of view I believe the minister had a perfect right to dismiss him because he helped me all he could, and I am sure he would help me to-morrow if he had a chance.

Then again the former practice was to print the name of the correspondent at the head of the news he supplied, and this was a guarantee to the labour men of the country of the ability of the writer to deal with the questions he treated of. Possibly, in some parts of the country there were correspondents not fit for their positions, but these correspondents must seek their information, especially from the labour standpoint, through the direct channel of the organization. I understand that in future the names of the correspondents are not to be published, and I am sure the Minister of Labour is not afraid to publish the names of his new appointees. The minister says he will let me know who these correspondents are, but it does not matter whether I know or not so long as the labouring people of the country, who are entitled to know, shall be made aware of the fact. If the names are not printed, what guarantee will the working men of the country have that it is not members of the Manufacturers' Association who will in future send the reports, and how can he expect to have a fair report? With all due respect to lawyers, I do not believe they are qualified to write a fair report on the trade conditions in different parts of the country. I believe the minister was badly misled in dismissing J. F. Girard, if he dismissed him on the grounds of not being competent. I have been informed time and again that he was a most competent man. If he was dismissed from the political side, I repeat that the Minister of Labour was perfectly justified in putting him aside, and I don't blame him at all, but we have his word that politics had nothing to do with it. The labouring men of the country are anxious to know who are going to be the correspondents in the future, so that we may learn whether we may expect proper reports on the trade conditions of the country.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour). My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) seems to assume that there has been some change in the management of the 'Labour Gazette' with respect to the publication of the names of the correspondents. There has been no change in that respect whatever. I am informed by my deputy that the names of the correspondents have been published all along and they are still being published. As to the dismissal of several correspondents I can only repeat what I said this afternoon: I got a written report from the officer who has charge of that publication, on all the correspondents in Canada. I went over the names with him, and without any regard whatever to their politics, certain of them were notified that their services would not be required after the 1st of January simply because they were incompetent or inattentive to their duties. I am glad to hear the hon. member (Mr. Verville) say that while Mr. Girard's services were not dispensed with on account of partisanship, he should have been dismissed for partisanship. I can assure the hon. member that the names

of the correspondents will be published in the future as in the past.

Mr. VERVILLE. I did not say Mr. Girard should be dismissed. I just said that if it were for political reasons he was dismissed you were right to do it, because he had supported me.

Mr. CROTHERS. That is in substance what I said. The hon. member (Mr. Verville) said that Mr. Girard had been guilty of partisanship, and he could not find any fault if he were dismissed on that ground. In addition to the ground the department acted upon, the hon. gentleman has given new ground for this dismissal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the Minister of Labour see that there is a great difference between dismissing a first-class man on the alleged ground of incompetency and dismissing him upon the ground of partisanship? I understood the minister to say that no correspondents had been dismissed for partisanship.

Mr. CROTHERS. I have said that all along.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And now it appears from the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Verville) that a most efficient man, in whom the public had great confidence, has been dismissed for alleged incompetency. If the minister dismisses a man on the ground of incompetency all right, but I understand that he has repudiated any such idea.

Mr. CROTHERS. Certainly. I prefer to take the report of my officer who has charge of the 'Labour Gazette' rather than a statement made by any man in this House on such a point. It was on the statement of my officer that these changes were made, and they were not made on the ground of partisanship.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the minister from his place in the House give me the names of the correspondents at Amherst and Springhill, Nova Scotia, and state if either of them or both of them were dismissed for incompetency or inattentiveness?

Mr. CROTHERS. The gentleman who was correspondent at Amherst is a man by the name of Ross. Immediately on the results of the elections being known he wrote to the department saying he expected to be fired and, therefore, would resign at once. Beyond that I may tell my hon. friend that the officer in charge of the 'Labour Gazette' reported that this man was an unsatisfactory correspondent. He has been replaced. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to have anybody dismissed merely because he was or is a Liberal. In addition, when anybody is dismissed, I shall see to it that a Conservative will replace him if I can find one capable of discharging satisfactorily the duties of the office. I communicated with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) and he recommended a Mr. Forsyth, a printer by trade, a member of the city council, and a very prominent and capable man in Amherst, and I had much pleasure in appointing him.

Mr. CARROLL. It does seem strange that the officer in charge of the 'Labour Gazette' did not ascertain before the 21st of September that there were certain incompetents employed on the 'Labour Gazette.' It strikes me as rather strange that he should have made up his mind with regard to these shortly after the present government came to power. I fail to see why the hon. minister should have any objection to giving this House and country the names of those who have been dismissed as correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' because of incompetency or negligence. I think it is due to the country that we should know who were dismissed and for what reason. I quite agree with the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) that the country should know who are the correspondents of the 'Gazette,' so that we may judge whether they really have the interests of the labour movement at heart or whether they represent the financial interests. As the representative of a constituency, where about half the people belong to labour organizations, the fact was brought to my attention that certain correspondents had been dismissed, and the labour organizations are interested in knowing by whom they are to be replaced. Are they going to be replaced by men who understand and are in sympathy with the labour movement or by men who have, perhaps, the financial interests of the country at heart more than the interests of labour? I would ask whether the correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' at Cape Breton has been dismissed, and if so whether for incompetency or negligence, and by whom was he replaced?

Mr. CROTHERS. In reply I may say that the report regarding the correspondent at Sydney, whose name is John Moffat, is in these words: 'A good correspondent, well informed, careful and attentive to instructions.' I, therefore, did not dismiss him, and he is still correspondent.

Mr. CARROLL. That is perfectly satisfactory to me, but if I had not put this question, we would not know who was the correspondent.

Mr. CROTHERS. There can be no doubt whatever that Mr. Moffat would have notified my hon. friend if he had been dismissed. My hon. friend has insinuated that this report from the officer in charge of the 'Labour Gazette' was made up very quickly after the 21st of September. I am rather inclined to believe that it was made up some time before, and that my predecessor was notified that these men were incompetent and inattentive, but did not take proper action.

GUYSBOROUGH BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the government, and especially that of the Minister of Railways, to the fact that a certain appropriation of $1,000,000, which was placed in the estimates by the late government to construct a branch railway in the county of Guysborough, Nova Scotia, has been struck from the estimates. I was somewhat surprised to note that fact, and at first I thought that there might have been some mistake made by the printer or some one else. But on examining the estimates more closely, I discovered that the vote for a branch line in the island of Cape Breton was also struck from the list, and that the only item remaining in the new estimates of the three which were in the old estimates, is the million dollars for the construction of a line in the county of Halifax. If the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) will say now that he intends to restore this item to the estimates for the present session and gives me the assurance that he will go on with the building of the Guysborough branch, it will be unnecessary for me to make some of the remarks I otherwise would make. I notice that he shakes his head.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have not noticed it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The hon. minister will not give me that assurance, so that evidently my worst fears are realized. I see that the purpose of the government is to abandon for the present the construction of this branch railway in the county of Guysborough. Now the remarks I shall make on this question will be directed chiefly to the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden). The Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) is to some extent a stranger to the province of Nova Scotia, but his right hon. leader (Mr. Borden) is of course well posted. He knows all the details about what is required there, he has gone over the ground and ascertained the condition of affairs in the county I have the honour to represent. I presume, therefore, that he will be willing to be held responsible for the action of the government in striking the appropriation for a branch line to Guysborough from the estimates. Ever since the 21st of September I have been repeatedly asked by my constituents what would be the fate of the Guysborough branch railway under the new administration, and I have always replied that I could not see how the government could do anything else than go forward with that work. It appears, however, that I have been mistaken. What are the facts? It will be remembered by those who were here last year that the late government decided to embark on the construction of certain branch lines in the non-railway counties in the eastern portion of Nova Scotia.

Three branches were selected as those most necessary to begin with—a short one in the Island of Cape Breton; a second one starting at Sunnybrae in the county of Pictou and reaching the town of Guysborough on the Atlantic seaboard, with a spur to the deep waters of Country Harbour; and a third commencing at Dartmouth, and passing through the Musquodoboit valley to the Dean settlement in the county of Halifax. This House accepted the proposal by a resolution. On that resolution there was quite a long discussion, a number of hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces, including the Prime Minister, speaking upon it. Acting on the resolution, the late government placed $200,000 in the estimates for the branch on the Island of Cape Breton, $1,000,000 for the Guysborough branch, and $1,000,000 for the branch in the county of Halifax. Very careful surveys had been made for these branches by the local government of Nova Scotia and a company called the Halifax and Eastern Railway Company. I see by the estimates that this information, which cost a great deal of money, is to be purchased by the government, there being an item of $85,000 for that purpose. There can be no question about the facts being in the possession of the government, as most careful surveys were made by the Halifax and Eastern Railway Company. Tenders were asked for, and about the time of the defeat of the late government, the contracts were awarded. The contract for the Guysborough branch was awarded to the Nova Scotia Construction Company of Sydney, which deposited, I am informed, $50,000 as security for the performance of the work. About the same time the late government purchased the Sunnybrae branch, which belonged to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, 12 miles in length, starting from Ferona on the Intercolonial railway and reaching Sunnybrae. It was intended that this should be made a branch of the Intercolonial railway. That branch will not be of much value unless it is extended into the county of Guysborough. Now, the re-

solution to which I have alluded was moved in this House on the 12th of December, 1910, by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), and I had the honour of seconding it. That resolution reads as follows:

That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived in the commercial and industrial development of the province of Nova Scotia when the Intercolonial railway of Canada should be extended into the non-railway counties of the eastern section of the province.

You will note that the resolution refers to 'the non-railway counties of the eastern section of Nova Scotia.' These counties were understood to be Guysborough and Victoria in the island of Cape Breton. The county of Halifax can scarcely be called a non-railway county, as it has a part of the Windsor branch within its bounds, the main line of the Intercolonial cutting it in two; the Dartmouth branch, and the Southwestern railway reaching from the city of Halifax to the boundary line of Lunenburg. The county of Halifax is almost gridironed with railways which have been built at the public expense, and the people of the county I represent have contributed their full share of the money. The eastern section of Halifax county, however, is in somewhat the same position as Guysborough in being without railway communication. The right hon. leader of the government on that occasion made a speech in which he urged that something definite and prompt should be done by the late government in regard to the construction of these branches. Permit me to quote a short extract from that speech, which was delivered in this House on the 12th of December, 1910. In referring to a series of meetings which he had held in Nova Scotia in that year, he said:

I passed along the shore of the county of Halifax to the county of Guysborough last summer. I travelled altogether about 500 miles through districts not served by railways at all, and where railway development would mean a great deal to the people and lead to considerable development in that little province.

I can tell the Minister of Railways a great many things I saw. I could speak of a great many districts where railway facilities might lead to very great progress and advancement in that little province. I saw, in the county of Guysborough just across the line from the county of Halifax, one of the most splendid harbours that can be found anywhere in the world—Country Harbour. This harbour stretches back ten miles from its mouth, with water close up to the shore everywhere from forty-five to sixty feet in depth, landlocked twice, and with a splendid roadstead outside, where, in almost any weather, ships can ride in safety—and have ridden in safety—without going inside... All along that shore are opportunities of development. The people of Halifax county, as well as those of Guysborough county, and those of other counties in the province of Nova Scotia to which allusion has been made, have, it seems to me, fairly good reason to complain that their interests in respect of railway development have not been properly attended to in the past. And especially is this true of the last fourteen years, when the coffers of this country have been filled to overflowing, according to the boasts of hon. gentlemen on the other side, and when huge projects of development have been undertaken... It comes down simply to this: does the government of this country propose to maintain the Intercolonial railway of Canada as a state-owned railway, or is it vacillating and hesitating, unable to make up its mind as to whether that road is to be a state-owned railway or is to be handed over to some private corporation for operation? I will assume for the moment that it is the intention of the government, as I believe it is the will of the people of Canada, that the Intercolonial shall still continue to be owned by the people of this country. Then, I say, it is the duty of the government, under these conditions, to give to the Intercolonial railway, not only in the province of Nova Scotia, but in every province of Canada, those facilities which a private corporation would give to that road, should it pass into the ownership of such corporation. This is no time for hesitation and vacillation. Make up your mind—and I hope you have made it up in the direction I have indicated; then, give to the Intercolonial the branches, feeders, extensions which would be given if it were owned by any of the great railway corporations.

I was very much pleased to listen to that speech, because I gave the right hon. gentleman credit for sincerity in making it. I felt that by that strong speech in favour of the branches proposed in the resolution for the non-railway counties he was committing himself to the proposition of building them. It will be noted that he made a very flattering reference to the port of Country Harbour, describing it as a splendid harbour, one of the best in the world; and with that I quite agree.

In a list of the ten great harbours of this continent I think you would have to include County Harbour, but, Sir, it was the Lord who gave us this harbour, it was the Lord who placed these granite headlands there that shelter us from the storms of the Atlantic. He placed those rugged mountains on either side and gave us these deep and placid waters in which the navy of Great Britain might ride in safety. We are thankful to Him for that, but where does my right hon. friend come in? Nature has done a great deal for us, but what is the Prime Minister of Canada willing to do for us? We did not ask him to do anything, but to keep his hands off. If he had kept his hands off what had been done by the government just defeated, this splendid harbour would have been connected with the great coal mines and with the trade and commerce of

Canada by two glittering lines of steel, fifty miles in length, in two years; all that he required to do was to leave it alone. The contract had been made, the money provided and the Lord knows that the railway was badly needed in that country. All these things had been done before my right hon. friend came into power. It is very fine to tell us about our beautiful harbour, but when he refuses to do anything to bring that harbour into touch with the trade of the rest of Canada I cannot give him credit for as much sincerity as I would have given him at the time he was making that speech. Note what he says:

> The people of Halifax county, as well as those of Guysborough county, and those of other counties in the province of Nova Scotia——

I presume he includes in that the people of Victoria.

> —to which allusion has been made, have, it seems to me, fairly good reason to complain that their interests in respect of railway development have not been properly attended to in the past. And especially is this true of the last 14 years, when the coffers of this country have been filled to overflowing.

Now, we have left with my right hon. friend a tidy surplus of $30,000,000 in the bottom of the chest. We have started him in business in as good shape as he could expect. He cannot, therefore, say that he has declined to place this in the estimates because he is short of money, it cannot be for the want of money. The meaning to me of that speech was: If you put me in power, if you give me charge of the affairs of this country, I will do this thing, I will do it without delay. This speech was made a campaign sheet by the Conservative party in eastern Nova Scotia. It was published in capital letters in the Guysborough 'Times,' in the county which I have the honour to represent. It was given great prominence in the Halifax 'Herald,' and other Conservative papers, and my opponent on every hustings in Guysborough county made frantic appeals to the people to desert me and vote for him because he said: If you ever want a railway in Guysborough you can only get it by voting for the Tory party. We have had two elections in that province, the local in June, and the Dominion in September, and at both of these elections in the county I represent this branch railway question was the leading issue, and the party of my right hon. friend committed themselves up to the hilt and professed to have the right hon. gentleman's authority for saying he was in favour of building this if he was returned to power. My right hon. friend did me the honour of visiting my county in 1910. He spoke at Sherbrooke at the village of Goldboro and in the town of Gusysborough and we were glad to see him there. One of the subjects he discussed was the great want of railway facilities in the county. I did not attend the meetings, but I understand he gave positive assurances that if he ever got into power he would build this important branch railway into the county of Guysborough. But he went further than that, he issued a manifesto to the electors of the county of Halifax prior to his own election and in his manifesto, if I understand it aright, he claimed that he was the man who originated this branch line idea in the province of Nova Scotia. I think I should embalm this manifesto on the pages of 'Hansard.' It reads:

> To the electors of the county of Halifax:
>
> Halifax, N.S., August 31, 1911.
>
> Gentlemen.—Three years ago you elected my colleague, Mr. A. B. Crosby, and myself to be your representatives in the parliament recently dissolved. Then, as now, the demands upon my time denied me the opportunity of holding many meetings in my constituency, or of meeting the electors personally.
>
> Upon the great issue which has precipitated dissolution, and upon other important issues now presented for the determination of the people, I have issued an address to the electors of Canada, which I submit to your consideration.
>
> Notwithstanding the enormous expenditure upon the National Transcontinental railway, little has been done to solve the transportation problem for Halifax. This port should become the real terminus of one or more great railway systems reaching into the prairie provinces and thence to the shores of the Pacific. The position and natural advantages of Halifax entitle it to that status. It is not necessary to enlarge upon the benefits which would thus enure to the constituency and to the province. It will be my aim and policy to accomplish this result.
>
> Railway extension through the eastern part of the county has for many years been urgent. For fifteen years the federal government with abounding revenues has remained indifferent and inactive. During the past session, while both federal and provincial governments were trifling with the question, I took the ground in parliament that the road should be built as a part of the Intercolonial railway and without delay. As a result of this the federal government has apparently been awakened to a momentary sense of its duty, and an item of $1,000,000 has been inserted in this year's estimates for the commencement of the work.
>
> The highways through the country districts of this and other counties have been for many years, and now are, in a disgraceful condition. The time has come when the federal government should co-operate with and assist the provincial governments in the establishment of a system of permanent state highways. This policy which is outlined in my general address will be of vast advantage to this county, which has suffered so long in this respect.
>
> The fishing industry, so important to our province, is carried on largely by boat fishermen. The conditions governing boat fishing have changed greatly of late years. Fish-

ing is now frequently carried on many miles outside our territorial waters and during the entire year. The boats employed are more expensive, better equipped and more costly to operate than those in general use some years ago. Thus, boat fishing has become largely a permanent employment, and those engaged in it are in reality seamen. This change is advantageous to the industry, because it ensures a regular supply throughout the year, which is essential in order to retain our hold on the markets. The Liberal-Conservative party has adopted and will carry out the policy of extending to the boat fishermen the same free medical aid and attendance afforded to those employed on Canadian vessels engaged in the deep sea fisheries.

Before the close of the campaign I hope to have the privilege of addressing you upon these and other important questions.

In conclusion, I desire to pay a well deserved tribute to the energy, the zeal and the industry with which my colleague, Mr. Crosby, has faithfully discharged his duty as your representative. He has been prompt, active and earnest on all occasions to safeguard and maintain the interests of his constituents.

Faithfully yours,
R. L. BORDEN.

You will note that in this address my hon. friend says that the old government was trifling with this question of building railway branches in those two counties and that he took the ground in parliament that the road should be built as a part of the Intercolonial railway and without delay.

As a result of that, the late government were awakened to a sense of their duty, and they voted $1,000,000 to build a branch in his own constituency. You will note that he was in a hurry on that occasion. In the case of the Navy Bill he wanted the word 'speedy' inserted, he wanted to push it along faster. In this case he uses the phrase 'without delay,' he was impatient to have the Guysborough road and the Halifax road built at once when he was in opposition. Now this address I have read refers especially to the road in his own constituency, and these roads were practically going over the same ground. One would almost think by reading his address that he had originated the proposition. He does not say anything about the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) who has been the pioneer on this question for a great many years; he does not give any credit to the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) who was really the man that brought on the resolution on which this estimate was founded. I am willing to give credit to my right hon. friend, where he deserves it, for originating anything in this House. I think he should take credit for originating the idea of medicine for the fishermen. That was his own idea. I have had a good deal to do with the fishing industry of this country. I was chairman of the fishery committee for a number of years, and I never heard a request for free medicine from the fishermen until I saw it in this document. But while I am quite willing to give him credit for that—and I want it understood that I am not opposed to free medicine for the fishermen, I am willing to give him credit for that—at the same time, I am not willing to give him credit for being the originator of branch lines in Nova Scotia, or anywhere else. He got the money very easily, he asked for it, and the government placed $1,000,000 in the estimates—just as easy as asking, that is all he had to do. I wish we could get money out of him as easy as that, by simply requesting it, and being handed out a million like rolling off a log. Now, I have pointed out by all these speeches of the right hon. gentleman in my county, and in the House of Commons, that he pledged himself up to the hilt in regard to this Guysborough branch railway. I quoted from his speech in the House of Commons, I referred to his remarks at Sherbrooke, and at Guysborough. Now that he is in power, what has become of it all? Does it mean anything? How is he going to redeem these pledges that he gave to the people of Guysborough when he was in opposition? Is he going to forget all his Tory friends in the county of Guysborough that trusted him so implicitly on this question? Is he going to forget the fishing industry in which he took such a lively interest at the time of the election? Let me tell him that the medicine will be of no use if he does not give the fishermen a railway into Guysborough county. Is he going to forget all about the harbour, the most splendid harbour in the world, to which he gave such a great certificate? Is he going to forget his friends, Mr. Rowlings, Mr. McNutt and Mr. Wells, those gentlemen who travelled over the county with him, and promised this railway to every fisherman, and farmer, and every one else in the county of Guysborough, if they would vote for him. But after all, he seems to have capitulated to some kind of petty party consideration, and he strikes the million dollars for the Guysborough railway from the estimates.

Now, I would like to be permitted to point out the contrast between the Prime Minister and the leader that I have the honour to follow on this side of the House. I don't like to make comparisons, but this comparison is very striking. When my leader was dealing with this question he looked over the requirements of eastern Nova Scotia. He saw that all that territory east of Halifax harbour was undeveloped, that there were great resources there. He did not care anything about

the county line, as to whether it was Halifax or Guysborough. He saw that two branches were needed, and he laid the two branches down on the map, irrespective of who represented the county. My leader dealt with it in a broadminded way, and he gave the two branches, one for Halifax and one for Guysborough; and I have never been prouder of him in looking over this matter than I am to-night, in comparing him with the leader we have on the other side of the House. Now we all admire a man with generous instincts, a broadminded statesman; but what do you think of a statesman that cannot see across the line fence of his own county? That is not what one would expect from a Right Honorable Privy Councilor of Great Britain. That is not what one would expect from the Prime Minister of a great country like Canada. I do not want it to be thought that I am opposed to the Musquodoboit branch. I will cheerfully vote for the Musquodoboit branch when the matter comes before the House. It is just as necessary that it should be built as the other; and I rejoice at the success of the people of Halifax in getting the Musquodoboit branch. How is it that my right hon. friend selected the Musquodoboit branch and condemned the Guysborough branch? An hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean) suggests that I call it the Dartmouth branch, perhaps that is a better name. Why does the Prime Minister condemn the Guysborough branch and select the Dartmouth branch? Can he give me any good reason? Why does he discriminate against the branch into the county of Guysborough? He cannot say that it is for lack of money with wich to build it. While I do not want to say anything against the Dartmouth branch as a business proposition, I make the statement without fear of contradiction that the Guysborough branch is a better business proposition than the Musquodoboit branch. To begin with, the Guysborough branch starts from one of the greatest coal mines in eastern Canada and ends at a great harbour on the Atlantic seaboard. There is a chance of development, a chance of trade. While the Dartmouth branch is defensible, and runs through a good country, still it ends in the woods. There is not a town at the terminus, no hotel there, it is simply a country district. You may get some logs to carry, some lumber to carry, but the two branches cannot be compared with one another, so far as the development that might take place is concerned. At the same time let it be understood that I am in favour of the Dartmouth branch, and I believe it will be a feeder of the Intercolonial. I may point out that along the line proposed to be run from Sunnybrae to Guysborough there is a large quantity of good timber that would keep a road busy for the first ten years to haul it out. The branch that runs to the town of Guysborough taps Chebucto bay, which is close to the best fishing grounds on the Atlantic seaboard. This road runs through a good agricultural country, equal to the Musquodoboit, I have here an example of the progress that has been made in the town of Canso for some years past, and I will place it on the 'Hansard' as an illustration of what can be done when you give the people railway facilities. Fifteen years or so ago they did not have a daily boat between the town of Canso and the railway at Mulgrave The late government, with its characteristic enterprise in promoting the trade and industries of the country, gave us a subsidy for a daily boat, and immediately the fresh fish branch of that industry began to grow. Here are the figures:

Comparative Shipments of Fish via Intercolonial railway from Mulgrave.

Year.	Tons Fish Shipped.	Value.	Railway and Express Charges Paid.
		$	$ cts.
1891.....	162	11,340	1,134 00
1895.....	790	67,900	4,805 00
1896.....	900	73,000	6,460 00
1897.....	997	77,600	9,596 00
1898.....	1415	99,050	11,312 83
1899.....	1353	94,710	14,493 00
1900.....	1450	100,000	16,500 00
1901.....	1900	133,000	19,760 00
1902.....	1800	126,000	18,720 00
1903.....	1600	112,000	16,840 00
1904.....	1700	127,500	17,680 00
1905.....	2201	116,070	23,032 06
1906.....	3154	220,780	29,063 01
1907.....	3156	220,920	27,417 70
1908.....	3372	235,900	31,644 03
1909.....	2371	191,170	26,685 55
1910.....	3431	240,100	36,022 58
1911.....	4110	308,250	45,179 11

Average = More than a car load per day.

That is splendid growth as the result of providing railway facilities for the town of Canso and remember, that is only the fresh fish business, that is only one branch of the business; it takes no account of passenger traffic, or salt fish or with all the other traffic which these boats bring to the Intercolonial railway.

Commencing in 1891 with $1,134 this trade grew until last year the Intercolonial railway got from it the magnificent sum of $45,179.11. More than a car-load a day of fresh fish was shipped by the Intercolonial railway throughout the whole year. In 1911, 4,110 tons of fish were shipped which, at ten tons to the car, makes a good deal more

than one car-load for every day in the year. If that can be done by one town like Canso in fresh fish business alone you can see what development could be brought about by a railway reaching along that shore and touching at points like Country Harbour and Guysborough. I attribute this splendid development of the fresh fish business at Canso largely to the facility given by the daily boat by which people were enabled to ship their fresh fish to Mulgrave to be forwarded by train from that port. The late government also placed fast freight trains on the Intercolonial railway starting on schedule time from Halifax and Mulgrave. These trains joined at Truro and then went on through to Montreal. A car-load of fresh fish is placed on this train and the shipper knows that it will get to Montreal on a certain day and at a certain hour in the day. That has done a great deal to advance the fresh fish trade. In addition to that refrigerator cars and icing facilities were placed along the line, express charges were lowered and the late government paid a part of the expressage in order to carry the fresh fish of the country into the market in Ontario and the west.

But what we need more than anything else is a railway connection with the shore. If you can give us at Canso a branch line of the Intercolonial railway reaching down to the water where the fish are landed so that we can get the fresh fish loaded on board the cars where it is landed from the sea like they do in Aberdeen and other parts of England and Scotland. We will make Canso the Gloucester of Canada, we will make it a bigger and a more thriving town than Gloucester in the United States, or Grimsby in England, situated as Canso is upon a Cape jutting out into the Atlantic and being the best fishing ground in existence anywhere on this continent to-day. With all these chances of development you can understand how great the disappointment was, after our struggles for the last number of years, to find that the million dollars placed in the estimates by the late government had for some reason which I fail to understand, been struck out by the present government. I am not here to ask for any favours for my constituents, but I am here to demand fair-play and their just right. The county of Guysborough is one of the oldest settled portions of this Dominion and ever since railway construction commenced in Canada many years ago my constituents have borne their full share of the $400,000,000 that was contributed by the governments of this country to aid railways in other parts of Canada. I submit, Sir, that in all justice their time has come, or ought to have come. I wish to protest and I wish to do so as strongly as I can, against the discrimination which has been exercised with regard to the county of Guysborough. Why should my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) strike out Guysborough and leave the branch in his own county to be built? This step that he has taken will be resented in Guysborough and in every other county in Nova Scotia, for there is a general feeling in that province that there should be a branch line in Guysborough. There is such a thing as public opinion in Nova Scotia and I do not think that my right hon. friend can outrage public opinion in that way and escape.

The people of Canada are forming their opinions about the new cabinet and the new Prime Minister and I am sorry that he should give them such an opportunity as this to form an opinion about him. They are looking around to see whether the men who occupy the government benches are broad gauge men or narrow gauge men. The people of Canada and the gentlemen in the reporters' gallery have been watching the men who hold cabinet positions in the new government and some of the newspapers have been writing about the gloom of the front benches. If my hon. friends keep on as they have been doing for the last month or two, keep backsliding, keep going back on all the promises they made during the fifteen years they were in opposition, the front benches will be getting gloomier all the time.

How can we expect that gentlemen who occupy the Treasury Benches could look cheerful, when day after day they are engaged in the ghastly work of chopping off the heads of decent officials? How could we expect the Prime Minister to look cheerful, when one of his recent acts was to bring despair to the hearts of 17,000 people in his native province, and his own next door neighbours at that? The right hon. gentleman is not justified in interfering with an expenditure of this kind, the principle of which has been accepted by the House, and on which $150,000 has already been expended for no better reason than to serve the petty political purposes of the Conservative party. Let the right hon. gentleman answer this question: Why has he continued the appropriation to the Dartmouth branch line, and dropped the appropriation for the Guysborough branch line, thus discriminating against Guysborough?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton). My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has ably presented the facts to the Minister of Railways, and to the Prime Minister, and these facts apply to my county of Victoria as they do to the county of Guysborough. I was very much pleased, when on a former occasion I brought this matter to the attention of the House, to have the able advocacy of

Mr. R. L. Borden, then leader of the opposition. I was pleased, indeed, to have his support for the resolution I then moved, because I felt that the opposition which he then led would not criticise a vote if put in the estimates for the purpose of building this road. It is a great surprise now to me, and to the people I represent, many of whom are ardent supporters of the present adminstration, that the Prime Minister has made such a right-about-face upon this question, and has abandoned every argument he urged in favour of the proposition when he led the opposition. We know that the vote for the building of this railway received the assent of the House without a dissenting voice from Liberal or Conservative, and let me ask the Prime Minister what does he think of this setting aside of estimates, which have received the sanction of the Sovereign through the Governor General; which have been voted by this House, and solemnly consecrated so to speak to the purpose for which the money was voted? I never for a moment supposed that the money so voted for the building of a railway in the county of Victoria would not be expended for that purpose. I may be inexperienced in such matters, but it seems to me that money voted in that way by the parliament of Canada for a certain purpose should not be lightly dropped from the estimates, and the vote of parliament nullified. Not only has this government discriminated as between Guysborough and Halifax, but it seems to have discriminated against Cape Breton in favour of other parts of Canada. There is an enormous appropriation in the estimates for the development in New Brunswick, and I do not say that that appropriation was unnecessary, but we find the Prime Minister without having any particular knowledge of how much money it will be necessary to expend there altogether, committing himself to the project, and rejecting necessary works in the counties of Victoria and Guysborough, in his own province. In Prince Edward Island we find that pre-election promises to broaden the gauge of the railway on that island, and nobody knows how much that work will cost, are to be carried out; but, urgent and necessary works in the shape of railways on the Island of Cape Breton are to be rejected. Does the leader of the government think it fair to the good people of Cape Breton that the votes passed by parliament for the purpose of developing their country shall be rendered nugatory by this government, while expenditures ten times greater are to be made in New Brunswick where they have all the railway facilities that are for the present required? Surely, it ought to be expected that before this government undertook such large expenditures in places where they are not so much needed as in Cape Breton, railway extension should have been granted to the county of Victoria. I wish to point out that we are not asking for expenditure in a country where there is no promise of a return from it.

I have here a letter which was published in the 'Post' newspaper in the city of Sydney—a paper supporting the present administration. In that paper there is an open letter dated January 2, addressed to the Minister of Railways, advising him what he should do regarding the development of railway facilities in the island of Cape Breton and between the cities of Sydney and Halifax. That letter gives the income now being received from the Intercolonial railway and an estimate of the income that might be expected from further development. Here are the figures, taken from the Auditor General's Report for the year 1910:

Earnings.	Freight.	Passenger.	Total.
Montreal	$565 669.76	$171,213.42	$736,883.18
St. John	470,105.86	124,240.44	594,346.50
Halifax.	640,631.33	193,022.64	833,674.17
The Sydneys..	663,138.34	138,511.12	801,570.46

These are the earnings from that part of the country for which I am asking further developments. That section is paying better returns to the Intercolonial railway than any other place from Montreal to the terminus of the road at the city of Sydney. When the Intercolonial railway was extended into the island of Cape Breton, it was said that it would not pay. We denied that statement and our contention has been proved correct. In the county of Victoria we have exactly the same resources, the same raw material to be developed. It is a good farming and lumber county and a splendid fish county. What my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said about his county is equally true about the county of Victoria. You cannot find a better sea coast any where for fish, and the fish from that county does not go into Canadian territory at all. It is brought directly on board vessels from ports in the county of Victoria right into Boston and other New England markets. To ship to our own markets would involve double freight handling. This magnificent fish, therefore, is sent direct to the United States and exchanged for goods which are brought back here, paying duty each way, which duties have of course to be paid by the Canadian people. But if we had the proper railway facilities, we would be in a position to send our fish direct into our own Canadian markets. I hope that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) will give this matter further consideration. For the last ten years I have been continually advocating this railway extension, and I heaved a sigh of relief last session when the government agreed to build this branch. I am all the more sorry that I have to begin the battle

over again. I have no wish to weary the House or the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways. The right hon. the Prime Minister knows the situation as well as I. He knows every corner of Nova Scotia, its resources and necessities. He certainly explained them forcibly in his speech which was quoted by the hon. member for Guysborough this evening, and his knowledge cannot be less to-day than it was then. I am sorry that he should have found it necessary to cut off the votes for the counties of Guysborough and Victoria, while retaining the vote for his own county. I would rather have expected him to leave his own county out and provide for the others. I trust we shall have some good explanation for the course taken, and I cannot too strongly urge on the government the carrying forward of this project which the former government undertook.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways). The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) told us that if I put one million dollars in the estimates he would not talk for an hour, but the thought occurred to me that it would cost the country a little too much if I were to accept his offer just now. The reason why there is no vote in the estimates this year is that the late government could not make up its mind as to which route the railway should take. They started at the blind end of the railway, near the ocean, and they purposed building for forty-three miles there, but they could not decide as to whether they would start the line from Sunnybrae or come across at the end of the Dartmouth road, which probably arose from the fact that they were considering the number of constituencies which might be influenced. Further surveys will be necessary. The engineer of the department has sent me a memorandum stating that surveys must be made, and of course hon. gentlemen will easily understand that there has been no time to undertake that work since we have come into office. I may say, further, that although hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted a great number of figures, there are no statistics in the department which I preside over, to warrant us going on with the construction of this railway now. I believe that before committing the country to any expenditure, we should be able to give the people a just reason for our action, and we should see that the taxpayers of Canada get a fair return for the money expended or at least sufficient to pay the interest on the capital. I know it is very desirable that the different provinces should be opened up so that their natural resources may be developed to the best advantage, and I trust that in the coming summer sufficient information may be obtained to determine the route and other considerations so that we may be able to come to a conclusion on the matter before we meet the House again at the end of the present year.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think the minister will agree with me that it is hardly fair to the contractors to delay the work any longer. A great deal of important work could be done during the winter season. At any rate, I would like to know when the minister expects to be able to enter into a formal contract for the construction of the Dartmouth branch, and if he expects that the construction will be commenced shortly?

Mr. COCHRANE. The contractor has been already ordered to go on. With regard to the Prince Edward Island railway, I do not think it would be prudent on our part to construct any more narrow gauge branches, in view of the policy of the government to establish a railway ferry, and to widen the gauge all over the island.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Inasmuch as it appears that a new survey must be made before this Guysborough road is an accomplished fact, may I suggest that the Minister of Railways take into consideration a proposition which has been put before the government to solve the difficulty, that is, that the road should start at or near South River or Antigonish, and pass up the South River valley to Country Harbour, with a branch line to Guysborough. I understand that Mr. P. S. Archibald is now in charge of the engineering work in the Halifax district, and he is quite familiar with the proposed route. I think he made a survey there some years ago for some company. There would be no engineering difficulties in the way of the construction of this road. It would be practically level, there would be no great bridges to be built, it would be a very cheap road to build, and it would pass through a magnificent agricultural district, one of the finest in the eastern part of the province. It will not be a bleeder or milker of the Intercolonial railway, but will on the contrary be a feeder from the start, and a good paying proposition. If Mr. Archibald is instructed to make a survey, I have no doubt that he will report favourably on the proposed road.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, no one appreciates more than I do the very great importance of the fishing industry of the province of Nova Scotia and its future development upon a much greater scale than has been attained in the past. I realize also the extreme importance of railway connection with points on the coast. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has given relief to his feelings in

a speech of about an hour. The only fault I have to find with it is that he might have condensed it into about ten minutes. The hon. gentleman is exhibiting at present an impatience that was not apparent during the ten years that he sat in this House, and never said a word about this matter. I want to tell him that he need not be at all pessimistic about it. He speaks about this government forgetting Guysborough. I would not be very much surprised if my hon. friend were quite willing that we should forget Guysborough if he thought he could make some political capital out of it; but we do not propose to forget Guysborough, and we propose to deal with the question of railway development in Nova Scotia by branch lines of the Intercolonial railway exactly along the lines which have been spoken of by me in the past. But I would like to remind the hon. gentleman, and also the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), that we cannot do everything at once or in the absence of certain information that is essential. The estimates for the present year are already running up to a very considerable figure, and there are those on this side of the House who have not been altogether pleased because the estimates do not contain some items which concern their constituencies. It is perfectly apparent that while we ought to proceed with the development of our transportation lines as rapidly as possible, we cannot do everything in one year. With regard to the Musquodoboit railway, the development of the port of St. John, the car-ferry between Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, all these matters have been brought to the attention of the House and pressed with great persistence, on many occasions. The hon. member for Guysborough will remember that some years ago, previous to an election, there was some work done on this Guysborough line by his own political friends.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What does my right hon. friend refer to?

Mr. BORDEN. I am referring to a piece of this line which I saw myself when in Guysborough.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will my right hon. friend permit me to explain that? That piece of line was built by a company, of which the late Mr. Fitzpatrick, of New Glasgow, was the president, a company consisting altogether of men of his own party. There was no politics in it at all. Nobody, who knows the facts, in Nova Scotia will say that it had any political meaning; but Mr. Fitzpatrick promoted the company to build that Country Harbour branch, and he fell down, because he could not get the money. He died in London while trying to promote this railway. He was a Conservative member of parliament in Nova Scotia; and associated with him in the company was Mr. McCormick, of Parry Sound, and Mr. McLeod, of Northern Ontario, both former members of this House, and both of the same political stripe as my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN. The provincial government of Nova Scotia, as I understand, put the carrying out of that road as an election promise.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Not at all.

Mr. BORDEN. I have no personal knowledge of that, but I have been informed that such was the case by respectable citizens of the county which my hon. friend represents.

All I have to say about the Guysborough road is that we cannot undertake all these things at once. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has had the importance of railway development in Nova Scotia placed before him not only by myself but by delegations which met him in Nova Scotia. He is thoroughly impressed with the importance of that development but it cannot all be done at once. As I have already said, the estimates for this year run to a large amount and do include the items to which my hon. friend made allusion. I do not know whether he objects to that or not. So far as I understand that item it simply amounts to this, that this government is willing to pay the reasonable value to the country of those surveys which were made by a company that proposed to undertake this work and which afterwards gave it up because the late government came to the conclusion, in consequence of a debate I think initiated in this House by the hon. member from North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie), that it would be the best policy to have that road built as a branch line of the Intercolonial railway, and I still have the temerity to think, notwithstanding the remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough, that the attitude which I ventured to take in the discussion of that motion had a good deal to do with the subsequent course of the government with regard to that very matter, and I know by the expression of approval which I see on the face of my hon. friend from North Cape Breton and Victoria that he entirely agrees with me in that. I would ask my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), not to be so downhearted and pessimistic about the prospects of railway development in Nova Scotia. Matters may have a gloomy appearance to him at present, but I will ask him to cheer up and come to the conclusion that the claims of Guysborough will be recognized, notwithstanding the fact that he represents that constituency. The county of Guysborough has a

very important fishing industry, no one realizes that more thoroughly than I do. So have the counties of Halifax, North Victoria and Cape Breton, and no one is more anxious than I am to do everything that can be done in reason to give railway development to every one of those counties in order that the fishing industry may be carried on upon a scale that has been absolutely unknown in the past.

So far as the voting of the estimates to which my hon. friend called attention is concerned, it is perfectly true that five twelfths of the amounts were voted in the first instance without discussion, and when we came back in the early part of this session we voted the other seven twelfths without discussion. My hon. friend knows the explanation then made. We had no time to revise the estimates or to consider what we could or could not do. These estimates were placed before the House with a distinct statement and understanding that in voting the balance of the estimates we must be left free to deal with the situation in any particular case according to what we conceived to be in the public interest.

Under these circumstances, I do not think there is any reasonable ground for complaint so far as the county of Halifax is concerned. It is not gridironed with railways by any means. There is more than 100 miles in the eastern part of the county of Halifax which has been settled for more than 100 years that has no railway communication. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) knows that as well as I do. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is also aware of that fact. Thus it does not seem to me that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has any reasonable ground of complaint against the appropriation for the purpose of building the Halifax and Musquodoboit Valley railway.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not making any complaint against that, I am heartily in favour of it, and I said so in my speech.

Mr. BORDEN. I am glad to hear the hon. member is in favour. He seemed to think that it should not be built until we could build all these roads at once. We cannot build all these roads at once, but we can make a beginning and every one in Nova Scotia realizes that the Musquodoboit Valley railway has been upon the tapis in that province and has been discussed at every election during the past thirty years. It is a magnificent fertile valley, the building of the road will open up a fine country and I see no ground whatever for any complaint in regard to the construction of this road.

In conclusion I can only say to my hon. friend from Guysborough and my hon. friend from North Cape Breton and Victoria that the claims of their counties in respect of these matters will receive the careful and earnest consideration of the government, but that they must remember that everything cannot be done in one year or at one session.

Mr. KYTE. Perhaps this would be an oportune time to receive a declaration from the right hon. the leader of the government with respect to the question of acquiring branch railways in the maritime provinces. That question has been closely associated with the question of extending the Intercolonial railway. The agitation for the construction of branches in the counties of Halifax and Guysborough has not been more active or earnest than that for the acquiring of branch lines in the maritime provinces. I will be glad if the Prime Minister will be good enough to say whether we are to hope that at an early date this government will carry out the policy adopted by the late government in respect to that matter. The present government obtained power largely on a policy of leaving well enough alone and the people of the maritime provinces would be very much disappointed if the policy adopted by the late government in regard to branch railways was not let alone and carried out without change. I was somewhat disappointed at the declaration made by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) a few days ago on this point, when he said that only such railways as would be feeders to the Intercolonial railway could be taken over and not such railways as would be milkers. The Intercolonial railway has been a milker of the green spots of the maritime provinces for a good many years. The most profitable and prosperous districts have been tapped by it and it has obtained business from these portions of the maritime provinces. Thus it could scarcely be expected that private capital could be got to come in and supply the unprofitable sections of the country with railways, and I deem it the duty of the government in the line of the policy of a generous expenditure with respect to railway and canal operations in other parts of Canada, to pay some attention to this important matter and at an early date to give some assurance to the people of the maritime provinces that the branch railways will be acquired on the lines of the policy laid down by the late governement.

Mr. BORDEN. I might inform my hon. friend of a circumstance that does not seem to have been brought to his attention, that under the policy announced by the late government and put in the form of a statute, which is still in force, I do not think that any one of the branch lines to which he alludes could be taken over. I think the terms fixed in that statute

would probably prevent any one of these branch lines being taken over. The terms of the statute, as the hon. gentleman knows, are very severe and stringent. When the hon. gentleman asks whether there is any hope, I can only reply to him in the words of the old adage, that while there is life there is hope, and there is probably good hope now since a progressive government is upon the treasury benches.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understood the Minister of Railways to say that he had some figures in his possession which indicated that the Guysborough branch line was not a good commercial venture. If he has such figures, I would ask if he would place them on the table of the House.

Mr. COCHRANE. I said there were no figures in the department on which I could base that claim.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Before you leave the Chair, I would like to say a word or two with regard to the subject which my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has brought to the attention of the House. The proposition to build this railway to Guysborough was one which, in the last parliament ,received the unqualified approval of the then leader of the opposition. As he has told us himself to-night, he supported the resolution moved by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) on this question of railway extension in Nova Scotia. I can remember the right hon. gentleman declaring in the most emphatic tones that it was the bounden duty of the government then to proceed with the construction of these railways in eastern Nova Scotia. Why has the right hon. gentleman adopted different tactics? Why does he come here now, when he has the power to implement his studied and measured statement of a year ago, when he has the responsibility in his own hands, and deliberately refuse to carry out the promises he then gave to the country, and upon which he and his supporters in the county of Guysborough canvassed during the last election? He was not satisfied with declaring to this House the necessity of the construction of that railway into Gusborough; but when he came before the people of Nova Scotia and asked for their support in the election, he issued a manifesto in which he declared that he and his party were pledged irrevocably to the construction of this railway. Why does he hesitate to implement that promise to-day? He has a surplus, I am told, which runs into tens of millions, he has ample money left him as a result of the wise administration of the last government. The last government, had they remained in power with the money at their disposal which the hon. gentleman has, would have gone on and built that railway.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why was not the contract for the whole road let, instead of only a little bit of it?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend need not try to escape from the responsibility by saying that only a part of it was let. Let us see where the Minister of Railways stands with regard to this proposition. Let us see what the late government did with the support of the then leader of the opposition. They proceeded to purchase a line of railway from Eureka to Sunnybrae, from the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, among the directors of which are a number of the friends of my friends opposite, who have come to the leader of the government and the Minister of Railways and asked them to continue the construction of the railway. My hon. friend knows that they proceeded to call for tenders for the construction of another portion of the railway, these tenders were received, and a contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. Now, the present Minister of Railways comes along and tells us we will disregard the purchase of this railway from the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, we will disregard the tenders that were called for, because the late government did not let the contract for the whole line. My hon. friend's excuse is not good enough; he is trying to escape from the responsibility which falls upon him. They say down in Nova Scotia, even the friends of the hon. gentleman himself, that he is one of those gentlemen who regard the maritime provinces as an incubus upon the Dominion.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman has no right to make any such assertion.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am only telling you what the hon. gentleman's friends say in Nova Scotia in regard to it. I am not saying my hon friend the Minister of Railways made that statement, but by their fruits ye shall know them. My hon. friend is trying to escape from the policy which was laid down by his leader, and to which he pledged himself in this House, and upon which he and his friends went before the people in Nova Scotia asking for support. Now we are told that nothing is to be done because the late government did not let a contract for the whole road. That answer won't go with his friends in Nova Scotia. Then the leader of the government tells us to-night: If you will wait some time in the future, perchance this railway will be built. Is that to be the way all the promises made by the right hon. gentleman in opposition are to be fulfilled? Is the answer to all these various propositions to be that some time in the

sweet bye-and-bye we will build the railway and we will provide all these sums of money that we assured you would be spent? Is the Minister of Railways to be the medium of carrying out the promises of his leader, or of attempting to see how he can avoid carrying them out? The Minister of Railways apparently is in the position before this House, and this country to-day of trying to find an excuse for not carrying out the promises of his leader. That is a very humiliating position to be in, Mr. Speaker. Either this railway in Guysborough county is required, or it is not. The Minister of Railways knows that a delegation of his own friends from eastern Nova Scotia waited on him in Halifax and pointed out how the greatest fisheries in the Dominion of Canada are barred from the markets of Canada, barred from that interprovincial trade which is said to be one essential in binding confederation together. My hon. friend's leader told us in the last parliament that they would remove that difficulty, and give the people railway communication. Yet to-night the Minister of Railways tells us that they are not going to do anything of the kind. Perhaps if you will be good boys, sometime in the future we will do something for you. That is practically the position. I want to say that the right hon. leader of this government came to Nova Scotia, and when the question was raised as to his position in regard to this railway matter, did he say, as his minister says to-day: We are not going to build this railway because the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not call for tenders for the whole of it?

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say that.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then all I have to say is that the Minister of Railways was trying to say something like that, perhaps he did not succeed in doing it. Apparently both he and his leader are taking the position that they are not going to do anything now. My hon. friend disclaims that as being a reason, but if it is not there is no other reason. On the eve of the last election his leader, in the manifesto issued to the people in Nova Scotia, gave his word of honour that if he and his party came into power they would construct this railway. Now they propose to build this railway in the Prime Minister's constituency, which will run up into the woods and stop there, without giving any communication to the fishing industries of Nova Scotia, and will fail to supply the great fishing industry on the banks of the south portion of Nova Scotia a means of access to the Canadian market. Let it be understood that that is the result of the declaration of the government in regard to this matter to-night. The right hon. leader of this government stands in this position, that he has falsified his position taken up in the last session, and falsified his promise to the people of Nova Scotia on the eve of the last election.

Mr. CROTHERS. Those of us who have listened to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) for several years, are not surprised at the very eloquent speech he has made, based upon absolutely nothing. The right hon. the Prime Minister told this House a few minutes ago that he was in favour of the construction of this railway, the Minister of Railways said in substance that he was in favour of it. The Prime Minister said: We cannot do it all at once. Then my hon. friend from Pictou gets up and makes an eloquent speech of some length on the assumption that we never intend to build it. That is the logic of the speech delivered by my hon. friend.

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

Labour—Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of the 'Labour Gazette,' and allowance to correspondents, $30,300.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) tell me why, without any reason, he has removed every correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' in Nova Scotia?

Mr. ROGERS. We have had that to night already.

Mr. CROTHERS. What was the hon. gentleman's question?

Mr. MACDONALD. Would the Minister of Labour tell me why he has removed the correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' in the county of Pictou?

Mr. CROTHERS. What is his name?

Mr. MACDONALD. Thomas Hale.

Mr. CROTHERS. If my hon. friend had been in the House this afternoon, instead of being away where he should not have been perhaps, he would have heard this whole matter discussed. As a matter of fact, Mr. Hale has not been dismissed.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am very glad to learn it. My information was to the contrary. I saw a statement in a local paper to that effect. I hope my hon friend will not dismiss Mr. Hale. If my hon. friend will give me the assurance that he will not be dismissed—

Mr. CROTHERS. Mr. Hale will be treated just as other correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette'. If my officer who has charge of the publication says that Mr. Hale is a good correspondent he will be retained.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is that the only qualification that my hon. friend requires? What does he consider constitutes qualification?

Mr. CROTHERS. There are several qualifications necessary. If my hon. friend had been here this afternoon he would have heard me state that when I got the report from the officer having charge of that publication on all the correspondents throughout Canada those that were reported as being incompetent, inefficient and careless were notified that they would not be required after the 1st of January. This was done without any reference to politics whatever. I did not know the politics of any one of them. Correspondents irrespective of their politics have been retained and nobody has been discharged except under circumstances I have mentioned.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am quite sure that the gentleman as to whom I have interrogated my hon. friend has been a most worthy correspondent, most satisfactory in every way and I hope that my hon. friend will deal with him solely on that basis.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These items have been taken up without any notice to this side of the House. We were all under the impression that the public works items would be considered. My hon. friend who represents Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), and who takes a very great interest in the labour movement, I am sure, would like to have been here while these items are under consideration. There is another matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the minister, and that is that the hon. member for Maisonneuve made a very courteous request, and a request which he had a perfect right to insist upon as a member of this House, that a list should be furnished of the names of the correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' who had been dismissed. I do think that my hon. friend the minister should comply with that request, and I think he ought to comply with it before asking the committee to pass the items which appear upon page 84. I submit to my hon. friend that that request is only reasonable and there are two good reasons for not going on with these items to-night. One is that we were informed that public works items would be under consideration, and, secondly, because the request of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve has not been complied with.

Mr. MONK. I was asked this afternoon to postpone consideration of the estimates of the Public Works Department on account of the absence of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was only Quebec.

Mr. MONK. In regard to that, the officers of my department have been extremely busy, they are having the notes containing the information in regard to the items typewritten; the work is not altogether finished, but it will be ready to-morrow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be better for the committee to rise if there is no other business ready.

Mr. MONK. There was no pledge that we would take up Public Works? In the statement made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), he said that Public Works or Customs, probably, would be taken up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The two were mentioned—Customs and Public Works. I referred to the fact that we were to have some information and some returns with regard to dismissals made by the Minister of Customs before proceeding further with estimates of that department, and then we all understood that Public Works would be taken up. These were the only departments which were mentioned, and I am sure that the hon. member for Maisonneuve—

Mr. MONK. He was here a moment ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has been here; he is not here at the present time; he has made a request and this is the best way, with all courtesy and all reason, to enforce the request of any member upon this side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Here he is, now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, my hon. friend from Maisonneuve is now here and I will repeat in his presence what I have said, that we were given to understand that the items for consideration this evening would be in the estimates of the Department of Public Works. There was no notice that items in connection with the Labour Department would be taken up, and I think that the request of the hon. member for Maisonneuve should be complied with before these items are considered. If my hon. friend is willing to waive that request and go on with the consideration of these items without getting the information, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. CROTHERS. I stated to my hon. friend from Maisonneuve this afternoon that I did not desire to expose to the public the names of those gentlemen who had been notified that their services would not be required after the 1st January.

An hon. MEMBER. That is absurd.

Mr. CROTHERS. I thank my hon. friend for saying it is absurd. I told the hon. gentleman that if he would take the responsibility of insisting on the publication of the names they would be published, but I did not understand him to take that re-

sponsibility. The hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) has now assumed that responsibility, and so I give the names:

Gustave Audet, Montreal, Que.
George Bartley, Vancouver, B.C.
J. A. Chenevert, Sorel, Que.
E. E. Cinq-Mars, Hull, Que.
F. A. Derman, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J. R. Falconer, Newcastle, N.B.
N. C. Franklin, Brockville, Ont.
J. F. Girard, Montreal, Que.
R. F. Gofton, Berlin, Ont.
Joseph Hanley, Belleville, Ont.
E. Little, Quebec, Que.
D. Mitchell, Windsor, Ont.
F. J. Nash, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
A. D. Pepin, St. Johns, Que.
A. D. Ross, Amherst, N.S.
J. A. Wiley, St. Catharines, Ont.

The main estimates last year provided for $27,300, and my predecessor found it necessary to put an additional sum of $3,000 in the supplementary estimates which have not yet been voted, so that we ask for $30,000, which is exactly the sum expended last year.

Mr. VERVILLE. Is it the intention to replace the dismissed men by men in the labour movement who have a thorough knowledge of labour conditions, or will lawyers and professional men be appointed who cannot possibly be competent for such duties? I can inform the minister that the only place it is possible to gather information on labour conditions, in the large centres especially, is through the different labour organizations, and it is very important that the minister should remember this. The fair wage officer generally goes to the labour temple in the large cities, and false information has never been given to him. It is just as important to the labouring men that this information should be correct as it is to the government and the 'Labour Gazette'. Of course, if the minister appoints incompetent men we shall very soon be able to discover that. He has announced that Mr. Audet and Mr. Girard have been dismissed in Montreal, and both happen to live in my riding which covers half the city. One is a carpenter, and the other a labourer, and Girard, who was a school teacher for eight years knows both languages and was competent to do the work. I do not ask the Minister of Labour to reappoint him because that is his business, and not mine, and no doubt the men who will get these places will be as good friends of mine as those dismissed. I am speaking now in the interests of the 'Gazette' when I ask that competent workingmen, and not professional men shall be appointed.

Mr. CROTHERS. Before appointing any correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' I will take good care to satisfy myself that he is qualified for the duties I desire him to perform. I am not in a position to promise that correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' will be drawn from any particular class, but I will undertake to be responsible that they are competent men. If they prove to be incompetent I will see that their services are dispensed with.

Mr. MURPHY. Where is the 'Labour Gazette' now printed?

Mr. CROTHERS. The 'Labour Gazette' is printed for us in or by the Printing Bureau. We have nothing to say as to where it shall be printed. So far as I am concerned nothing has been done to change the place of printing.

Mr. MURPHY. Is the 'Gazette' actually printed at the Printing Bureau or in some establishment outside?

Mr. CROTHERS. When I first took office I understood it was not printed in the Printing Bureau and that under direction of my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) it was printed in the 'Free Press' office in this city. I have heard, although I know nothing about it myself, that the printing has been changed from the 'Free Press' Company to another company in this city, but I have nothing to do with that. The Printing Bureau is supposed to do the printing for us and if any change is made it is made there.

Mr. MURPHY. Then we will get the information from the Secretary of State.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Secretary of State). I have no objection to giving all the information in my possession. Formerly the 'Labour Gazette' was not printed by contract, but was printed from month to month by the Ottawa 'Free Press.' The King's Printer informed me that other applications had been made to him to print it, one being by the Ottawa Printing Company. He told me he had informed himself as to the equipment of that establishment to handle the work and inasmuch as the company offered to print it at the same price that the Ottawa 'Free Press' was printing it at, he had my sanction to transfer the work from the 'Free Press' to the Ottawa Printing Company. I asked him if in his opinion he thought it would be necessary to call for tenders and he stated no, as he could testify that the prices were fair and reasonable, and, as a matter of fact, the prices instead of becoming lower since the work was given to the 'Free Press,' had actually gone up. He felt sure that if tenders were called he would not get it printed as cheaply as at present. Under the circumstances I gave my sanction to the work being transferred to the Ottawa Printing Company at the same price. There is no contract, and if at any time the work is not done satisfactorily to the King's Printer the arrangement can be changed.

Mr. MURPHY. I may say that the 'Labour Gazette' was not printed at the 'Free Press' under my instructions. It had been printed there for years before I came to the department and the work was continued there. But the fact that it was printed at the 'Free Press' and not at the Printing Bureau was a fertile subject for criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite when on this side. The hon. gentleman who used to lead these assaults on the former Minister of Labour is not in the House this evening; and as he is a personal friend of mine I shall not refer to his criticisms further, but shall content myself with reminding the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) that each time this estimate came up, there was an attack made on the late government for not having had the 'Gazette' printed at the Printing Bureau. Now, however, the contract is taken from the 'Free Press' and turned over to the Ottawa Printing Company without any tenders being asked for. This is just another evidence of the hollowness of the professions of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CROTHERS. The hon. gentleman objected to the word 'instructions,' but I understood that he was at the head of the Printing Bureau a number of years, and had control of the printing of the 'Labour Gazette.' The printing of the 'Labour Gazette' continued to be done by the 'Free Press' for years after my hon. friend became the head of the department, so I think I was not far astray in saying that it was done by his instructions.

Mr. MURPHY. It was not I who made the contract with the 'Free Press.' The contract was there and I continued it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What will be the cost of printing under the present contract?

Mr. ROCHE. That is impossible to tell because it varies from month to month. At any rate the cost will not vary much from that which we have been paying in years gone by.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is hardly a satisfactory answer. There is a rule governing all the departments, that where practicable, work shall be put up to public competition. I would like to hear the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) on this subject. During several sessions we were favoured with interesting speeches from him advocating public competition, and that not only printers friendly to the government, but also those opposed to the government should be given a chance to compete for the advertising. My hon. friend looks strong and healthy this session, and I am surprised that he has not yet opened his lips to offer any criticism upon any of the betrayals by the government of its professions, which we have brought to the attention of the House. I do not believe that, it would be possible for him to restrain himself when he finds a contract like this given absolutely without competition and without asking for any tenders.

Mr. MURPHY. Would the Secretary of State be kind enough to furnish us with the prices paid the 'Free Press' and those now being paid to the Ottawa Printing Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As well as the total estimated cost for the year.

Mr. MURPHY. Who compose the Ottawa Printing Company?

Mr. ROCHE. I have no knowledge whatever.

Mr. MURPHY. Were the overtures made to the King's printer?

Mr. ROCHE. He, who, I presume, was the proprietor, had an interview with myself. I think his name is Mr. Boudreau or some such name as that. I do not know who compose the company.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). One of my townsmen, I notice, is in the unfortunate list of correspondents removed from office—Mr. Mitchell, a very respectable and intelligent mechanic—and I am very much surprised to find his name in the black list. What is the particular reason for his dismissal, and was his dismissal recommended by the chief executioner for that district who represents North Essex (Mr. Wilcox)?

Mr. CROTHERS. Mitchell's work was not satisfactory to the officer in charge of the 'Labour Gazette.'

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). In what respect?

Mr. CROTHERS. I cannot go into the particulars now.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Was his dismissal recommended by the hon. member for North Essex or entirely at the instance of the department?

Mr. CROTHERS. I have no recollection of receiving any communication from the hon. member for North Essex asking for the dismissal of this man. I know, however, that he was not dismissed on the request of any one, but for the reason I have given.

Mr. DEVLIN. As the hon. Secretary of State contemplates making changes in the printing, I would like to remind him that the city of Hull is very near Ottawa and that we have establishments there for printing, and he might save the country considerable expense if he would inquire from the printers of Hull how much

they would charge to print the 'Labour Gazette.' He would no doubt have satisfactory work done in any one of these establishments.

Mr. McKENZIE. What is the circulation of the paper in the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. CROTHERS. I am sorry that I cannot tell at this moment, but I may be able to give the information to-morrow.

Mr. McKENZIE. Has anything been done to push the circulation by agency or otherwise?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find by the Auditor General's Report of last year that 184,000 copies were published and the cost ran very close to $17,000. Does the hon. minister think it right to hand over to a company, presumably friendly to the government, printing to this extent without taking the least trouble to obtain tenders? It is a very large order, and it seems to me that it is one in regard to which my hon. friend ought to have called for tenders, if not in a public way, at least by circulars issued to the different offices.

Mr. CARROLL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour if it is his intention or the intention of the government to introduce this session any amendment to the so-called Lemieux Act, especially the concilation part of it. The reason I ask this is that for many years past in this House, and on the hustings hon. gentlemen opposite criticised that Act very adversely.

Mr. CROTHERS. I have been considering very carefully the various provisions of the Lemieux Act with a view to improving its provisions, but I have not yet reached a conclusion, and it is not my intention to recommend to the government to introduce any amendments to that Act during the present session.

Mr. MURPHY. If the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), were in the House, he would be certain to ask the hon. Secretary of State if the Ottawa Printing Company were a union office. In his absence I beg to ask that question.

Mr. ROCHE. I know nothing whatever about the Ottawa Printing Company, whether it is a union office or not.

Mr. MURPHY. May I ask if the Ottawa Printing Company was recommended to the Secretary of State by the Ottawa members, or either of them?

Mr. ROCHE. I presume that the Ottawa members did recommend the Ottawa Printing Company.

Mr. DEVLIN.

Mr. EMMERSON. This parliament during the last three or four years, passed an Act which prohibited any department giving any such order without first asking for public tenders. I would ask the Secretary of State if he is familiar with the passage of such an Act, which apparently has been disregarded, not only in the present instance, but in the action taken by his predecessor in office.

Mr. ROCHE. I am aware of the provisions of the Act to which the hon. member refers, but I presume that the government preceding this government did not look on this arrangement in the light of a contract that would come under those provisions, because it made an arrangement with the Ottawa Free Press Company to print the 'Labour Gazette' from month to month, and that arrangement could be terminated at any time possibly before the $5,000 would be reached. But I am somewhat surprised that the hon. member for Westmorland, and the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works should be so shocked at the idea of this government handing over the printing of the 'Labour Gazette' to the Ottawa Printing Company, in view of the fact that no word of criticism emanated from either of them when the government of which the ex-Minister of Public Works was a member made a contract, if contract it was, with the Ottawa Free Press Company for printing the 'Labour Gazette.' I am confident that if the Ottawa Free Press Company were still printing the 'Labour Gazette,' we would not have heard a word of remonstrance here.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may have been a member of the government when such a contract was entered into. If I have sinned, that certainly would be no justification for my hon. friend; but, in the light of the professions of my hon. friend and of those who surrounded him during the past few years, professions to which I have often listened to with admiration, I would naturally have expected that they at least would not have followed in the footsteps of their sinning predecessors.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Secretary of State if he does not think that for the printing of the 'Labour Gazette,' involving for 1913, an expenditure of $30,000, he should have asked for tenders. He must surely admit that he is skating on very thin ice when he seeks to overcome the principle of the Act referred to by dealing with the whole thing as a monthly expenditure. I do not think it is very important what the late Secretary of State did in this connection. If he did what the present Secretary of State proposes doing, he did wrong. Possibly the matter never came to the attention of the committee just in this light. I do not

think the Minister of Labour should get this vote until either he or the Secretary of State states that for the fiscal year 1913, he proposes to ask for tenders.

Mr. ROCHE. The hon. gentleman has entirely exaggerated the situation. The publication of the 'Labour Gazette' does not involve an expenditure of $30,000. All the expenditure connected with the Conciliation and Labour Act, and the allowance to correspondents is included in the vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the printing of the 'Labour Gazette' come to very nearly $17,000?

Mr. ROCHE. I cannot tell, for the reason that it is not let by contract for the year, but the expenditure varies from month to month. Of course, I assume responsibility for this as Secretary of State, but I am not a practical printer.

I did ask the King's Printer, a practical man appointed by the late government, whether in his opinion it was necessary to call for tenders, and he stated he did not think it was, that he could quite justify the expenditure, and that if he called for tenders, the work must be printed in this city anyway, and we could not have it done at as low a rate. I am not condemning the expenditure on the 'Labour Gazette' in years gone by, but as it is from month to month, and I had the advice of the King's Printer that it was not necessary to call for tenders, I was guided by his advice, and merely transferred the work to another establishment at the same rate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend remember that within a year or two this question came up in the House upon a motion, made, I think, by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asking this House to declare that as far as possible all work should be let by public competition, and was not that resolution unanimously passed?

Mr. MONK. Was it acted upon?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and acted upon continuously in the Department of Public Works, and I think my hon. friend is acting upon it to-day in that department. It is the law, as the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) says, that no contract for any public work involving an expenditure of more than $5,000 can be made except after public competition except in two cases, one where in the opinion of the chief engineer or the chief architect of the department the work can more properly be done by employees of the department or in cases of extreme urgency where in the opinion of the chief engineer or the chief architect it is in the public interest that it should be done without calling for tenders. The House, if I am not mistaken, affirmed clearly that that principle should govern in all the public departments. It was urged by hon. gentlemen opposite, and was concurred in by the members upon the then government side of the House, that what are known as patronage lists should be done away with, and that in all cases of obtaining supplies for the government there should be public competition, either an advertisement should be published in the newspapers inviting competition or circulars should be sent around to different people in a particular city where the supplies were to be obtained asking their prices. I think we ought to treat this matter with a good deal of earnestness. This is the first time in the history of this new parliament that the matter has been brought to the attention of the House, it certainly is a very glaring case. The Secretary of State made up his mind that he would no longer allow the printing of the 'Labour Gazette' to be done by the Ottawa 'Free Press' because those controlling the Ottawa 'Free Press' are Liberals. My hon. friend in defiance of the law, and of the express wish of the members on both sides of this House, has chosen to enter into a private contract involving the expenditure of about $17,000 a year for printing the 'Labour Gazette'. I ask him how he can justify that. It will not do for him to say that he gets it printed as cheaply as it was being printed by the Ottawa 'Free Press'. I do not know whether tenders were called when the contract was given to the 'Free Press', but I do know that very recently either in the last session or in the session before, both sides of the House expressed the view that work of any magnitude should only be done after public competition, that all patronage lists should be done away with, and that the government and all departments should endeavour to get the work done at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. MONK. Did not my hon. friend permit dredging to be done in the river Saguenay to the amount of $60,000 without tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were called for the dredging work on the Saguenay, the work was not let without inviting public tenders.

Mr. MONK. It was done with my hon. friend's permission without any contract and the claim is there to-day for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend said it was done without calling for tenders? My recollection is that public tenders were invited for that work. The price was too high to accept, but we entered into communication with the lowest tenderers, and told them their tender was too high and they agreed to abide by a reduction which

the department might make. They went on with the work because it was urgent and they came down to the figures recommended and agreed to by the departmental engineers. But that is a very different thing from doing work without tenders. The Secretary of State has not awarded this work to the lowest tenderer, as we did in the case of the Saguenay river, but has awarded this large contract of $17,000 a year to political friends upon the recommendation of the Conservative members for the city of Ottawa, as my hon. friend has said, and without inviting competition from any quarter, without giving the printers in Ottawa an opportunity of submitting prices. My hon. friend in that is not only violating the law as expressed in the statute, but he is disregarding the expressed view of members of this House as shown by the resolution in which both sides of the House agreed.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I do not think it is a good argument for the present Minister of Public Works to justify a contract of that kind without tenders simply because the ex-Minister of Public Works sinned in that way, as I have no doubt he did. No contract of this magnitude, $15,000, should go through without tenders. That is a good principle to stand by, and we should adhere to it, that nothing over $5,000 should be given out without tenders being called for in the usual way. The Minister of Public Works said his predecessor had done this.

Mr. MONK. That was in answer to the boasts that were made. I would be quite ready to bring down lists of work done without tenders if that is called for.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Even if there were such cases, that is no excuse for you doing the same thing. We will admit that my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) made mistakes, but after the professions made by the gentlemen now in power they should adhere to the principle and I for one cannot vote for this item unless we have an assurance that tenders will be called for later on if it cannot be done now.

Mr. BRADBURY. What effect did it have when the House expressed itself in that way? How often was the principle violated by the late government?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. That is the old story again, you do as badly as we did. I cannot vote for an item of that kind unless the minister says that tenders will be called for.

If it cannot be done just now, he may say it will be done later. But the principle is there, and on this side of the House we always stand for principle.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. CROTHERS. I think it is very doubtful whether the strict meaning of the statute referred to by the ex-Minister of Public Works has in any way been violated. I remember distinctly when I took charge of the department that I asked my deputy, trying to familiarize myself with the work of the department, where the 'Labour Gazette' was printed, and he told me it was printed by the Ottawa 'Free Press.' I asked him if there was a contract, and he said he did not know, but he would write to the King's Printer. He wrote to the King's Printer, and got word back that there was no contract, that the work was being paid for month by month at so much per page, costing $1,200 or $1,500 a month. So there was no contract. I was told at the time that it would be wise to leave it where it was, because if we were to advertise for tenders it would cost us a great deal more. I laid the matter aside for further consideration; I was not called upon to consider it afterwards. There seems to be no contract except month by month. as I was advised by the King's Printer. We pay them, as I understand, so much an em, which varies according to the size of the monthly publication, and according to the number of copies disposed of from month to month. Their contract is really only for one month at a time, and is less than $1,500.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Will the minister say that he will call for tenders?

Mr. CROTHERS. My hon. friend was probably out of the House. If he had heard this whole discussion, he would know that I have nothing to do with the printing of the 'Labour Gazette.' It is being printed by the Printing Bureau.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. That is very clever. I will ask the hon. the Secretary of State if it is his intention to call for tenders for printing the 'Labour Gazette' in the future.

Mr. ROCHE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if the work is not being done satisfactorily, either at excessive prices or otherwise in an unsatisfactory manner, certainly tenders will be called for, since the hon. gentleman insists upon it. But if we have to pay higher prices the responsibility must devolve on the other side of the House. But at the same time, owing to representations made to myself by the King's Printer I did not look upon it in the light of a contract. It is a monthly arrangement, and I do not think it comes at all within the provision that the ex-Minister of Public Works has stated.

Mr. MURPHY. I have a great deal of sympathy with my hon. friend. I hope he will not think I am unduly insistent if I ask him further whether he knows that the 'Labour Gazette' is printed in the office of the Ottawa Printing Co. or outside; in other words, if he knows whether the Ottawa Printing Co. has the plant necessary to do this work?

Mr. ROCHE. That is the very point on which I satisfied myself personally. I had an interview with the proprietor and asked him if his office was sufficiently equipped to do that work within his own office, and he said it was. I advised him to see the King's Printer, and he did, and satisfied the King's Printer to the same effect. I am not aware that the work is done outside, I do not think it is.

Mr. MURPHY. Would my hon. friend be good enough, when he submits the comparative prices of the Ottawa 'Free Press' and the Ottawa Printing Co., to submit this very information.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I intend to vote against this item unless the hon. gentleman will say that for the future he will ask for tenders. A principle is at stake. I do not wish unnecessarily to embarrass him, let him take his time, but the principle must stand. We have got to have tenders called for any contract of that kind.

Mr. CURRIE. It does appear to me that the whole trouble in this case is that the work has been taken away from a good Grit institution and given to somebody else. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) is very insistent on his view. I understand that one of the largest political bodies in Montreal that controlled the expenditure of thousands of dollars during the régime of hon, gentlemen opposite, never for a moment gave a Conservative any consideration at all, but gave all their work to good Grits. Then the moment there is a change of government, the cry goes forth, 'if a Tory wants to get any work, or tender for any work, oh, there is politics in this; that is a Tory politician, you cannot give the work to him; you will have to give it to a non-partisan Grit.' That is the system they want adopted. I think we had better let hon. gentlemen opposite run the country and control all the patronage; let them do everything in connection with the government. But no hon. gentleman have forgotten the old days when the gentleman that to-night leads the opposition used to stand up here and proclaim boldly that the government of the country was run just according to the way they wanted it run on this side and not according to the way we wanted it run, and that if there was anything good going they would take good care it was the Grits that got it and not the Tories. It is not many moons since I heard the leader of the opposition declare: 'Gentlemen, you take care of the Tories, and I will take care of the Grits.' Now when we start in to take care of the Tories, what happens? Why, hon. gentlemen across the floor, whose escapades with reference to sawdust wharfs we all know, and who gave contracts in certain cases after the work was done, have the audacity to get up and tell us, Oh, this is a terrible thing! Why, you are giving this work out without calling for tenders! Well, now, I happen to be a practical printer. I used to be one, and know a little about the business, and I know that it is one of the most surprising things in connection with this system how well a number of Grit printers have thrived in this city of Ottawa. We have some who went 'stoney-broke' in Toronto, good Liberals, who came down and started printing offices in Ottawa, and in a few years they were riding in automobiles. But now, when some poor unfortunate Tory has had the audacity to offer to do some printing for this government, the late Minister of Public Works, who was the grand almoner of the Liberal party, finds his dignity offended, and he says there must be tenders called for. To my mind, knowing the business as I do, knowing that from month to month changes are required in the printing forms, knowing that from month to month the kind of type that is used is different, and that the number of pages in the 'Labour Gazette' is different, the only thing the government can do is to ask for tenders or ask for a price on each publication; and if you ask for a price on each publication the price does not come anywhere near $5,000. I hope the day will come when hon. gentlemen will cease all this wild cry about keeping the patronage for the Liberal party. Let them become reconciled to the fact that they are now in the cold shades of opposition. Let them be 'sports' and not die-hards. Let them take things easy. If a Liberal does lose his head, don't let them get excited over it. It is very amusing to hear them say: 'Don't give one dollar's worth of business to a Tory, nor get it done in a Tory office. Tories are not worthy of it. Only those gentlemen who have so long sat at the feet of the present leader of the opposition are fit to get a dollar of business from this country.'

Let us look at this question in a commonsense way. The government has come into office and it is endeavouring to carry on the business of the country to the best of its ability. Let us give a little bit of work to the Tories. Do not let hon. gentlemen opposite have all of the patronage for the next ten or fifteen years and we will

get on much easier in this House and the time of the House will not be wasted. I think the explanations given have been sufficient. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) is very inconsistent. When an opening occurs in Montreal, shall it go to a Tory? Oh, no not for a minute. When a Tory applies for an office on the water-front he says to him: You are a politican, you cannot have this office; only Grits who are not politicians shall be allowed to get office.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the water-power.

Mr. CURRIE. I forgot to mention that. Only Grits should get any of the water power of the St. Lawrence river across from Montreal. Now, Mr. chairman, let us give up all this nonsense—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE. Yes. Let hon. gentlemen accept the situation gracefully. Let them be goods sports and not waste the time of the House crying aloud for reforms that for years were brought to their attention and which they persistently refused to adopt. Let them give the government a chance to look into these things.

Mr. McKENZIE. The question is whether there is such a statute as that which my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has brought to the notice of the committee or whether there is not. I accept the law as he states it. I am not familiar with the statute. The hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) says there is such a law. A few days ago there was some criticism about the construction of the tariff law of this country. We said that a generous construction should be given to that statute. What were we told? We were told by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) and others, that any law that is upon the statute-book must be observed while it is there and that if it is bearing hard upon anybody let it be amended. But, for me and my house, says the Minister of Customs, backed up by every Tory on the other side while the law is there it should be observed to the letter. That is the construction, the doctrine, the theology of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why not now be manly enough to stand to it? I ask the hon. member for Simcoe has he a new doctrine when that does not suit him? That was the doctrine in its application to the construction of the tariff law of this country. Now, there happens to be a law which says that any work which exceeds $5,000 must be put up for tender and contract. I submit to the Minister of Labour and to the Secretary of State, both of whose departments seem to be involved in this thing, that they cannot avoid the operation of the statute by making twelve pieces of a contract. That is a violation of the law.

Mr. CURRIE. Why did hon. gentlemen opposite violate it for ten or fifteen years?

Mr. McKENZIE. I care nothing about that. I am talking about the violation of the statute and we have evidence of it before us now. We have no evidence that anything of the kind was done before. We have now the admitted fact that it is the purpose of the Secretary of State to make twelve pieces of a contract in order to get clear of the operation of a statute solemnly passed in this House. He cannot do it any more than he can divide up his claim in a suit at law in order to get into a court of lower jurisdiction.

Mr. CURRIE. If the Secretary of State cannot do it now, how in the world did the Secretary of State who sits across there do it before?

Mr. McKENZIE. Supposing my hon. friend steals something, which, of course, he would not do——

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McKENZIE. —which of course he would not do——

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has sat in a court of law as judge, and he knows there is no such thing as supposing. Nothing but facts have weight there.

Mr. McKENZIE. But supposing he did. You will get through very much quicker if you will leave me alone.

Mr. CURRIE. I do not know; we are in no hurry.

Mr. McKENZIE. I was going to say that if a person is put in the criminal dock charged with a violation of the criminal law, would it do for him to say to the prosecuting counsel: You are guilty of the same thing that you have charged me with? Is that an answer that a judge would take cognizance of? Is that an answer to the jury or is that a ground upon which you can expect to be acquitted? It is nothing of the kind because it would be ridiculous to put forward such an argument and it is equally ridiculous here, in a new parliament fresh from the people, especially in view of the pledges of honesty and good government which hon. gentlemen made to the country. I submit, Sir, that there is a statute which requires that it shall be observed in a certain way, and I appeal again to my honest and hon. friend the Secretary of State, for whom I have the greatest regard, and whose intentions, I believe, are good, not to be led

away with the idea that he can make twelve pieces of this contract in order to escape the statute. He cannot do it. He cannot escape responsibility in that way. I want in this way to bring to the notice of the Auditor General, if he ever reads the debates of this House, that this country expects some safeguards from him, a fact which I believe, in some instances, he seems to have forgotten. The people have been told that it is the duty of that officer to scruntinze the payment of money out of the public exchequer, and they expect that the Auditor General will see to it that the provisions of these statutes are observed to the letter before the money is paid. I call his attention to the fact, as it may come to his ears, that he should see to it that the cost of printing this book should not be paid out of the exchequer unless the law governing such contracts is fairly and strictly observed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is very desirable that hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly the hon. member for one of the Simcoes who, to our edification and delight, shows that he knows a little of everything and is not troubled with any great knowledge on any one thing—

Mr. CURRIE. Perhaps you would like me to give some of your history here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it might be well to place upon 'Hansard' the statute which clearly bears upon this question. It will be found in the Revised Statutes of Canada, volume 1, page 660, and it is section 36 of chapter 39:

Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works, except in cases—

(a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest; or

(b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department; or,

(c) where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000 and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

Then subsection 2 provides:

2. Whenever in case of any work tenders are required to be or are invited, the minister having charge of the department concerned shall submit all tenders received therefor to the Governor in Council and the contract for the work shall be awarded under the direction of the Governor in Council.

Upon reflection the Secretary of State must perceive that he has violated the provisions of this statute. Does the minister pay so much a month or does he not pay according to the extent of the work which is done?

Mr. ROCHE. So much per page per month.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And he pays each month simply because the departments pay monthly. According to the argument of the minister, if this work involved $100,000 per year, he could let it without tender and say that the work is being done from day to day, thus getting rid of the law entirely. On the same principle you could let a contract to dredge out a harbour which would cost one million dollars and pay at the rate of so much per 100 cubic yards, and say that such a course was justifiable. This printing is to all intents and purposes a yearly contract, amounting to seventeen thousand dollars a year, and it is unquestionably an infringement of the law to let it without tender. I may say to the Minister of Labour that he was mistaken to-night in thinking that I used the word 'absurd' in reference to his remarks; that word was in connection with another matter I was speaking about to my hon. friend beside me, and of course I would not insult the hon. gentleman, but, I do say that it is absurd for any lawyer to contend that a contract cannot be given verbally just as well as if it were written, signed, sealed and delivered, and when the Secretary of State orders this printing to be done at a price of $17,000 per year, it virtually amounts to a contract. What we complain of, however, is, that in face of the statute and of the resolution moved by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and adopted by parliament condemning the partronage system and the awarding of contracts without tender, this contract involving $17,000 a year is let by the government in violation of that principle. The Public Works Department has always endeavoured to adhere to that rule in the past—the minister smiles at that.

Mr. MONK. Very much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister would smile at anything if he would smile at such a correct statement as that.

Mr. ARTHURS. Did you not violate that rule yourself when you gave the contractor for the Royal Victoria Museum $70,000 to finish the building, without calling for tenders. Did you not give as a reason in this House for doing that, that the contractor was losing money on the building and you thought it just to give him the balance of the work without tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is wrong. Mr. Goodwin was the contractor for the whole building, and it was thought it would lead to very great inconvenience to have different sub-contractors for the plumbing and the electrical fitting and such work in the building, and on that account, the contract for these incidentals

was given to Mr. Goodwin and that was in accordance with the provisions of the statute. Of course, in case of urgency, such as where a wharf has to be repaired quickly, time does not permit of calling for tenders.

Mr. MONK. The Timiscaming dam for instance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In that case tenders were called.

Mr. MONK. No, sir.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend had better take time to look into these matters before interrupting.

Mr. CURRIE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) is prepared to come to the Public Accounts Committee during the rest of the session to defend his accounts where he has given contracts without tender I can assure him that he will get plenty of opportunities.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall not be afraid to go before the Public Accounts Committee or anywhere else to defend the awarding of contracts in my department. Does not the hon. member (Mr. Currie) think that it is a poor defence for the Secretary of State to offer when he says: You violated the statute and I am perfectly justified in doing the same? The members of the late government always endeavoured to keep within the law and we instructed the employees of the departments to keep within the law, but to-night the Secretary of State persists in a violation of the law when his attention is called to it, and he refuses the reasonable request of the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) to assure the House that at a convenient time he will call for tenders for this printing.

My hon. friend declined to give that assurance, and it does seem to me as if our hon. friends opposite, coming here flushed with victory, really believe that the people will justify anything they may do, and will condone violations of the law, or any erratic course they choose to pursue. They will find, however, that the people are not in that mood, but that on the contrary they expect this government to improve, if they can, on the course followed by their predecessors. At all events they expect that when the attention of the government is called to a violation of the law, they will have sufficient respect for the statute to give the reasonable assurance asked for by the hon. member for St. Lawrence, and see that public tenders are called for.

Mr. CLARK (Bruce). I am somewhat surprised to find members of the late government condemning the present administration when it follows a precedent set by themselves. But what I want to call the attention of the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to is the fact that the assurance he asks for has already been given. He has been told by the Secretary of State that this is only a temporary arrangement which can be abandoned at any moment, and the Secretary of State has told him that if the arrangement does not work satisfactorily, new tenders will be called for and a new arrangement made. That surely ought to be satisfactory.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I do not wish to embarrass the Secretary of State, but rather to assist him in every way possible, but I will not sit in this House and vote for any contract that is in violation of the statute. The statute requires that in the case of any expenditure over $5,000, tenders should be called for, and I shall vote against this item unless I get the assurance that this arrangement will cease, and tenders be called for.

Mr. MONK. Let me appeal to my hon. friend—we both come from the same part of the country. My hon. friends have come to the House to-night full of fight, and we have been working since three o'clock trying to advance the business of the session. Let me say that I do not agree that this is one of those expenditures on public works which fall within the law. It is work done under an arrangement from month to month, and the amount is lower than that fixed by the statute. In that view we are supported by the fact that the same method was followed a number of years ago by those gentlemen who are now criticising us. We have the assurance of the minister that he will observe the requirements of the law.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. He has not said so.

Mr. MONK. He has declared that if this printing done from month to month is not satisfactory, he will have it done differently. He has given an assurance which ought to satisfy my hon. friend, and I would ask him to allow us to make some progress in our work.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. My hon. friend knows that I would not press this matter further, if the Secretary of State would give us the assurance that he will not violate the law.

Mr. ROCHE. If I thought I was violating the law, I would not ask that this vote be sanctioned.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). A good deal of the opposition to this item is based on an entire misconception of the scope of the Statute. A contract from month to month, not exceeding $1,500 in any month, terminable at a month's notice or less, is not a contract to the amount of $5,000 which comes under the Statute. There is not a lawyer in this House who will say that such a contract, terminable at a day's

notice, changeable at any time at the wish of the minister, is a contract amounting to $5,000. Therefore it is evident that, so far as the Statute is concerned, there is no violation of the law. I think everyone admits the general principle that where a substantial sum is involved, tenders should be called for. I do not dissent from the proposition that in the case of public works, involving an expenditure of $5,000 or over, tenders should be called for, unless the nature of the work otherwise requires, because there are works with regard to which no advantage would be gained by calling for tenders. But the point I desire to press on my hon. friend is this: My hon. friend, who is leading the House (Mr. Pugsley), is a good lawyer, but also a very clever advocate, and he can torture a statute about as well as any one I know when it is his interest to do so. I happen to be a member of the bar myself, and I am confident there is not a lawyer in the House who will say, as a matter of strict law, that a contract which is terminable from day to day, or week to week, and which does not involve in any one month an expenditure of over $1,500, is one which comes strictly within the Statute. In other words, the sum of $5,000 is not immediately involved, because the contract is terminable at any time, and the amount involved immediately is $1,500 or less. And in support of that view, I can point to the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite when in office. In doing this, I am not using the tu quoque argument, because that is not one on which I rely, but I say it is a fair argument to urge on behalf of our contention that it was one which was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite year after year while they were in office. What would they have said if we had urged the interpretation of the contract which they now adopt, and have insisted that they should call for tenders in this particular case? Would they not have said that the statute did not apply to any such contract?

Mr. McKENZIE. Is there such a contract as the minister states?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think there has been probably a misuse of terms in regard to a contract. Any agreement, verbal or written, is a contract; but what I think was meant was that no formal contract for a year or some other period of time was entered into. There is no doubt that an order given for work duly acted upon constitutes a contract.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is there a specific contract which we could handle?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That is only the document. That is not necessary to constitute a contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Can the hon. Secretary of State say whether there is a written contract?

Mr. ROCHE. There has been no written contract from the beginning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has there been a letter giving the order?

Mr. ROCHE. As to that I am not confident; but the King's Printer informed me that the arrangement could be terminated, if not satisfactory, at a month's notice. If it were a yearly contract, as the Minister of Public Works says, how could it be terminated at a month's notice?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then, if it is satisfactory, it is not terminable at a month's notice.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend, I think, is quibbling a little as to that. If I hire a man at $5 a day, would my hon. friend argue that because I might by possibility continue to hire him for 2,000 days, this would involve a contract of $10,000? Let me ask my hon. friend in regard to an item for 1911-12, that appears in the estimates on page 7—the printing of Dominion notes, postage stamps and Inland Revenue stamps—a very large contract. Let me ask him whether since 1896 any tenders have been called for that work. In 1896, I understand, tenders were called for, but since that time the contract has been renewed from time to time without tenders being called. I am not too critical about that, but I want my hon. friend to be reasonable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend aware as to whether or not the contract which was awarded to the Bank Note Company after public tenders were called provided for an extension from time to time?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am not positive that it did not. As I say, I am not unduly critical about that, because that work is of an exceptional nature. Take a contract for stationery: I suppose it is a most common experience for a business house to get its supplies from some concern that knows its wants. The contract for the printing of Dominion notes and stamps involved last year $175,000, and for years no tenders have been called for in connection with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But my hon. friend is going to call for tenders.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The contract expires in October next, and we are going, if we can, to make a five years' contract, and we are calling for tenders, on account of the large amount involved. The point I am making is that hon. gentlemen opposite have interpreted this statute in the past differently from what they have done to-night. That is confirmed by the fact that

the company that did the work before was given it without tenders being called for, as I understand. On all these grounds I say that they have succeeded in making a great deal of smoke where no fire exists, and have gone out of their way in regard to a comparatively minor item to bring a charge against the government in connection with the giving of work strictly in conformity with the statute and along the lines of its previous interpretation by themselves.

Mr. OLIVER. I agree with the Minister of Finance that this question of itself is not of serious importance, but I must draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the position taken by our friends on the government side makes it a question of very serious importance. When we see every kind of argument brought forward, from the strictly legal one to the 'you're another,' all in defence of a procedure which admittedly is not in accordance with the best principles of carrying on the public business, our friends are putting themselves in a very unfortunate position before the country. What difference does it make what the late government did in this matter? Our friends on the other side are there to say from time to time that the late government did wrong. They have no hesitation whatever in changing the policy of the late government in many important respects, and I submit that it is not for them to raise as a defence for their action that the late government did the same thing. If they are going to follow the policy of the late government in everything, their argument is good; but if they are going to reject the policy of the late government in things of the highest importance, I submit that they cannot raise the defence that the late government did thus and so. We are here as they are there for the purpose of transacting the business of the country in the best way, and if something done in the past has not been done in the best way, no matter by whom it was done, we are here, we on this side as well as they on the other side, to have it done in a better way. Now, as a practical printer, I want to say that it is not economical to handle the printing business in this way. There is all the difference in the world as a practical proposition between the letting of a contract for the printing of the 'Labour Gazette' and the letting of the contract for the printing of the notes and stamps required by this country. There is only one institution in the country that can fulfil the latter contract.

Mr. AMES. That is if the work of all the departments is to be given under the one contract.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

Mr. AMES. But if the work of each department is to be given separately there is more than one firm able to do it.

Mr. OLIVER. My statement stands as I make it, it is correct and must be admitted to be so. The Minister of Finance is no doubt taking the proper course in advertising for tenders for notes and stamps. The difference is great between that and an ordinary piece of printing. There are a thousand institutions in Canada which could print the 'Labour Gazette.' If the Printing Bureau is too crowded to do it, it must go outside, and I submit that the contract for the printing of that paper should be a yearly contract and should be let by public tender. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been defending an action which is indefensible as a business proposition on legal grounds on the one hand and on the other hand on the bald, plain ground that it was right and proper that the public money should be paid to the friends of the government for services to be rendered as required. Hon. gentlemen will vote for that principle when the committee is divided.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Minister of Finance has taken exception to my interpretation of the Act. My hon. friend said that the Bill does not apply to this case, and that no good lawyer will say so. He says that this work does not come within the meaning of the works mentioned in the Act.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No, I said it might be argued. I was arguing on the ground that it did not come under the $5,000 clause.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend would thereby throw a doubt on the point I have raised.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). And I think it is reasonable to do so.

Mr. EMMERSON. The section is No. 36 in the Act respecting the Public Works of Canada. The second section of the Act says:

This Act is divided into two parts. Part 1 applies exclusively to the Department of Public Works and the public works and property under the control of that department. Part 2 is not by this section limited in its application.

Section 36 is incorporated under part 2 of the Act and it says:

Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders.

With the exceptions therein referred to, I hold that this particular work

comes within the meaning of that section. I hold that the 'Labour Gazette' must be printed for the year under contract and that it must be printed in Ottawa. That contract must be approved of by the Governor in Council and I hold that where the amount exceeds $5,000 it must be made the subject matter of an order in council. Admittedly this has not been made the subject matter of an order in council, and in that my hon. friend is not following the law. No publishing house in Canada would take this work from month to month at as low a figure as it would on a yearly contract. It must have been understood in making this contract that this work was to cover a period of 12 months. I am not a stickler for doing every work under contract.

As the Minister of Finance says, there should be reason applied in all these things. If the Secretary of State were to say that this work is of a nature that could be better done without tender and contract, I would concur in the idea. The same with respect to work that is done in the Department of Railways. Take the preparation and publication of the time-table. That work must be done in one particular place, and as near the headquarters of the railway as possible. I am not making a factious opposition to this vote. If the minister holds that this is a contract from month to month, and that it should be acted upon, either by individual tender, or by an order in council I would say that he was taking the proper course.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). I would like to direct the attention of the committee to the fact that the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), when he was Minister of Public Works, and constructed the new wing of the parliament building, the original contract let by tender amounted to something like $250,000, and in addition to that there were items amounting to $237,000, for which no tenders were invited at all. It seems to me that upon this small item the ex-Minister of Public Works is showing a high degree of sensitiveness. It seems to me that when he let the enormous amount of $237,000, in connection with the erection of the new wing without contracts, he should not be so supersensitive in connection with this vote. Just for the information of the House, I desire to place upon 'Hansard' the proceedings of February 18, 1909, on an item for additions and alterations to Ottawa parliament buildings:

Mr. AMES. Were not tenders invited for these additions? Were tenders invited for the elevators?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we decided that it is very much better to install the Otis-Fensom elevator as we believe their system to be the best. We have had some experience calling for tenders for elevators, and it was very unsatisfactory.

Mr. AMES. Then all the other $237,000 were given out without tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Without public tender.

Item voted on division.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What items will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MONK. We will dispose of the Bills which are on the Order Paper, and then go into Supply. We will be ready to take up the estimates of the Labour Department, some in Public Works, some in Marine and Fisheries, and some in the Interior.

On motion of Mr. Monk, House adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 19, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE RAILWAY QUESTION.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). On the calling of the orders of the day I beg to give notice that I will take an opportunity at an early day, on going into Supply, to discuss the railway question as it is in the country at present, and especially with a view of trying to get at the underlying principles connected with the railway situation in this country, in view of the inquiry to be made into the rates and other railway grievances by the Railway Commission.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 19) to amend the Inquiries Act. —Mr. Doherty.

THE PUBLIC ARCHIVES.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 66) respecting the Public Archives.—Mr. Borden.

On section 2,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is it the intention of my right hon. friend to have the department under the control of the Prime Minister?

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). Yes, at the present time. My right hon. friend will observe that a department is not being created, although the archivist is to have the rank and status of a deputy head.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that. The reason I put the question is that I have discussed the matter with the former Secretary of State, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), and he thought this department had better be under the Secretary of State. There are in the Department of State valuable archives, and they are being added to from year to year.

Mr. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman will observe that it is quite possible to do that by order in council. I shall be very glad to give attention to his suggestion, and it may be that that will prove to be the better course. I think that it will be necessary in the early future to make some addition to the archives building, as I am informed by the archivist that the present building is already taxed almost to its full capacity. He thinks the addition could be made without destroying the architectural symmetry of the building.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I rather think myself that it is a pity that the archives building was not planned on a larger scale, as the archives are likely to be added to from time to time by such a competent man as Mr. Doughty.

On the preamble:

Mr. MURPHY. I regret that I was not in my place when the reading of the sections of the Bill was begun. But, if I may be allowed at this stage, I desire to offer a suggestion to the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden). It seems to me that the Archives Branch would be much more properly placed in the State Department than attached to the Privy Council. The leader of the government is aware that the Department of State Act places in the charge of that department all state records. The Secretary of State is given a dual capacity. Section 5 provides:

> The Secretary of State shall be the Registrar General of Canada, and as such shall register all instruments of summons, proclamations, commissions, letters patent, letters patent of land, writs and other instruments and documents issued under the Great Seal, and all bonds, warrants of extradition, warrants for removal of prisoners, leases, releases, deeds of sale, surrenders, and all other instruments requiring registration.

The State Department is essentially a department of record, and the work of the department, and the work of the Archives Branch would seem to be intimately correlated. There are, I happen to know, a great many old and valuable records in the State Department, as well as other records not so old but of great national value. It seems to me that the Archives Branch would more properly fit in with the State Department than with the Privy Council, or in fact, with any other department. I think we may apprehend a good deal of confusion arising, and a good deal of unnecessary work being made if the Archives Branch is not placed in the State Department. That was brought home to me all the clearer when, the other day, my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) brought down a return showing among other things the great variety of documents that are on record in his department, and of which he has custody as Registrar General. I bring this subject to the attention of the right hon. the leader of the government in case he has not considered it. I would point out that, in my opinion, unless the Archives Branch is placed in the State Department, it will be necessary to amend the Department of State Act to avoid the difficulties to which I have referred. I entirely approve of the Bill, and only offer these observations with the view to making it more workable, and carrying more thoroughly into effect the object which I know my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has in view.

Mr. BORDEN. The right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has already spoken along the same lines as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murphy). I can only repeat to my hon. friend what I said to the leader of the opposition, that the suggestion is worthy of consideration, and will receive it. But the hon. gentleman will observe, that under clause 2 of the Bill, it is quite possible to change by order in council the department to which the Archives are assigned. I have not been able to give the subject all the consideration it deserves, probably. But the object of the Bill is, that as documents in the various departments of government cease to be required for the every-day purposes of public administration, they should be removed to a place of security in the Archives building, and classified so as to be easily accessible to those who may desire to consult them. I have here a memorandum, prepared by Dr. Doughty, giving an historical view for the past thirty or forty years of what has been done in this direction. From this memorandum, and from conversation with Dr. Doughty, I find that the documents in the Archives are useful not only to those engaged in historical research, but are found eminently useful from day to day for the purpose of determining questions in controversy in courts and in many other similar ways that will occur to hon. members. It seemed to me that the idea mainly to be kept in mind is that as these documents cease to be useful in the departments they should be removed, not only as a matter of convenience, but also for greater security. I am told, for instance, by the deputy of my own department, that there are thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of documents in the upper story of the eastern block which are, and have been for a long time in danger of destruction should fire unfor-

tunately break out in that building. No doubt the same is true of many other departments. The removal of such documents is provided for by the Bill, subject, of course, to the approval of the department concerned. In the meantime, the difficulty has arisen that the Archives building is altogether inadequate, so far as space is concerned, for this purpose. And I indicated before my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) came in, that it might be desirable, and even necessary, in the early future, to undertake the erection of an addition to that building, which could be done, I think without any detriment to the symmetry of the structure as originally designed. I can only repeat in conclusion that the observations of my hon. friend are very pertinent indeed, and I will give them careful consideration.

Bill reported.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act by providing that when a person is a member of either House for more than thirty days during any session, though a member for part only of such session, he shall not be subject to any deduction from his sessional allowance for any day on which the House did not sit before he was elected or appointed, or after he ceased to be a member, as the case may be.—Mr. Doherty.

Mr. DOHERTY. The whole purpose of the Bill to be founded on this resolution is to insert in section 37 of the Senate and House of Commons Act the word 'sitting' before the word 'day.' That section at present provides that when any gentleman is elected or ceases to be a member of the House of Commons or appointed to, or ceases to be a member of the Senate during a session, and is consequently a member of either of said Houses for only a part of a session, which part, however, exceeds thirty days, he shall be entitled to his full indemnity less a deduction for each day of absence, and a further deduction of $15 for every day of the session that elapsed before his election or appointment, or after his ceasing to be a member of either of said Houses. The section that provides for absences of members provides for a deduction of $15 for absence on each sitting day. The effect of the provision with regard to gentlemen who become members of either House during a session, or who cease to be members during a session, is that a deduction of $15 is made for every day of the session before their election or appointment or after their ceasing to be such members without regard to whether the House sat or not. This in a number of cases has worked out so that hon. members of the Senate have been subject to a considerable deduction for days on which the Senate did not sit at all. In the last couple of cases the effect of the disposition was that two or three hon. gentlemen found themselves actually indebted to the country for the privilege of having been a senator for a part of the session, as the deduction of $15 for every day that elapsed before the appointment exceeded the entire amount of indemnity. I do not think that is a reasonable position. If these gentlemen had been members of the Senate and had been absent, they would only have had a deduction of $15 on each day the Senate sat. But to be subjected to a deduction of $15 for every day of the session before they were appointed, or after they ceased to be members, does not seem to be reasonable.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is the Bill retroactive?

Mr. DOHERTY. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I apprehend the object of my hon. friend's Bill, but I am not sure that the amendment is aptly expressed.

Mr. BORDEN. It amounts to this, that the deduction ordinarily is for every day on which the House sits. The deduction is made, not only in respect to every day before the appointment or election on which the House sits, but is made for every day whether the House sits or not.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 75) to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, including payment of members of board, witnesses, travelling expenses, &c., $25,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to make a few remarks in regard to the constitution of the Conciliation Boards at the present time, and I would suggest to the Minister of Labour that if he has in view any amendments to the Act he should consider the establishment of a permanent board to deal with the disputes under the Disputes and Industrial Investigation Act. I represent a constituency in which there are a great many miners. Nearly every day during the last four or five years, boards have been asked for in connection with disputes between the miners and operators, and the feeling has developed that the present operation of the Act is not satisfactory. I would like to point out the reasons to the Minis-

ter of Labour, and ask him to consider them. At present under the Act, the employees appoint one member for the board and the employers another member, and these members are partial to the side that appoints them. Then the Minister of Labour almost invariably appoints a chairman, because the other two members cannot agree on the chairman. This chairman may be impartial but he has no information on the issues that come before him, he is not acquainted with the technical side of the matter presented to him, and as a result his decision is often unsatisfactory, no matter which side he favours in his judgment.

Last year at a banquet in the city of Lethbridge I took occasion to advocate the establishment of a permanent Board of Conciliation something along the lines of the Railway Commission, but operating as the present boards of conciliation do under the Lemieux Act. I felt that in that connection we would be able to get a board of men who would become thoroughly acquainted with questions affecting industrial disputes and there would not be so much trouble in having the parties to these disputes accept the judgment of the board as there has been in the past. In connection with mining many technical matters come up and a man really must be acquainted with the mining business in order to sit upon that board and consider the questions brought before him and decide in a way that would be satisfactory to one side or the other. When I made that suggestion in Lethbridge it was endorsed by some of the leading newspapers of the province of Alberta, and there is no province in this Dominion that is more interested in the proper working of the Lemieux Act than Alberta. A strike has just come to an end in that province which lasted for seven months. That strike was a very serious matter. I am perfectly satisfied with the existing Act in every respect except this that I believe there should be a permanent board. I would like to quote the opinions of a couple of newspapers in regard to a suggestion I then made of a permanent board of conciliation.

The Edmonton 'Journal,' a very strong supporter of the present government said:

Mr. W. A. Buchanan, of Lethbridge, made a very valuable suggestion the other day to the effect that the board of conciliation should be made a permanent one, instead of being appointed to deal with a particular trouble. This would, he believed, tend to give increased confidence on the part of both employers and employed in the working of the Act.

There can be no question of this. It would then be known by the parties to the controversy whom they would be dealing with. The board would be able to do better work as a result of larger experience and its prestige being increased, there would be less chance of action being taken contrary to its decisions.

The Calgary 'Herald' said:

Hon. W. A. Buchanan, of Lethbridge, expressed a sensible and courageous opinion at the Board of Trade banquet there, when he advocated a permanent board of arbitration for labour disputes. Such a tribunal, if similar to the railway commission would be very valuable.

The Calgary 'Albertan' at the same time endorsed the suggestion by saying:

The suggestion made by Hon. W. A. Buchanan that the commission for the investigation of strikes be made a permanent board, and not merely a temporary board, is a very good one. The objection made by the miners to arbitration in this instance was that they do not know who will be on the board, and are not inclined to refer to any person the settlement of technical questions. A permanent board would be much more valuable than a temporary board.

I quote these references not because they are endorsing a suggestion I made myself, but to impress upon the Minister of Labour that the idea is favoured in Alberta, and I believe generally in western Canada, and I hope the minister will consider this suggestion in connection with any changes he may make in the Lemieux Act.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is the minister contemplating making a change in the provisions of the Act?

Mr. CROTHERS. I think I answered that question yesterday by saying that I was considering the various provisions of the Act with a view to making improvements if I reached the conclusion that I could improve it, and also that it was not the intention to propose any amendment to the Act during the present session.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do I understand the minister's statement to mean that the department will not put into effect this session the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan)?

Mr. CROTHERS. Yes, I have considered very fully the change suggested by the member for Lethbridge and I have not reached the conclusion that it would be any advantage to make that change. I may be convinced of that hereafter.

Combines Investigation Act, $10,000.

Mr. MURPHY. How far has the inquiry into the United Shoe Machinery Company's business proceeded?

Mr. CROTHERS. A great deal of evidence has been taken both in Montreal and Quebec, but I have no knowledge how nearly through they are in taking the evidence.

Mr. MURPHY. I understood from the papers that there was some delay on account of some notice from the department, and that the proceedings were suspended.

Mr. CROTHERS. The proceedings were never suspended.

Mr. KNOWLES. Are there any representations in the department with a view to having an investigation as to an alleged combine in the retail lumber trade in the prairie provinces, and if so, does the minister propose taking any steps to have such alleged combine investigated?

Mr. CROTHERS. We have not had any such representations as my hon. friend refers to. The Minister of Labour has no power under the anti-Combines Bill to begin proceedings against anybody, or to initiate any investigation into combines. The anti-Combines Act provides that any six individuals may set it in motion, but not that the government can set it in motion.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Has an investigation been applied for under the Combines Act in connection with the Davies Pork Packing Co.?

Mr. CROTHERS. I have no recollection of such application to us. Had it been made I would have pointed out that we have not the power to proceed under the Anti-Combines Act.

Mr. KNOWLES. Have representations been made as to the alleged combine in cement?

Mr. CROTHERS. I do not know that I have received such a communication directly, but I have heard there have been such charges. We have no power under the Anti-Combines Bill to take any action.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the minister intend to improve the Combines Act or to change it in any way this session?

Mr. CROTHERS. I have no intention of suggesting any changes in the Anti-Combines Bill or any other Bill this session.

Mr. MACDONALD. This government possesses very prominently the characteristic of being unready in all things.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Except about dismissals.

Mr. MACDONALD. In my constituency in 1908 the chief issue against me was what my opponents described as this nefarious Lemieux Act which was passed by the Laurier government, and in the mining counties of Nova Scotia every Conservative candidate declared that the government, by that legislation, had interfered with the rights of the workingmen and promises were made that the moment they got into power that legislation would be swept away. In the last campaign, the Conservatives talked a good deal against the Combines Act, and promised its improvement, but here is their Minister of Labour in power for four months and though he does not seem to have been working very hard, he is only able to tell us that he is going to do nothing about it, and that he will take time to think. Well, thinking seems to be the chief occupation of this government, but it is time that they should give effect to some of the schemes they propounded in opposition. The Minister of Labour before he attained power was loudest in denouncing Mr. MacKenzie King, but now that the responsibility is upon himself, he proposes to do nothing and to be satisfied with the legislation he formerly denounced.

Mr. OLIVER. What part was taken by the Department of Labour in the settlement of the coal strike in Alberta?

Mr. CROTHERS. We did everything we could to effect an amicable settlement after the parties had refused to accept the award made by the Board appointed by the late government. Shortly after we came into power the Minister of the Interior told us he was going to Lethbridge on business of his own department, and I suggested that he might be able to assist the parties in arriving at an arrangement. I communicated with them and they answered thanking me for calling their attention to the fact that Mr. Rogers would be in Lethbridge, and I believe they met him and talked over the matter and a settlement was reached on general terms, and an agreement in writing was signed by the parties leaving some details for further arrangement, and these details were settled later. I do not remember now that he took any part except by way of correspondence.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is there any record in the department?

Mr. CROTHERS. There is the correspondence.

Mr. OLIVER. What time elapsed between the Minister of the Interior meeting the parties at Lethbridge and the date the coal strike was declared off?

Mr. CROTHERS. I do not remember exactly, but some days, and possibly some weeks, elapsed.

Mr. OLIVER. What principles were at stake in the dispute, and how was the agreement arrived at with respect to them?

Mr. CROTHERS. From recollection, the points in dispute were respecting wages, and also respecting the closed shop, particularly in its connection with the practice of the check-off. I think both sides accepted the finding of the board as to wages, but with respect to the leading difficulty between the men and their employers, I believe the board reported they were unable to get a definite statement from either party as to what they desired, and, therefore, could not reach a conclusion. The award was made before I came to the department, but I understand it was unsatisfactory in respect to the check-off.

Mr. OLIVER. What was the final settlement in regard to the check-off?

Mr. CROTHERS. My recollection is that it was agreed there should be something in the nature of a check-off. Under the system the men were required to sign a paper addressed to the employers authorizing them to deduct from their wages a certain amount and pay it into the union.

I understand that in some cases they have gone so far as to insist that the men should authorize their employers to take off a sum of their wages to pay the rent of the union buildings. In some cases they have even gone very much farther, and the men are required to sign papers authorizing their employers to pay a certain sum into the church. I do not think the men consented to all these conditions, but they did consent that a small sum should be docked off their monthly pay to meet the fees of the union.

Mr. OLIVER. Is there an agreement that the mines shall run under the closed or open shop system?

Mr. CROTHERS. My recollection is that there was no question as to the open or closed shop—at any rate not in these terms. I do not think that the settlement referred to an open or closed shop in these terms, but recognized that distinction to the extent of providing that a certain sum should be docked from the men's wages to pay the fees of the union.

Mr. OLIVER. On the order of the employees?

Mr. CROTHERS. Yes, in writing.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to have the view of the minister on the question of the International Union.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Why not go further and ask him about socialism?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to ask him whether he would favour the restricting of the spreading throughout Canada of labour unions which have their headquarters in the United States.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. CROTHERS. I do not think that this is an opportune time to discuss that question.

Mr. MURPHY. Did I understand the hon. minister to say that the western coal strike was settled without the intervention of his department?

Mr. CROTHERS. I did not say so.

Mr. MURPHY. Was it settled without the intervention of his department?

Mr. CROTHERS. I have said what we did. There was a correspondence between us and the leaders of the different parties out there, I requested them to see my hon. colleague (Mr. Rogers). I understood that they did see him, and he succeeded in securing a settlement, and that settlement was signed. Now a settlement of that kind, I understand, is subject to the approval of the different local unions in the eighteen mining districts affected, and it took some time to submit the settlement to the various unions, and have their approval.

Mr. MURPHY. That is not the understanding I got from the despatch which was published in the 'Montreal Star,' dated 28th October, 1911. A telegram was sent to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), in these terms:

> Have succeeded in getting full and complete settlement of strike signed by both parties.

To that telegram the following reply was sent by the deputy minister, no doubt at the public expense, and was likewise published in the 'Star':

> I am directed by the Minister of Labour to convey to you his most cordial congratulations on the splendid success resulting from your efforts in the cause of industrial peace and thus bringing to a close the prolonged dispute in the western coal mines. I am also to request you will kindly convey the minister's best wishes to both parties and an expression of his desire that the settlement effected may bring a season of extended prosperity and good feeling.

Naturally upon reading these telegrams, one would conclude that the strike was then over and ended, but we are now given to understand by the Minister of Labour that he was misled by his colleagues and that these congratulations were extracted from him under a misapprehension.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask for what period the arrangement was signed? I assume that an arrangement was reached for some stated period.

Mr. CROTHERS. My recollection is two years from the 31st of March coming, but I may be wrong as to that.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to say, so that there may not be any misapprehension as to our understanding of the matter, that my information is that my hon. friend is hardly correct in stating that the arrangement in its essential particulars was arrived at and signed on the intervention of the Minister of the Interior and that all that remained was to obtain the consent of the various local unions. My information is that for a long time—I cannot say how many days—after the visit of the Minister of the Interior, there were councils held between the two parties and that, as a matter of fact, an arrangement which could be submitted to the local unions was not arrived at until some weeks after the arrival there of the Minister of the Interior. Then after the men and the operators had finally come to a conclusion. there was still further delay, as my hon. friend has said, in order to secure the consent of the various local unions. Now the settlement of the strike was vitally important at that time for this reason: It was at the beginning of the winter when the whole country was depending upon the opening of these mines. The people had to lay in a supply of coal then if they were going to have protection against the rigours of the winter. They could get coal from the east if they ordered it in time; but if they could get coal from these western mines, they would be under no necessity to order it from the east, so that when my hon. friend announced to the country that the strike was settled, a large number of people, who otherwise would have ordered their coal from the east, did not do so. Consequently, as the strike was not then settled, these people were short of coal at the beginning of the winter, and unfortunately the winter set in with rather extraordinary rigour. That is all over now; and in one way it is not important even if my hon. friend or the Minister of the Interior thought they had settled the strike when they had not. But I take the liberty of warning my hon. friend that in dealing with a matter so important as a supply of coal to the prairie country in the beginning of winter, he should have made sure that the strike was really settled before he announced the settlement; and I would suggest that on any future occasion he should take care before making such an announcement, to be sure that it is absolutely correct and thus save the people a great deal of suffering which they had then to endure because of that premature announcement.

Mr. CROTHERS. My hon. friend has had a good deal more experience than I have had in public office. It is very kind of him to warn me to be more careful in the future. He is perhaps old enough to have had experience of the settlement of of a case that did not stay settled.

Mr. OLIVER. Several.

Mr. CROTHERS. He is quite unwarranted in inferring that because this case was settled it did not stay settled. I am almost sure that I saw in the office the original agreement of settlement made at the time the Minister of the Interior was at Lethbridge. The terms of that agreement quite justified my hon. friend in sending the telegram that he did, and justified me in sending the congratulatory message which I sent to the parties who, I thought, I was justified in thinking, from the papers they had signed, had reached a settlement.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite accept what my hon. friend has said; but would there be any objection to placing the papers he mentions on the table, so that everybody may be satisfied that matters were as he has stated here?

Mr. CROTHERS. I do not think there is any objection.

Mr. OLIVER. I would ask, then, that that be done.

Mr. KNOWLES. There is one phase of the subject on which the Minister of Labour has voluntarily informed us, and it concerns the Minister of the Interior. The Minister of Labour remarked, as I understood him, that the part played in this matter by the Minister of the Interior, which so many have believed to have been a great and important part, was a mere incident. I happened to be in the city of Winnipeg on the day the Minister of the Interior left there for Lethbridge, and it was given out with a great flare of trumpets by the press supporting the present government that he had gone to settle the strike. Those who know the Minister of the Interior in the west, and we all know him by reputation, know that whether he does things or not, he makes the public believe that he does them. Though a colleague of the Minister of Labour he is unlike the Minister of Labour in this respect, that he labours. The Minister of Labour says that the one thing that should have been done by his department was not done by him, but by the Minister of the Interior, while he has been thinking, and he will perhaps continue to think until next November before he does anything to supply the needs of his department in the line of legislation. At the time the Minister of the Interior left Winnipeg for Lethbridge, I remember meeting some of his party friends, and they all agreed in saying that the strike was settled before he

had gone. Let me say, without meaning any offense to my hon. friend, that it was a piece of clever political play on his part to go to Lethbridge at that time so that he would get political gain from the settlement. I believe it was for the sake of political profit that he gave such a blare of trumpets, and afterwards, at the country's expense, was the recipient of congratulatory messages such as that which the Minister of Labour sent. But the Minister of Labour this afternoon gets up and tells the country: 'It was just a little incident that the Minister of the Interior happened to be there at all. He came to me, and said he was going to Lethbridge, and asked me if he could do anything for me.' The Minister of the Interior has plenty of business in the west. At that time he had several defeated candidates to look after, and we find that Mr. McGrath, Mr. Lake and Mr. Campbell, are now all nicely stowed away; perhaps he went west principally to arrange their advent to the restfulness of office. He was going to Lethbridge on business which was no doubt important, and while there, by accident, as a side issue, he settled this great question of supreme importance to the western country. I think the Minister of the Interior will take it with little kindness from the Minister of Labour that what people believed took him out there was merely a little incident, and not deliberate, and that not by any serious thought, but just by putting in a little word the strike was settled.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to enlighten the hon. member for Edmonton as to why the announcement was made that the strike was settled when it was not. Some members, at least those from western Canada, will remember that at that time there were four by-elections about to take place in the southern part of Alberta. The people there were very much interested in the efforts to settle the strike, and before the elections took place the announcement of the settlement of the strike was made, and every candidate supporting the party of the Minister of the Interior was returned. The strike was announced to have been settled on the day the Minister of the Interior left Lethbridge. That had a good effect on the electors in the city, though it was some weeks, probably a month, after that before the men resumed work and the strike was really settled. In the memorandum of agreement signed by the Minister of the Interior when at Lethbridge there was a clause providing that if they could not come to terms on the questions mentioned in it, the Minister of the Interior should appoint another committee to try to settle the strike. I may say that the award made by the Rev. C. W. Gordon of Winnipeg was the award accepted by the men in this particular settlement of the Minister of the Interior; but when the award was originally made by the chairman of the board, the representative of the operators, Mr. Colin McLeod, although he agreed with the report of the chairman of the borad, added a clause to the report, and it was that clause which prevented the early settlement of the strike. Both sides later accepted the Gordon award, and it was the basis of the agreement made by the Minister of the Interior. I am told on good authority that the miners and operators had come to an agreement, ten days or two weeks before the Minister of the Interior visited Lethbridge, to accept the Gordon award. It has been said, I do not know whether it is true or not, that a member of the operators' association, who was a very kind friend of the Minister of the Interior, and was very anxious that he should get credit for the settlement of the strike, managed to hold off the settlement until that memorandum of agreement was drawn up, although it had been practically agreed to two weeks or ten days before that time.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I hope the minister will do me the honour of answering my question, which I submit is a very practical and important one. The minister must meet with this question day by day in the management of the affairs of his department. The question is this: Would the minister appoint a conciliation board at the instance of a union having its headquarters outside of Canada, say in the United States, just the same as he would if it had its headquarters in Canada? That is a very practical question, I think, and one that ought to be answered.

Mr. CURRIE. Before the question is answered, I think, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) should explain his own views on the subject; he comes from Nova Scotia.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would favour the Canadian union. But I want to know the minister's idea.

Mr. CROTHERS. What is the hon. gentleman's question?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think the minister ought to have been able to understand the question. The question is: What is the status of International Unions, so far as the Department of Labour is concerned, under this government? Would the minister appoint a Conciliation Board at the instance of a union having its headquarters in the United States as readily as at the instance of a union well known to have its headquarters in Canada? For instance, in Nova Scotia we have a union known as the Provincial Workman's Association, to which a large number of miners belong. We have another, with headquarters in the United

States, known as the United Mine Workers of America. Suppose these two unions, differing in views from one another, seek to deal with the department, which of them would the minister favour? Or what are his views with regard to dealing with unions that have their headquarters outside of Canada?

Mr. CROTHERS. I think I cannot do better than send my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) a copy of The Industrial Disputes Act. It is clear the hon. gentleman has never read it. We do not regard the matter at all from the point of view of whether the union is Canadian or International. If there is a dispute between workmen and their employers in the cases provided for in the Act, we proceed to establish a board without considering whether there is a union of any kind or not.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that the question asked by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is a very pertinent one and certainly is a very practical one so far as eastern Nova Scotia is concerned. We had a serious struggle in the mining centres of Nova Scotia which lasted for a couple of years; a struggle which arose, as I understand it, not out of differences between capital and labour, but out of differences existing between two rival labour organizations. It arose between the United Mine Workers of America, an International Union having headquarters in Indianapolis, and the Provincial Workman's Association. I understand the hon. member for Guysborough to ask this question: Suppose a grievance arises and the United Mine Workers want a Conciliation Board, and the Provincial Association want a Conciliation Board, to air the same grievance, and they come to the hon. minister at the same time, to whom is he going to grant the board? I think the question is a pertinent one; and it is one in which the people of Nova Scotia have a very keen and live interest to-day, and are likely to have for some time to come.

Mr. MACDONALD. The question asked by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) seems to me a fair one, and the minister is distinctly evading an answer—there is no use in putting it in any other way. Every one who has read the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act knows that a certain number of workmen can apply for a board. And the statement made by the minister setting forth that fact suggests that he is avoiding and evading, an answer to the question which was intended to show where the minister stood on the question of international labour organizations. The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) shows the importance of that question. What does the minister think about it? Or does he think anything about it? So far as I can see, if the minister has any views regarding affairs relating to his department, he proposes to keep them to himself. Whether he has views or not seems to be a matter of doubt; certainly, so far as this House is concerned the minister has not given any enlightenment. Perhaps he might say whether, in his opinion, the present law in regard to trades unions requires any amendment or not. He is doing such a powerful lot of thinking, perhaps he will tell us when he is going to give us the result of his thoughts. The question put by the hon. member for Guysborough is a fair one, and, in justice to the House and country, the minister, as head of the department, ought to make an answer.

Mr. CROTHERS. If I were as fond of talking as my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) I might take up as much of the time of the House as he does. Or, if I were to endeavour to lash myself into paroxysms of eloquence as he does, I might feel it right to take up time with merely hypothetical questions. I can say to my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that no such question has arisen since I was appointed minister. When the question arises I hope I shall be competent to deal with it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understood the minister to answer my question in this way: He directed me to read the Industrial Disputes Act, and pointed out that under the Act any individual could make representations to the government in such a matter whether appointed by a union or not.

Mr. CROTHERS. I did not say that.

Mr. SINCLAIR. And I understood the minister to say that he would not give the preference to a Canadian over an American organization. That is the inference I draw from his answer. I was hoping it would be the other way, and that he would take the view that it would be better to give a preference to the organization with headquarters in Canada. I have strong views on that question myself, and am disappointed to find that the new government does not agree with me.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CURRIE. Another question?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes, another question. The subject on which I desire information from the minister is this: The Carpet Weavers' Union of Toronto caused an information to be laid last June against J. C. Murray, of Toronto, president or manager of the Toronto Carpet Company, I believe. A prosecution was

instituted, and after the change of government the prosecution was stopped by orders from Ottawa,—I do not know from what department. I would like to know whether the prosecution is now proceeding or is to be proceeded with. A question was asked in the House on the 26th of November last as to whether the prosecution would be gone on with and at whose instance it had been stopped. Part of the question only was answered. It was not stated at whose instance the prosecution had been dropped or stopped. It was currently reported that it was stopped at the instance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for West Toronto (Sir Edmund Osler). All I desire to find out from the Minister of Labour at the present moment, is what position the prosecution is in now.

Mr. CURRIE. I think the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is trifling with the House. The question is one that ought to be put on the order paper. While I am quite willing, and I am sure the House is quite willing, to accede to the wish of hon. members opposite for a little fight, I think it is going too far to expect a minister to have all the details of his department at hand every moment of the day and night.

Another thing is this absurd idea of wasting the time of the House by putting hypothetical questions—if such and such a contingency should happen how will the minister act? Now children at school would know better than to put questions of that kind. If the hon. gentleman desires an answer to that question—I do not speak for the minister—but I say in all fairness, put it on the order paper. Whilst we were in opposition I never, during the whole period that I was in the House, for three terms, put a question of that kind.

Mr. BELAND. The hon. Minister of Labour is very fortunate inasmuch as he has the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) to supply the information which he himself fails to give us. The minister seems to be very reluctant to answer questions put by members on this side of the House. I may be more fortunate than some of my colleagues, but I heard the minister make a statement a few minutes ago that about a hundred boards of conciliation had been appointed during the last year.

Mr. CROTHERS. No, about 120 since the Act was passed.

Mr. BELAND. How many boards were appointed last year?

Mr. CROTHERS. I could not tell offhand.

Mr. BELAND. Could the minister say how many boards were appointed whose findings led to an agreement between the disputing parties, during the last year?

Mr. CROTHERS. I could not tell you as to last year; but I believe that out of 120 investigations about 110 were successful in bringing about a settlement. I am not sure that the whole 120 went so far as to have an award made, but about 110 brought about a settlement, or a settlement was effected in consequence of the proceedings.

Mr. BELAND. Just for the sake of information—does the minister know whether any board has been appointed to deal with disputes arising in private enterprises?

Mr. CROTHERS. There has been no such board appointed since I came to office. The Act does not apply to private individuals or firms. But if private firms consent, the department may proceed, and establish a board.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I want to see if I can get an answer to my question. Surely the minister knows whether, in that case, the prosecution has been stopped this year.

Mr. CROTHERS. I had nothing to do with instituting any such proceedings as my hon. friend refers to; I had nothing whatever to do with stopping any such proceedings.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Will the minister say whether proceedings have been stopped?

Mr. CROTHERS. I do not know, I have not dealt with it in any shape or manner.

Mr. GUTHRIE. On the 29th of November last my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) put this question:

1. Has the J. P. Murray Carpet Company, of Toronto, been charged with a breach of immigration regulations by inducing weavers to come to Canada while a strike was in progress?
2. Were proceedings commenced against this company for this alleged violation?
3. Have these proceedings been stopped? If so, at whose instance?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Some misunderstanding of instructions has taken place, but the matter is now before the Justice Department with a recommendation that the case proceed.

Now, if the Minister of Labour would be kind enough to inform me as to the position of the case, that would probably satisfy all I desire to know at present. I have a communication from the Weavers' Union, and I desire to answer it. It may be that the matter is in the Department of the Interior more strictly; it was an officer of the Department of the Interior who laid the information. As the information is a serious one, I think perhaps I had better, in this instance, put the facts upon 'Han-

sard', and if the Minister of the Interior will grant an explanation it may serve my purpose. The information comes to me in the shape of a statutory declaration made on the 28th of June, 1911, and sets out the facts as follows:

I, Harry Packwood, formerly of Ayr, Scotland, but at present of Toronto, carpet weaver, do solemnly declare:—

1. I am a carpet weaver and lived in Ayr, Scotland.

2. About the end of the month of May last I was visited in Ayr by one Louis Sprage, a fellow weaver, who showed me a letter from one Costello, now an employee of the Toronto Carpet Company, Toronto, Canada, stating that there had been 'a bit of bother' at the company's works in Toronto with the workmen, 'It is all settled,' and inciting me to come to Toronto to work for the company. Mr. Sprage had received that letter from Jas. T. Murray, a director of the company, who was then in Glasgow. Accompanying that letter was a covering letter from Murray to Sprage stating that at the company's works in Toronto 'Pay was good, work is steady, living is reasonable, British law rules, justice and fair-play are always respected.' The letter further invited Sprage to bring others to Toronto to the company's works.

3. Sprage saw a number of others as well in the factory where I was working, and about 16 of us went to Ayr to see Mr. Murray. We all visited him together. I asked him, in the presence of the others, if there was not some trouble with his employees at Toronto, and he said 'No,' there was no trouble, no strike or no lockout. There had been some trouble but it was all over. Some had come back and the others had gone to the United States and started work there. I told him I did not mind working in a non-union shop as long as there was no trouble there. He assured me and all the rest that there was no trouble at all. About seven altogether agreed to go, but eventually five from Ayr and nine from Dundee and one from Glasgow agreed to come out, on the representations made by Mr. Murray. Prior to my departure he showed me a declaration sworn to by him that there was no strike or lockout at his factory in Toronto.

4. Not one of the 16 had as much as $25 before we left Liverpool. After we passed Rimouski Mr. Murray spoke to me and gave me 16 express orders, each for $25, with instructions to give one to each man, in order to pass the immigration officials, and to tell the men to say, if questioned by the officials, that they had had more money, but had left most of it at home and had only brought $25 and enough for a little spending money. Subsequently he recalled the express orders stating that he found he could get us through without the money. We passed through at Quebec without any one, immigration officials or any-one else, asking us any questions of any kind.

5. Upon arrival in Toronto we immediately learned that there was a lockout at the factory and that it was still in existence, with employees still walking the streets. Eight of us refused to work under the circumstances as we had been totally misled by Mr. Murray as to conditions of labour at his factory in Toronto. The result is that we are thrown on the streets, without means and no way of getting back to our homes in Scotland. We have nothing to send to our families.

6. The names of the 16 who came out are: W. Phillips, W. Drake, J. Abernethy,, W. Clark, J. Imesley, L. Sprage, T. Dempsey, Jamieson D. Muir, R. Niell, P. McGlenn, E. Dunn, H. Rennie, S. Jones, T. Whithurst and myself.

7. We ask if these conditions are a sample of the 'British law, justice and fair-play' referred to by Mr. Murray in his letter above referred to.

And make this solemn declaration, &c., &c.

Upon these facts an information was laid before the magistrate in Toronto under section 55 of the Immigration Act, 1910. That Act provides a penalty of $400 in the case of any one inducing any person to come to Canada upon a misrepresentation of facts.

Under the statements contained in that declaration I think it quite clear that an information may well be laid under section 55 of chapter 27 of the statutes of 1910, but through some technicality the police magistrate at Toronto dismissed the charge. Upon the charge being dismissed in June last the Carpet Weavers' Union communicated with the Department of the Interior, and an inspector of the Department of the Interior, Inspector Herbert went to Toronto to investigate the case. Inspector Herbert then lodged an information charging breach not only of the Act but of the regulations. These men were passed into this country on fraud in the face of regulations which should have prohibited them. Either Mr. Murray attempted to supply the men with money to qualify them under the immigration requirements or he made some fraudulent arrangement with somebody whereby they were admitted without the $25. The inspector of the department promptly laid an information against Mr. Murray who went to England and did not return, I believe, until after the general election. No sooner was the election over than Mr. Murray, through some influence, obtained a direction that the proceedings against him be dropped and the proceedings were stopped. When this House met, the matter was brought to its attention by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) who asked at whose instance this prosecution had been stopped. The answer is evasive, it does not state at whose instance it was stopped but it does say that the matter is in the hands of the Justice Department with instructions to proceed. Surely I can get an answer to my question, has the prosecution gone on and if not, why not?

Mr. ROGERS. Shortly after I took over the department this matter was brought to my attention by an officer of the department who pointed out that this case had already

been before a magistrate in Toronto and had been dismissed, and that he doubted very much whether we could collect sufficient evidence to successfully carry on a prosecution. He presented the case to me in such a way as to lead me to believe that it did not amount to very much and so instructions were given to allow the matter to go. Shortly after I had notice of the seriousness of the case, something along the lines of the statement just read by my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and immediately that was brought to the attention of the department we took the matter up with the Department of Justice, and since that time we have been collecting evidence. I was informed by the officers of my department the other day that sufficient evidence has been collected and that the case is proceeding at once in the city of Toronto as soon as it can reach its turn in the court there.

Mr. MACDONALD. Has the minister arranged to completely settle the differences between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and its employees, and can he tell us whether the men who were not taken back, about whom a great deal of complaint arose during the autumn of last year, have been reinstated?

Mr. CROTHERS. I have been doing all in my power to endeavour to have these men reinstated, and I am not without hope that I shall succeed in the near future.

Mr. OLIVER. Although under the terms of the Combines Investigation Act proceedings have to be initiated outside of the government at the same time the fact that there is such an Act presupposes the undesirability of the existence of combines. The organization of combines, if it is an evil, has become a greater evil from year to year and from month to month. Four or five years ago the organization of combines was almost negligible, but to-day it would be impossible for me to give a list of the combines that exist. One of the recent ones will, by its name, attract special attention, that is the bread combine. When a condition arises that actually the baking of bread has been made the subject of a combine, the purpose of that combine being to, of course, restrict the cost of production, which is a proper purpose, but also and more especially to restrict competition in production, and, therefore, make it possible to increase the cost to the consumer, it seems to me that the time is ripe for a new view to be taken in regard to combines. This question has become one of the first importance in the commercial, industrial and financial life of our country. It is an outgrowth of present day civilization. It is a condition which did not exist in former years, and which could not have existed. It has become possible because of the completeness of the machinery for carrying on commercial, industrial and financial enterprises.

It is something that in itself was right but it unquestionably has grown to be a wrong, and the high cost of living as to which the people complain everywhere, is not so much because of decreased or restricted production, or increased or lavish consumption, as because of the restraint upon market conditions, exercised by the combines which stand between the producer and the consumer for the purpose of taking an unjust toll from both.

Intimately connected with the combine question is the question of over-capitalizatoin. In earlier times the merger was arranged in the first place for the purpose of reducing the cost of production which was legitimate; in the second place, for the purpose of increasing competition, which was not so legitimate, and in the third place for the purpose of increasing the cost to the consumer, which was entirely illegitimate. In the organization of the mergers to-day the main question is that of over-capitalization, the building up of financial structures whose foundations rest upon the ability of the combine to take an unjust toll from both consumer and producer upon the necessaries of life, and the more it is a necessary of life the greater the power of the combine, and the greater the possibility of profit. In my estimation this feature of combines is of such extreme character as to change the attitude of the public mind towards these organizations. I am not asking the minister to declare on the subject now, or to take the responsibility of initiating legislation, but there must necessarily have come to the Labour Department facts in regard to these mergers and combines, and protests against them which I will ask the minister to facilitate access to for the benefit of those members of the House who may be interested in legislation dealing with these questions.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I can see now that I and some other members of this House are likely to get more support than in the past in dealing with the capitalization of companies of all kinds. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), nas raised the important question of the enforcement of federal law by the federal authority, and for many years I have advocated that principle in this parliament. Our Combines Act to-day is left to the initiation of private individuals, but in the combines law of the United States there is a distinct clause stating that it is the duty of the Attorney General of the United States to enforce it, and there is provision made for the appropriation of a large sum of money for that purpose. There is a clean-cut clause in their legislation stating that it is the duty of the Attorney General of the United

States to enforce the law, and to that end he is authorized to engage counsel and employ special agents. The result is that in the United States to-day there is an effective law against combines and the most active man in the enforcement of this law is the President of the United States and his Attorney General and the United States attorneys throughout the country. It is idle for us to pass laws in this parliament if we make no provision for their enforcement, and I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will change the idea they have held in the past with regard to this matter. Our doctrine is that while we pass laws at Ottawa to remove grievances, it is for the provinces to enforce these laws, but that doctrine I have never subscribed to. The enforcement of the Railway Act with reference to exorbitant railway rates, is left in Canada to the individual shipper, whereas in the United States the Interstate Commerce Commission can enforce their law and can employ special counsel to that end. I believe, Sir, we are coming to that in this country. Indeed, in the telegraph rate case, and the express rate case before the Railway Commission, special counsel were retained to represent the people. It is for an extension of that principle that I am contending; I want to see federal laws enforced by the federal government. We have combines in Canada, it is true, and I assert boldly here that these combines must be regulated by the law of this parliament, and that law must be put in operation against them by the federal authority.

I would like to hear some expression of opinion in that regard. The question of over capitalization, I propose to discuss at a very early day, as I to-day gave notice on the Orders of the Day that I shall bring that question up. That is comprised in the railway question, and that very same question has been raised in this House by the present Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Monk) who has been long desirous of this government having some control over the capitalization of joint stock companies. That is a question which must be dealt with, and it cannot be dealt with by the individual so well as it can be by the state. We must change the system we have followed in the past and no longer leave the enforcement of our laws to individual initiative. I take the ground that the enforcing of Federal laws must rest with the Minister of Justice or any special department created to administer these laws. We have a railway commission but it is not given all the powers it should have. In many cases, in which that commission has taken the initiative, it was taken by the chairman largely on his own account; and the law would be much more effective if we had some official whose duty it would be to enforce it.

Mr. BURNHAM. I should like to add my feeble testimony to the remarks of the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), who has told us that the principal question for solution at the present time is the discrepancy between the price paid the producer and that paid by the consumer. Between the two there is an enormous disparity, and that loss or waste is entirely due to the absurd conditions which bolster up the middleman. The middleman has developed in recent days into a combinester who is living on the fat of the land. He is largely, by means of over capitalization, living on the efforts of the producer and the necessities of the consumer and if the people of this country want a socialistic state, the way they will get it is by neglecting to enforce the laws they are so ready to make. The masses, who are vainly striving to get their wages raised so that they may be able to live decently and pay for the education of their children will not submit to be robbed, and have the food taken from their lips by those who have no hesitation in over-capitalizing their companies and combines in order that they may in this way blind the people's eyes and be able to rob them at discretion. If the government, whether Grit or Tory, is not willing or able to enforce the laws they have made, then the people of Canada will take over the means of production and transportation and all the duties of the middlemen and conduct the state as a socialistic state, so that in the future there will be preserved a just and equitable balance between those who produce and those who consume.

Mr. KNOWLES. Did I understand the Minister of Labour to say that he is unable to tell us whether any representations have been made in regard to the alleged cement merger?

Mr. CROTHERS. My recollection is that I saw a copy of a resolution said to have been passed by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, complaining of an alleged merger in cement.

Mr. KNOWLES. That resolution was one of the important representations which were made and forwarded to this government. Sir Sanford Fleming, a lifelong Conservative, has communicated in the most public way with the present government on the same subject. We have here an item of $10,000 which, if it is voted, will be used by the Minister of Labour, who is so ignorant of these communications made to his government. Does it not show indifference to his office and duties when he comes to this House and asks this committee to vote $10,000 to be used in all possibil-

ity—nay in all probability, we hope—in investigating the affairs of that same cement merger, and at the same time tells us that he has not taken the trouble to look into these representations that have been made on this matter? Does he know that he wants the money for anything? Surely if he wants it for anything, it will be to investigate those outstanding grievances. Yet, although the record is right under his very eyes, he tells us that he has not taken even the trouble to give it any attention. The cement merger is one that the minister would do well to inform himself upon at an early day. It is going to be a live issue. The hon. minister will recollect, especially if he was a member of the Private Bills Committee last session, that the people who have been spoken of as the cement merger came to parliament and asked for a private Bill, giving them the entity of a stock company, created by statute of this parliament. Hon. members will recall the outburst this application created throughout the country, the demand for information it excited, the desire for statistics or data as to the way in which this merger sprung into existence, and how, when this company refused to give that information frankly to a committee, the committee, a majority of which was then composed of Liberals, refused to proceed with the Bill, and its promoters discreetly withdrew it. I put a motion on the order paper at the close of last session—for the matter did not reach prominence until then—calling for all the papers in connection with the creation of that joint stock company, which I believe was created by letters patent, but the session came to an end and my motion was not fruitful in getting these papers. Now, the country is agitated. The Boards of Trade, especially in the west, are taking the matter up and will continue to take it up, and I fear they will have a much lower opinion of the Minister of Labour when they learn that he has not taken even the pains to read the information which has been placed formally and carefully before his government.

Mr. ROGERS. One would really think that my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) was serious in pointing out what he claims is the lack of knowledge on the part of my hon. colleague the Minister of Labour with regard to the cement combine. However, I would like to say a word or two in connection with the remarks of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and as well as a word or two in connection with statements made by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). I agree entirely with a great deal that has been said by my hon. friend from Edmonton regarding the conditions which this government finds existing in the matter of combines in this country today.

It is strange that after having been fifteen years in power our hon. friends opposite are unable to point to any Act of theirs which has had the effect of preventing the up-building of combines in this country, and should so suddenly become converted and begin attacking those combines. Now, this is to my mind a very important question for this parliament and this government, in view of the fact, as stated by my hon. friend from Edmonton, that a few years ago we did not have these conditions in this country, which was largely due to the policy followed by the party on this side of the House when formerly directing the affairs of this country. Since that time we have had changed conditions. We have had a government which has been very generous in its treatment of the combines in all parts of the Dominion. It, therefore, becomes the duty of this government to meet the conditions as we find them, and I do not think there is any single question that has engaged more of the time and attention of the government since they came into power than the very question we are now discussing, as to how we can best remedy the serious conditions which have been left us by hon. gentlemen opposite in respect to the combines that exist throughout the length and breadth of this country. It is a matter for serious consideration. The amount in the estimates seems small, but it will be well and properly used by the government for the purpose for which it is voted, that of investigating these conditions and endeavouring to improve them. Let me say also, on behalf of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour, that he will be only too pleased at any time to supply information to this House in respect to any complaints that may be made in connection with the question we are now considering.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. Minister of the Interior is somewhat surprised that the party sitting at present on this side of the House did absolutely nothing during the years they were in power, to combat the evil of combines and mergers. I would like to remind him that one of the great effects of reciprocity for which we laboured so hard would be to kill combines and mergers. I am very glad that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) brought this question up in the form in which he did. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) made some wise suggestions, and the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) spoke strongly against combines and mergers. We have in the

county of Wright which I represent what is worse than the cement combine; we have a merger which will more directly appeal to the hon. Minister of Labour than any other merger in this Dominion. It is a merger in what is essential to the health of the labouring classes—a meat merger. Recently a company whose chief place of business is in the city of Hull, and which does a great business, a company which I greatly admire, more perhaps than they admired me during the last election, formed a combine in the meat business under the name of the Matthews-Lang Packing Company. The only effect of such a merger is to considerably raise the prices of meats of all classes. I have very little concern for the richer class, a class to whom the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side belong, and with whom the government of the day is more particularly concerned. We on this side of the House, while wishing at all times to protect the richer class where it is necessary, are more concerned with the classes who have no protection. We are the friends more particularly of the masses of the people, and to the ranks of those friends we heartily welcome the hon. member for West Peterborough and the hon. member for South York.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I am holding out the hand to you, and I am glad to see you coming over.

Mr. DEVLIN. It is a cause for mutual congratulation that we should find a plank on which we can agree, and I am glad to see the hon. member for South York standing with us for the masses of the people. I would like to appeal to the Minister of Labour, as I think an appeal to any other hon. gentleman on the treasury benches would be futile. I could not appeal to the Minister of Inland Revenue or the Minister of Public Works or to the Minister of the Interior; these are all the ministers of capital. I appeal to the Minister of Labour to give his earnest consideration to what is to-day in its infancy, but what promises to sap the very life of this nation this awful meat combine. I hope he will send officers to the city of Hull to inquire into its working. I give him the assurance, as the representative of that side of the river, that I will help his officials out as far as it lies in my power to do so.

Mr. MURPHY. The hon. Minister of Interior has said that during the former régime of his party there were no mergers in Canada, but he stopped short of supplying the reason. The reason was that when his party friends got through with what was valuable in this country, there was nothing left to merge. They were identified with the lean years in this country whereas the party which followed were identified with the fat years. Let me remind my hon. friend from South York and my hon. friend from West Peterborough that the bread merger was not brought into being by any Act or law of the Dominion government or parliament.

The bread merger was the creation of the Ontario government at a time when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) was a member of that government. Now, it may be true that the Minister of Labour has received no complaint with respect to the bread merger. But let me point out that the headquarters of that merger are in the city of Toronto—most properly in the city of Toronto. Let me also remind him that he has in the city of Toronto one or more correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette', and I should think it very strange, indeed, if these correspondents had not drawn attention to that particular merger, and its operations in that city. I would ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) whether the Toronto correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' have not drawn attention to the bread merger, and to the operations of that merger more particularly in the city of Toronto.

Mr. CROTHERS. They have not, so far as I am aware.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crothers) make inquiries, and let us know at a later date, and on some other item of his departmental estimates? It may be that up to this time the minister has not had time to read the 'Labour Gazette'.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Before passing this item—which I hope we shall soon pass—I should like to say a word. I am very sincere in saying that I hope we shall soon pass the item. I do not know what has come over my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) lately. He is defended from behind by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). That is not a unique experience; for that hon. gentleman, apparently has a self-assumed position of general oversight of the Cabinet. But the hon. minister has also been defended by the minister in front of him (Mr. Rogers). I think it time that some one on this side should come to his relief, and try to get this estimate through. I was very gratified, notwithstanding the Minister of Labour's (Mr. Crothers) self-imposed—or should I say, Simcoe-imposed?—rule of partial silence, to hear from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) that the Cabinet are seriously considering this very important question of trusts. I cannot use any words of condemnation to the Minister of Labour for considering or thinking; and I believe that if the Cabinet will only think plenty upon this question of combines, if they will honestly and fully consider it, they will become more radical in their ideas; they will reach the root of

the question, and find the cause of combines. They will then have a clear road. For, as I have said on former occasions in this House, it is an important rule for politicians as well as for medical men that the best way to treat a disease is to remove the cause. Now, I do not think that this Cabinet—or ten Cabinets like them—will be able to prevent what is evidently an industrial tendency of our times; I do not believe they will be able to prevent these combinations of capital. I believe that these combinations have come to stay, and I will go a step further and say that if these combinations are in the order of Providence, and in the course of evolution, not only can you not prevent them, but, I believe there is no harm in them. And I would like to point out to the Cabinet who are considering the question—and after all one of the functions of this House of Commons is to participate, in its own way, in the thinking of the Cabinet—that these combinations become dangerous only when they get the field to themselves.

Now, when do they get the field to themselves? When competition is ruled out. Rule out competition and you give them the field to themselves whether to buy or sell, and they become masters of the situation; masters of the producers on the one hand and of the consumers on the other. It is extremely necessary to teach this doctrine in eastern Canada; not so necessary in the west, for we there knew a little more about it, judging by the results of the last election. Why, I am told, that there are actually people in eastern Canada who could not solve the simple proposition of how reciprocity could at once help the producer and the consumer! It was the very A B C of economics. The moment you subjected your trusts—your canning combine, for instance—to external competition, this is what would have happened: they would have had competition in buying and competition in selling, and they would have been compelled by the operation of the laws of trade to give more for what they bought and to sell the finished product at a lower price. Why, that is the simplest thing in the world. There is the position: These things become dangerous only when they have the field to themselves, and they get the field to themselves from the want of competition. And now the next step: The want of competition is artificially arranged by the tariff. Yes, it is the tariff that artificially protects these men, whether in buying or in selling; and thus they can rook the producer on the one hand and the consumer on the other. I throw out these things for the guidance of the Minister of the Interior who has been good enough to lift the veil of the cabinet proceedings to the extent of telling us that these matters are seriously engaging the attention of the cabinet. Now, my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), to whom we are all indebted for bringing up this question, shows that closely connected with the evils of trusts themselves is the evil of over capitalization. The possibility of over capitalization is, economically, absolutely connected with the other evil of the want of competition. I do not need to labour to prove this part of my case; the people who make the combines prove it to us. When they send their circulars abroad to float the securities of their concerns, they state in these circulars what tariff is being carried by the stuff they peddle. Why do they state that? Why, to show that the tariff ensures to them the right to be free from competition in buying on the one hand and in selling on the other. Oh, they are quick enough! Politicians may be slow, and statesmen may have to consider, but the merger men know their business, all right, and know what it is that enables them to pay big profits. They tell the foreign investor: This stuff in which we are forming a merger carries so much of a tariff, therefore, we do not have competition and so we are enabled to rook the consumer to the extent of the extra money to enable us to pay dividends both upon the actual capital invested and upon the artificial wealth we are going to pour in, in the shape of water.

Mr. BURNHAM. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Certainly.

Mr. BURNHAM. Has the hon. gentleman seen the report of the statisticians in England of the over capitalization of railways in free trade Britain? And will the hon. gentleman please explain that?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I have not seen the report, so it is rather hard upon me to ask me to explain it. I really must play my role; and that does not include the ability to explain a report which I have not seen. But my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) will agree with me, that we are not talking about railways, and he will see that railways do not enter into the question. I have been speaking of things in which foreign competition is artificially cut off by the tariff. Now, foreign competition in railways is a thing I never heard of. So far as I know, people do not import railways into the country.

I really think it is well that my hon. friend intervened, because I had said all I intended to say. I dealt with the subject in a way that I hope the cabinet won't resent. I have given them a little help in the considerations upon which I understand they are engaged. I do trust that they will be thorough. I am not in

a hurry for them to do things. I wish they would let the tariff alone. I see they are going to introduce a tariff commission this session. I wish they would leave well enough alone, through one session, any way. But the more thinking they do upon this question the more they will begin to see that at the root of any evils flowing from combines is the tariff, which gives the field to the combinations, and enables them to rook the producers on the one hand and the consumers on the other.

To provide for the appointment of inspectors in connection with shipping gear, dangerous machinery, railway construction, &c., $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the Minister of Labour explain what it is intended to do with this amendment?

Mr. CROTHERS. This sum was put in the estimates last year with a view of appointing an official, as is stated in the item here, in connection with shipping, dangerous machinery, and railway construction, with a special view to the appointment possibly of an officer to visit construction camps on railways, and see if anything could be done to better the conditions of those who are engaged in railway construction. However, no attempt was made although that sum was voted last year and no part of it has been expended. It is thought that possibly an inspector may be appointed this year, or it may be found desirable to appoint one; therefore, this sum is asked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to say that the item seems to be intended to cover the salaries of other inspectors besides those who may inspect railway construction or dangerous machinery. I think that if it is intended to serve any useful purpose by this vote, the amount ought to be increased. The amount voted last year was only $5,000. My own opinion was that it was entirely too small for any real and effective service. As my hon. friend is aware, the loading and unloading of steamers is a pretty dangerous occupation. In the city of St. John it is not an unfrequent occurrence that men engaged in this occupation meet with accidents, and sometimes lives are lost, through, is is claimed, defective machinery. I think it is very desirable in the interest of the large number of people who are engaged in this work that there should be a very effective and thorough inspection of the gearing and machinery employed in loading and unloading vessels. If you take the ports on the Pacific coast, Victoria, Vancouver, Prince Rupert, New Westminster and others, and the ports upon the St. Lawrence, the ports upon the great lakes, and the ports of the maritime provinces, my hon. friend will see that with the small sum of $5,000 he will be limited, and will scarcely be able to cover the requirements. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made some appointments. I know the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries did make appointments of inspectors of gearing and machinery in one or two ports. The appointments ought to be solely in one department or in the other, and I think perhaps they would come more properly in the Department of Labour. One thing I wish to emphasize is that it is all important that experienced and thorough inspectors should be appointed at the large ports, with a view of reducing as much as possible the dangers incurred in this occupation.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman has referred to the necessity of having compentent men appointed as inspectors. I think it is very important indeed that at the ports where large numbers of men are engaged in loading and unloading ships, every care should be taken to see that the gearing is of a proper quality and construction, and every effort should be made towards the security of the workmen engaged in this occupation. There are some inspectors already in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and if others are appointed in the Labour Department, there might be some overlapping. There was an inspector of gearing, I think, appointed in Montreal by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries. My attention having been called to this matter this year on consultation with my officials, I had an order in council passed for the appointment of a permanent official to inspect the gearing and machinery used in the harbour of St. John. This step was taken largely through members of the labour organizations in that city, men who are engaged, both in winter and summer, working in loading and unloading ships. A most competent man was recommended by these labour organizations, a man well able to pass the examination which he was required to pass, and he was appointed for that purpose. His salary will be paid out of the funds of the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Mr. McKENZIE. When the Minister of Labour is appointing these inspectors, I would like him to keep in mind the harbour of Sydney, where there are very large shipments indeed of ores and coal. In that harbour we have a tremendous amount of machinery which is under no inspection at all that I know of, and in

connection with which there may be some danger. I hope, therefore, without any regard to party affiliations, the Minister of Labour will see to it that a proper man is appointed to inspect the gearing and machinery in the harbour of Sydney.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will find in his office representations from some labour organizations in Halifax asking for the appointment of some such official.

Mr. HAZEN. If such representations were made it was before I became minister, but I shall make inquiries in the department.

Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Education, $15,000.

Mr. MURPHY. Has this commission completed its work and reported?

Mr. CROTHERS. Last year there was voted for this purpose $25,000. The commissioners completed their general work about the beginning of December and during that month each commissioner wrote out his report of portions of the work done especially by him. After a conference they left the general report to be prepared by the chairman of the board, Dr. Robertson, who is now engaged, with the secretary, in the preparation of the general report. It is expected that he will complete his labours about the 1st of March.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does the minister recollect the remuneration paid the members of the commission?

Mr. CROTHERS. I think it is $16 a day and all travelling and living expenses.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am rather of opinion that the remuneration is not so high, I think it is $16 a day and moving expenses, but that the commissioners have to pay their own living expenses.

Mr. CROTHERS. My recollection is that it is $16 and all necessary travelling expenses, including living expenses, but my hon. friend may be right.

Mr. NESBITT. Is this supposed to complete the payment of the commission?

Mr. CROTHERS. We think it will complete it. The printing of the report will, of course, be a matter for the House to determine.

Public buildings, N.B.—Hampton public building, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend proceeding with the public building at Hampton?

Mr. MONK. This $3,000 is for the purchase of a site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was provided last year, and I had hoped my hon. friend would put in an amount for the erection of the building, which was not supposed to be expensive, I think about $5,000.

Mr. MONK. We are not yet in possession of the site, and steps are being taken by the Department of Justice to see that the property is vested in the Crown.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the minister consider putting in an amount in his supplementary estimates of $5,000 for the erection of a building?

Mr. MONK. If the demands are not too numerous, it seems to me it could be done.

Hillsboro public building, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the minister inform me why the inspector of that work, a very capable man indeed, an architect? of much experience, has been dismissed? Was there any complaint as to the way in which he performed his work?

Mr. MONK. I shall endeavour to procure the information for my hon. friend this evening.

The position of inspector on buildings under construction has always been considered of a temporary character. He would hold his office absolutely during pleasure, and the case is very different from that of a permanent employee. I think there were complaints against this gentleman that he was a political partisan but I cannot say if action were taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the minister bring down the record?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot imagine that this gentleman could be a political partisan, I have known him a long time, and you might search New Brunswick from end to end and not be able to secure quite as competent a man as Mr. Watson E. Reid. He has had a large experience in Canada and the United States, and there are evidences in New Brunswick of his splendid ability as an architect and builder.

Mr. MONK. Was he the architect or the inspector of the building?

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume the plans were drawn in Ottawa, and he was employed to inspect it. It is unwise to change the inspector of a building—unless there are very grave charges against him—during the construction of that building. It is evident that the man who starts at the very foundation should be there to see it completed. I think a mistake was made in the interests of the country in removing this gentleman, and I do not know that even any good will result from it to the party in power.

Mr. MONK. I found that a large number of buildings were under the supervision of local architects, and I do not think I dismissed any of them. If he is the architect in charge of that building I doubt very much that action was taken, but I will bring down the information. In the province of Quebec, at all events, the position of inspector of a building under construction has generally been considered an absolute sinecure.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not so in this case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This gentleman was appointed by reason of his experience as an architect for the purpose of seeing that these plans and specifications were properly carried out.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand that he was the architect, and not the inspector?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is an architect of wide experience, but he was appointed as inspector by reason of his expert knowledge.

Mr. MONK. Then he was the architect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in the sense of drawing the plans which were prepared at Ottawa, and they were sent to him, and he was appointed inspector to see that they would be carried out.

St. John drill hall, $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister has stated that where a local architect had been appointed to take charge of the erection of a building his policy was not to discharge him. Mr. Brodie, a clever young architect, was appointed to take the entire oversight of the erection of the St. John drill hall. I have not the pleasure of knowing him personally, but I never heard that he took part in an election. He has a very high reputation as an architect, and was appointed because of his expert knowledge. I am informed that he has been removed and a Conservative architect given the position. It seems to me that that is carrying the system of party patronage to a very great extreme. Let me call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the resolution moved in 1910, by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), which was concurred in by both sides of the House, and which reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the prevailing system of party patronage constitutes a menace to honest and efficient government, incites to great waste of resources and extravagance of expenditure, tends inevitably to corrupt and lower the tone of public morals, and should forthwith be eliminated from our federal administration.

There was an additional clause added to that resolution, moved by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who complimented the late government on the efforts they had made to remove the evils which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), complains of. That resolution, as amended, was unanimously adopted. But despite the efforts made, during the last few years at all events, to remove as far as possible the evils of patronage, we find my hon. friend, without any reason whatever, so far as I know, dismissing a thoroughly competent architect from the position of inspector of this building and appointing another in his place. Would my hon. friend be good enough to give the reason why Mr. Brodie was dismissed?

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the North Arm Bridge and Railway Company.——Mr. Stevens.

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Architectural Institute of Canada.—Sir Edmund Osler.

Bill (No. 55) respecting certain Patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company, and to change its name to The Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.—Mr. Chabot.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Premier Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Bennett. (Calgary).

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

St. John quarantine station, Partridge island—new buildings, repairs and improvements, $40,000.

Mr. NESBITT. Is this amount expected to complete the improvements?

Mr. MONK. Yes, it is calculated that with $39,500 the whole of the improvements will be completed. We have asked for $40,000.

Tracadie Lazaretto—house, &c., $10,400.

Mr. BELAND. How many patients are in that hospital?

Mr. MONK. I have not that information. The Director General of Public Health states, by letter of October 22nd last, that a house is urgently required for the medical superintendent, who has not been able to bring his family to Tracadie since his appointment on the 1st of April, 1909. In addition to this, the reverend sisters are

very desirous of having a drying room 40 feet square in connection with the laundry. The estimated cost is: house,$4,500; barn, $1,500; additions to laundry, $3,000; septic tank and contingencies, $1,400. At present there is accommoadtion for only 12 lepers.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The other evening, item 4 of the vote for public buildings in Nova Scotia was allowed to stand at my request. The item reads:

Halifax Station on Lawlor's island—new buildings, repairs and renewals, $25,000.

I suggested that the words 'on Lawlor's Island' be struck out. The vote in those terms would be sufficient for the department; on the other hand, if there is any force in the remarks which I made as to the desirability of having the quarantine station elsewhere than on Lawlor's island, the department will be free to make the change.

Mr. MONK. I am not conversant with the question of quarantine, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) in whose department this matter rests is not in his place at the moment. I thought that I had reassured my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) as to his objections. The vote was not asked for with the idea of dispensing with the services of any of our officers.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I was not questioning that. I did not intend to be taken too seriously on that point. But there is a feeling in Halifax among some persons who are qualified to have an opinion on this matter that the quarantine station should not be on Lawlor's island. If the words I have indicated were struck out, the department could spend the money even though it should decide to change the location. If this amendment cannot be adopted now, I would like the item to stand.

Mr. MONK. I think we can adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend and leave out the words. I move that the words 'on Lawlor's island' be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD. Before we leave the consideration of public buildings I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) a question with regard to the dismissal of the caretaker of the public building in Westville. I am informed that the officials of the department notified this officer that his services would not be required after the 31st of January. Will the hon. minister inform me what were the reasons which induced him to take that step?

Mr. MONK. I am sorry to say I have not the papers before me at the moment, and I do not recollect the correspondence. But I can bring down the papers if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) desires them.

Mr. MACDONALD. In the first place, whatever the reason may have been for this dismissal—and I cannot conceive of there being any reason that would warrant it—at least the hon. minister could hardly be justified in removing this official on the 31st of January. Westville is a mining town, and to remove a man from his home in the middle of the winter is a very hard thing for the party thus dispossessed. It is almost impossible to get a place to live then, for the town is overcrowded. If the hon. minister is not prepared to tell why he dismissed this man, I would ask him as a matter of fairness, as a matter of the charity which we ought to show towards even those politically opposed to us, that he should at least give this man a month's time, until the spring opens, before he dispossesses him. We cannot discuss the reasons for the dismissal, as my hon. friend is not ready. But I ask him, if only as a matter of common decency, that he give this man a little longer time.

Mr. MONK. I will make a note of my hon. friend's suggestion, and act upon it. We gave what we thought was sufficient time for the caretaker to find another installation. We have done that in several other cases, including some in Montreal. I can assure my hon. friend that actions in this direction are very unpleasant to me; and if the treatment meted out to the caretaker in question can be softened by an extension of time I will see to it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. minister to go into the case from that standpoint. As to the merits of the dismissal, I would like, before the last of these items is passed to have an opportunity of discussing it. It is better to have these matter disposed of on the estimates rather than upon substantive motion in the House. I should like to have the opportunity of discussing the matter, and I am sure that the hon. gentleman will give me the information required.

Mr. MONK. Yes, I will get the information, and on some item of the supplementary estimates—

Mr. MACDONALD. Not the supplementary estimates, if my hon. friend pleases. For, if there has been no reason for this dismissal, my hon. friend will have gone beyond the stage where he can provide a remedy. I am prepared to discuss the question now. But my hon. friend has not the information on which his officials acted. I would like, then, at some later stage of these estimates, to have an opportunity to discuss the matter. I trust he will temper

justice with mercy and accept my reason for delaying action in the matter.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I would like to get information with regard to the dismissal of the caretaker of the public building in Inverness. I have been looking for this information for two months, but up to this time have not received it. The caretaker in the public building in Inverness was dismissed summarily. Why it was done, I do not know. As to his being a partisan, I cannot speak with knowledge. I know that my friends blamed him in 1908 for voting for the Conservative candidate. That he may have done; I do not know.

But I think it is due to the caretaker, who has discharged his duties, I think, to the satisfaction of the department, that he should be told at least why he is dismissed. I have both written to the minister and had an interview with him, but up to date I have not been able to get any information whatever. This gentleman depends upon me to get the information why he was dismissed. What am I to do? I have been to the minister to get information why the man was dismissed, and that is all I can do. Surely it is not too much to ask the minister to give the reasons why this man was dismissed. I would like also to get a little information with regard to the proposed public building in Hawkesbury. Perhaps I am not in order on this item. But perhaps the minister will give me information with regard to my first question.

Mr. MONK. I regret to say that I cannot at this moment give my hon. friend the information which he is certainly entitled to. If my hon. friend has written to me and received no answer it has been an inadvertence on my part. Since I am in office, I have four stenographers busy, I may say, far into the evening every day, answering letters, and it is quite possible that the letter written by my hon. friend has not received attention. That is through no fault of mine. It is an accident which can be understood. When the minister receives three or four hundred letters a day, some may escape notice. But I am very anxious to give that information to my hon. friend, and will do so as soon as I can examine the records of the department. As the committee is aware, we act in cases of that kind upon the complaint of responsible parties, and as I have understood the principle as laid down in this House in past discussions, it is considered that the complaint of the sitting member or of a candidate in an election——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MONK. I have always so considered. A complaint that is properly libelled, giving proper details, supported by proof to the satisfaction of the minister, is considered conclusive evidence of active partisanship. But I will find out the details for my hon. friend, and will let him have the documents as soon as I can get them. My hon. friend will have several opportunities of discussing the matter before these items are put through.

Mr. KYTE. The other evening we had a discussion on this question when the Minister of Customs was getting his estimates through. He was asked what principle he had adopted with respect to dismissals, and he stated that in counties represented by Conservative members he took the word of the member as regards charges of partisanship against officials. In cases of constituencies not represented by Conservatives, he felt it was his duty to have an investigation and inquiry. He did not go so far as to say that he would take the word of the defeated candidate. I observe that in the city of Ottawa there is a gentleman named Chauvin appointed to investigate charges of partisanship against officials of the Public Works Department in the city of Ottawa. The charges are given to the accused officials, and they have a right to retain counsel to represent them at the investigation. I think that is only fair and proper. I should like very much if the Minister of Public Works would intimate to us to-night that a similar course will be adopted with respect to officials who are charged with partisanship in the outside service. There is a case in my constituency of a man named Bissett, who is a government repairer of telegraph lines. He received a letter on the 7th day of December, reading as follows:

Geo. E. Bissett, Esq.,
General Repairer,
St. Peter's, N.S.

Dear Sir,—I have from the hon. the Minister of Public Works an advice of the termination of your engagement as general repairer. You might please turn over to Mr. Morrison, our local agent at St. Peter's whatever tools, and so forth, that you have belonging to the service, so that they will be in hand when required for your successor.

He received no notice whatever of any charge being made against him, he was not aware that any charge had been made; the first intimation he received that a charge was contemplated by the department was this letter of dismissal. Now his dismissal took place at the end of December, only two days' notice I think was given. this is a case where I think, at all events, that some investigation should have been made. There is no alle-

gation whatever made upon which he was dismissed, no allegation that he was guilty of partisanship, or any other offence that would justify his dismissal in this harsh and arbitrary manner. There are many employees of the Public Works Department in my constituency, and I should very much regret indeed if it is the intention of the minister to pursue a similar course in these other cases. I think it would be fair that all the ministers of the government should adopt the same policy with respect to this matter. I think the statement made by the Minister of Customs the other evening met with the approval of both sides of this House, when he said that in constituencies not represented by Conservative members, charges of partisanship would be investigated. I observe that the government did recently appoint several commissioners in the province of Nova Scotia for the purposes of investigating charges of partisanship. There are three gentlemen that I recall now who have been appointed to investigate these charges; and I fail to see with what purpose or object these appointments were made, if dismissals are to be made summarily in this manner. It is a farce and a waste of public money to appoint commissioners to make inquiries, if ministers are going to take upon themselves the dismissal of officials without investigation or inquiry. I think it is a new doctrine on the subject which has been laid down by the Minister of Public Works to-night, that if the defeated candidate makes charges against persons in his constituency, charges of partisanship, his word is to be accepted and the accused persons are to be dismissed. With regard to the Conservative member who is elected, the case is different. The man who is elected can afford to be magnanimous; he has no reason to be actuated by motives of revenge as regards officials who may have worked against him. But as regards the defeated candidate no such considerations will appeal to him, he is actuated by a spirit of revenge, and he is not so careful nor so generous in his dealings with public officials as the man who has been elected.

Mr. EMMERSON. Besides, he is not here.

Mr. KYTE. He is not here to defend any improper charges he may make against those officials. It is contrary to precedent, it is contrary to our notions of right and fair-play that the defeated candidate, who is not here to answer any criticisms, should be accepted as a sufficient authority to justify dismissals. I wish the minister would be good enough to take us into his confidence to-night and state whether these summary dismissals will be continued in his department, or whether he will give accused officials an opportunity of defending themselves against charges that may be made by those who feel it their duty to make them.

Mr. MONK. Heaven preserve and guard me from any expression, and protect this committee against any word, that may fall from my mouth which would have the effect of once more rekindling the discussion we have had in this House, I think far too lengthy, upon the subject of dismissals. But if my hon. friend wishes me to take the committee into my confidence and tell the committee what I think, I am prepared to say at once, that so far as my department is concerned, I would be delighted to afford any official who is about to be dismissed, or who has been dismissed, or who feels that he has been the object of any injustice, an opportunity of having an investigation.

In 1896 when every official in my county was dismissed under circumstances to which I have already adverted, and when I asked for a general investigation, my lamented friend Mr. Blair who was then Minister of Railways and Canals shrugged his shoulders and told me such a thing was impossible and was never done. But the lesson I learned then has taught me that these things cannot be done with impunity, and I would be prepared to grant an investigation wherever there is some ground for putting the country to the expense involved because it must be obvious that if every civil servant who has committed an infraction of the rules which the minister is satisfied he has committed is entitled to a commission, the country would be drawn into very great expense, and some kind of discretion must be exercised. But where there is a doubt, common British Justice requires that the minister should afford the employee an opportunity to justify himself and show that the accusation was not well founded. I have acted upon that principle, and wherever I had a doubt, if an investigation was demanded, I have granted it and always with the feeling that it was a somewhat costly proceeding. As I said the other night, if you are sure an employee has infringed the rule in such a grave manner as to deserve dismissal, you dismiss him. You cannot make every one of these dismissals the occasion of a political trial which calls for considerable expense, and although in political matters you have to be doubly careful, you cannot have an investigation where there is really, in your own opinion, no need for one. However, I have granted one wherever I have thought necessary.

In Ottawa the circumstances were somewhat special. A large number of complaints were made by the sitting members. I received them, I saw that they were put in such form as to constitute regular accusa-

tions, and when I saw that in many cases these accusations were denied, I chose a man who I thought was just, humane and equitable, and I entrusted him with the task which I could not possibly carry out myself, of giving a fair show to the employee accused in order that justice should be rendered.

As to the sitting member, my hon. friend seems to take it for granted that if he denounces an employee, then, on account of the position he occupies in this House, his accusation must be considered prima facie well founded. Is it just to refuse the same amount of credence to a man because he has been defeated? If he is nobody, if he has no standing in the community, I could understand it, but if he is a man chosen as the candidate, holding a respectable position, just as respectable as that of his triumphant adversary, and he puts the proper allegation before the minister, I think it little matters whether he is the defeated or the successful candidate. Any respectable citizen worthy of credence who makes a complaint against a civil servant is entitled to be listened to. Because a man is a member of parliament he is not, in my opinion, in a better position in this respect than anybody else, and if the circumstances are given, if the complaint is properly lodged, why should I not act until the contrary is proven on this accussation? It would be giving a singular privilege to a member to say that he would be in a different position than any respectable member of the community who makes that complaint.

I believe we can greatly improve our civil service, but I think every man is prepared to admit that all these improvements would go for naught if we should allow civil servants to take an offensive part in politics. If a civil servant attends meetings in a noisy manner, interrupts the speakers, becomes an offensive partisan, if he canvasses, attends committee meetings, takes an active part in the election, if he furnishes teams to one of the candidates can he be treated with indulgence? I think not, I think we ought to be very severe. I never complained on that score, when all my own constituents were put out of office suddenly, some of them at a moment's notice, infirm men with large families. What I complained of was that they were not afforded an opportunity of defending themselves when they asked for it. In the case pointed out to-night, I am prepared to lay the documents before my hon. friends and if in their opinion there is ground for an investigation, which is always a somewhat costly proceeding, it will take place undoubtedly.

Mr. EMMERSON. Would you restore the man to his position?

Mr. MONK. Surely if any injustice has been committed, some arrangement must be arrived at by which that injustice can be repaired.

To save expense investigators have been appointed in the different provinces, and they will be available for any investigations that may be necessary. There are a number of civil servants who openly meddle in elections. I have seen them in counties in Quebec interrupting speakers, raising rows, fighting, openly taking part in an offensive manner in the campaign and stating that they were ready for dismissal if their party did not remain in power. What is to be done in cases of that kind?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). No one would object to a dismissal in that case.

Mr. MONK. No, I think not, I think that in the present condition of affairs in regard to the civil service, we must absolutely admit that principle. There is room for improvement, but the moment you countenance in any way the meddling of civil servants in a campaign you do a thing that has always been discouraged in England, and in every country where they have endeavoured to improve the civil service, and I think we should endeavour to stand by that rule here.

As to any individual case in my own department I am anxious to give all the information possible, and where any injustice is committed, to repair it, to give the parties a full chance of investigation. I have done that in Ottawa. I believe that in the city of Ottawa the abuse was very great. I really believe that candidates forget all the injury they do to a civil servant in asking him to furnish teams to attend committee meetings or if he controls other employees to get them to vote and work in the election. It is in the excitement of an election campaign that he does this, but he places their positions in jeopardy. I know that has been done in several cases because these public servants have come to me and have told me how the thing happened. It was under these circumstances that I chose a man who I thought was just and fair, and asked him to investigate. There were probably 100 complaints. Neither I nor any of my officers could afford the time to investigate them as we were already overrun with work. I chose the most fair man I could find and told him that he must act absolutely according to the principles of justice and fairness.

Mr. NESBITT. Is there anything in the Civil Service Act which keeps any civil servant from taking part in elections?

Mr. MONK. There is such a clause in the Act, but anyway everybody knows that it is absolutely forbidden, and that if

civil servants do meddle in politics they risk their positions. Some do it in an underhand way, but the more frank do it openly and say they don't care whether they lose their positions or not.

Mr. KYTE. It is within my personal knowledge that the late Minister of Railways absolutely refused to dismiss without inquiry, a man against whom a charge of partisanship was made, and he appointed a commissioner to inquire, and not until he had that commissioner's report did he act. Of course I accept the statement of the Minister of Public Works as to what took place in his own constituency, but in my constituency no dismissals were made in 1896, except after investigation and report by a commissioner. The Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), who is I suppose not any more humane than any other member of the government, has adopted a course entirely different from that of the Minister of Public Works. Where charges of partisanship have been made against officials of the Post Office Department in my constituency he has notified them of the charges and asked them for their answers. I am happy to say that in a couple of cases, in which I asked the Postmaster General to give these officials an opportunity of defending themselves, he was so gracious as to grant my request. So far no dismissals have been made in the Post Office Department to my knowledge, and I have reason to believe none will be made until an investigation is held. At all events, the Postmaster General has been fair enough to intimate to the officials charged what the allegations against them are. I am not asking for an investigation in every case, but I do say that the charge should be communicated to the official, and an opportunity given him to answer. If he is charged with partisanship and he has been a partisan I have no doubt, if he is a truthful man—and I have no reason to assume they are not all truthful and honest men—he will admit the charge.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have had some experience and I would like to find one of them who would admit it.

Mr. KYTE. The experience of my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury), with his people is very different from my experience with my people. My people will state whether or not the charge is true. But there are cases in which the line is so illdefined between partisanship and nonpartisanship; and there are cases in which the man making the charge does so on hearsay, and these cases should be made the subject of inquiry and the official given an opportunity to explain the circumstances. I object to the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Public Works, that it is proper to dismiss a man first and try him afterwards; it would be more consonant with British justice to have the trial first and the conviction afterwards.

Mr. MONK. I would not like to be understood as reflecting on the conduct of the late Mr. Blair when Minister of Railways in 1896, but those who were there at that time will have no difficulty in accepting the statement I have made with regard to the dismissals in my constituency. Of course, at that time the doctrine as to the civil service was not as clearly defined as it is now. I know from my own experience, that when civil servants are charged with partisanship they generally deny it, and small blame to them because they think they may have a chance of retaining their positions. For instance, there was a man in my department, and I had abundant proof before me that he had infringed the rule, and I told him it was better he should resign. The man interested me, I had no desire to dismiss him, I thought I might transfer him to some other position, but he absolutely denied the charge, and we had to have an investigation, which I tried to conduct as cheaply as possible, yet it cost over $250, and of course the evidence was absolutely clear as to his infraction of the rule. As a rule, the officials deny such a charge, although in some cases the evidence is so strong that were it not that the political question was present no minister would have any hesitation in accepting the evidence without the inquiry.

Mr. MACDONALD. The resolution of the House imposes on the minister the duty of removing a man who offensively interferes in politics, and with that I do not quarrel. As to whether we are to have civil service reform in this country, in the inside or outside service backed up by public sentiment, and that all officials should refrain from politics, is a question as to which there is some doubt. If the minister will carry out his promise to be fair in dealing with these officials, there is little he has said I would quarrel with, barring his assertion that the statement of a defeated candidate is entitled to the same credence as the statement of any member of this House. When a member of parliament stands up in this House and makes a statement under the rules of this House he is on his honour and that statement must be accepted by every one of his fellow members. The rule is so absolute in its character that any hon. gentleman sitting in this House must realize there is an onus put upon him which places his statement in a category different from that of an ordinary statement. The defeated candidate is bound by no such rule as obtains in this House in that regard, and

pressed by party friends in his constituency he makes representations which nine times out of ten are not to his own personal knowledge. He is not on his honour in the presence of parliament as to the statements he makes, but he is actuated in a large degree by the political necessities of the local situation.

So that there is a very great distinction, which the hon. minister will himself at once admit, between the member of the House on either side who makes representations here on his honour as a member and a man outside—whether a defeated candidate or not. That being the case, if my hon. friend is actuated by a desire to be fair to those who occupy positions in the service, whether in the outside or inside service, he will not accept representations made to him by parties who are not members of this House without giving the accused the opportunity of saying whether or not these charges were true. At the inception of this debate I mentioned the case of a caretaker in the government employ at Westville. I happened to be in that town on election day, I took an active part in that contest, and I never saw this man interfere in politics in the slightest degree. I was very much surprised, therefore, when the other day this man came to me with a letter from Mr. Ewart in my hon. friend's department, notifying him, without any alleged cause whatever, to leave on January 31st. I mention this also to my hon. friend because I regard it as a severe hardship to move this man, who has a family to support, dependent on his retaining his position, in the midst of winter. In this case it was not even the defeated candidate who made any charge, because the defeated candidate was Mr. Bell, now a senator, and I am sure that he did not approach the minister concerning this man at all. So that it was solely on the representation of somebody outside this House who was not even a defeated candidate, that this man was dismissed. I would ask my hon. friend to cancel this notice of dismissal and give this man an opportunity to be heard in his own behalf.

Mr. MONK. I certainly recognize that there is a distinction between a member of this House and an ordinary citizen of a constituency or a defeated candidate. But still I think he will admit that the member elected remains in active politics and undergoes a pressure which in many cases the defeated candidate does not. Of course I eliminate at once the candidate who does not reside in the constituency, but who goes in to contest an election and leaves it afterwards, and is not subject, as is one who is living there, to the public criticism of his constituents when he asks for the dismissal of a public servant. But a defeated candidate, who resides in a constituency, holds a prominent position there, is a man of standing and credence, and in such a case the complaint has to be considered according to the circumstances of the case. In the case of the member elected, who has to defend his actions in this House as my hon. friend says, we are obliged to accept his statement, according to the rules of the House. But when a man of standing in his constituency, who is subject to the judgment and criticism of his fellow citizens, openly denounces a public servant as unfit to retain his position, his representations are entitled to considerable weight. I might mention personally that in one case since the election, I was asked by a gentleman living in the constituency, occupying a responsible position there, and not meddling in politics: How is it I hear of dismissals and you have not dismissed a certain public servant, who is known to have taken a most active part in the elections, who has done committee work and canvassed the voters and who spoke at meetings held there. I said there had been no complaint against him, but will my hon. friend say that I should take no notice of such a complaint against this man?

Mr. MACDONALD. I did not say that. If my hon. friend will just follow out that rule, he will grant my request at once. We both agree that where a public servant has been guilty of interference in politics as a partisan, he should be dismissed. We also agree that when a representation is made by a member of this House, the minister should accept the statement of the member who makes it. We also agree that when a complaint is made to a minister by any person of standing in the constituency, whether on the ground of partisanship or any other dereliction of his duty, the minister is bound to inquire into it. But my hon. friend will not say that because a defeated candidate, or any other person outside this House, chooses to make a complaint against an official in a department, he will act on that without investigation. In the case I refer to, the defeated candidate did not ask the minister to dismiss this man. My hon. friend is dealing with a case in which somebody outside this House, who is not even a defeated candidate, has asked him to make the removal. All I ask my hon. friend is to give this official the opportunity to be heard and not turn him out of his home, without an investigation, in the depth of winter.

Mr. BEATTIE. I have not asked for any dismissals in my constituency, though I think I ought to have done so. I certainly would have done so if I had

followed the precedent set by the late administration. For instance, in 1896 there were three young lads, not one of whom were more than twenty-five years old, dismissed from humble positions in the post office at London. The only charge against them was that their fathers were supporters of mine. I did not raise my voice against that arbitrary action, although I felt deeply that it was a great hardship and injustice. The dismissals made in 1896 were a disgrace to the country. Let me point to another instance. These hon. gentlemen opposite compelled an old gentleman of 68 years, who had been in charge of that post office for years, to take superannuation, and before they left office appointed in his place an old gentleman, whom I shall not name, of about 75 years of age. That gentleman they made postmaster of London. He had previously been Deputy Speaker of this House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He never was very brilliant, but I will not say here that he was not fit for the office.

Mr. BEATTIE. The appointment was very much against the wishes of the Liberals of London. I have not made any representations to this government regarding that gentleman, although in 1896 the late government dismissed everybody they could lay their hands on. Here was a case in which three young men were dismissed by the late government from the London post office, not one of whom was over twenty-five years of age, solely because their fathers were good Conservatives and supporters of mine.

I am very glad those young gentlemen were dismissed, because they occupy to-day very much better positions than they would have attained in the postal service of Canada. The Conservative party have been very kind and lenient in this matter, and I have been the same. I do not wish to do any man an injustice. But it is somewhat amusing to hear hon. gentlemen opposite complaining of dismissals when we have not dismissed anything like the number they did in 1896.

Mr. KYTE. The hon. Minister of Public Works stated that, in considering the value to be attached to the statements of defeated candidates with respect to charges against officials, he would eliminate the man who went from one constituency to another to contest an election, and returned to his own home after the election was over. That is exactly the condition in my own constituency. My opponent is not a resident of the county I represent, but lives in another. He came to my county as the candidate of the Conservative party, and after the election he returned to his home in another constituency. Since then whatever information he has received with respect to the partisanship of officials in my constituency has been largely obtained from men seeking the offices of those they desire to have dismissed. I would like the minister to bear that in mind whenever in the future representations are made by the defeated candidate in Richmond county looking to the dismissal of officials there. He is not a resident of the county, but a non-resident, and therefore has no personal knowledge of the charges he alleges. I hope, therefore, the minister will feel constrained not to put the value on that gentleman's allegations that he would in other cases, but will grant investigations in all cases where the officials are accused of partisanship.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was very much disappointed to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works make what seems to me to be a declaration of approval of the doctrine, to the victors belong the spoils.

Mr. MONK. It was not so intended.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps it was not, but it had that effect. The hon. gentleman referred to the action of the late Hon. Mr. Blair. In the county of Westmorland is the city of Moncton, the headquarters of the Intercolonial railway. In 1896 I was not in Dominion politics, but in that year the Hon. Mr. Blair became Minister of Railways, and I wish to state that among about 1,000 employees outside of the higher classes of officials, there was only one dismissal made by Mr. Blair because of political partisanship, and that was the ex-chief engineer of the Intercolonial railway upon charges that were made and investigated.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). How many dismissals on other grounds?

Mr. EMMERSON. None. Although the Conservative party had been in power for eighteen years and had filled every possible position on the Intercolonial railway, in the shops and offices and everywhere else, with their own friends, the Hon. Mr. Blair, on becoming Minister of Railways, declined to make dismissals except in cases where charges were made and investigated. Previous to dinner there was a question up with reference to the dismissal of Watson E. Reid, an architect, who was entrusted with the responsibility of inspecting the public building under construction at Hillsborough, and the Minister of Public Works stated that after recess he would have full information on the matter. I would like to ask him if he has furnished the information, and if so, what the character of that information is?

Mr. HAZEN. I have listened very attentively to this debate, and I am astonished that hon. gentlemen opposite should

attempt to leave the impression on the country that after the general elections of 1896 men were not removed from the employ of the government on the ground of political partisanship unless their cases were investigated and they were found guilty of the charges laid against them. I am especially astonished to hear the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) make the assertion he has made, because it is a well known fact in the province of New Brunswick that up and down the line of the Intercolonial railway from Quebec to St. John men were dismissed by the score without investigation.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is not prepared to say that was the case in the county of Westmorland.

Mr. HAZEN. I am prepared to say that it was the case up and down the Intercolonial railway, and I am prepared to give my hon. friend examples if he wants them. I have in my mind a man in St. John, James Demille, who occupied a humble position as checker in the railway station, and who after the election of 1900 was dismissed without one word of warning.

Mr. EMMERSON. That case did not occur until after the election of 1904, years after Mr. Blair had ceased to be Minister of Railways.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not care who was Minister of Railways. The party to which my hon. friend belongs were in power, and during the régime Mr. Demille, a worthy and respectable citizen, was dismissed from office on the ground of political partisanship.

He denied the charge and wrote demanding an investigation. He received a reply that no investigation was to be given and no change made in the order of dismissal. That is one case that occurs to me at the moment. I turn to 'Hansard' and I find another. My hon. friend from Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Kyte) has told us that in his constituency no dismissals were made without investigation first held. I accept his statement as I would accept that of any other hon. member of this House. But, even though that was the case in Richmond, it was not the case in every county of Nova Scotia. I find in 'Hansard' for 1909 at page 6784, the following:

Mr. MADDIN asked:.

1. When was Hector McRae, late keeper of Plaster Mines lighthouse, Victoria county, N.S., dismissed, and what was the cause of his dismissal?

2. Was there any charge against him? If so, who was the complainant and was there any investigation?

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

1. (a) By order in council, dated 6th May, 1909; (b) offensive political partisanship.

2. (a) Yes; (b) D. D. McKenzie, M.P.; (c) No.

So it is clear that in other counties they were dismissed without investigation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The point was that the defeated Conservative candidate was not a resident of the county.

Mr. HAZEN. That does not affect the statement of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) which was that no man in that constituency was dismissed by the Liberal government without an investigation. But as to this gentleman being resident outside the county, the hon. member for Richmond might have explained that that gentleman represented the county of Richmond in this House, I believe, from 1891 to 1900. And on several occasions since he has been a candidate in the county. Surely the statement of such a man should have weight. It must be recognized that he has knowledge of the politics of the people there. My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has referred to the case of Mr. Reid, inspector of construction of the post office at Hillsborough. And the hon. gentleman speaks in a way—I do not say intentionally—to give his hearers the idea that this gentleman was the architect of this post office.

Mr. EMMERSON. I expressly said he was not the architect, but that he was an architect by profession and was employed as inspector. Being an architect, he was better qualified to act as inspector than another man would have been.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman always speaks of him as an architect and inspector of the post office at Hillsborough. He may be an architect, but though I am fairly familiar with the people of New Brunswick, I have never heard of any great architectural work designed by Mr. Reid, nor have I ever heard of Mr. Reid as an architect at all. He was acting as inspector on this building, work which did not call for a man with the qualifications of an architect. I am sorry the hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) is not in his seat, for he would be familiar with the facts. But I am informed that Mr. Reid was very active in the elections in endeavouring to defeat the hon. gentleman who is now member for that constituency. But the position Mr. Reid occupied was in no sense a position in the civil service. He was appointed because he was a friend of the government, and the position was in its very nature a temporary one. Was it not in line with the way politics are carried on

by both sides that, when the present government came into power it should select one of its own friends to fill this position which Mr. Reid occupied simply because he was a friend of the former government? I do not wish to take up time discussing a matter which has already been discussed at length, and would not have spoken but for the statement of the hon member from Richmond (Mr Kyte) which would lead one to believe that no official was dismissed by the late government without an investigation. Hundreds of cases are to be found all over the country, cases of men who had been for years in the public service and whose dismissal involved great hardship, cases even of men who were dismissed not for anything they had done, but to visit upon them the sins of their relatives who had taken part in politics.

Mr. EMMERSON. The late Mr. Blair's name having been mentioned, I stated that in the county of Westmorland, Mr. Blair had made no dismissals after 1896, without an investigation.

Mr. HAZEN. Was not Mr. Foster dismissed?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not in Mr. Blair's department. And in that case, a year or two afterwards an investigation was held by Mr. Bill, from Nova Scotia. As Mr. Blair's name was mentioned, I thought it due to his memory to recall the fact, that, in 1896, when he became Minister of Railways, so far as the county of Westmorland is concerned, which I have the honour to represent, though in the Intercolonial railway shops at Moncton there are about a thousand men employed, and hundreds more in the offices, and hundreds in other places in the county, no dismissals were made except after an investigation. Speaking from memory, there was really only one, the chief engineer; and the facts of that case frequently came before this parliament after 1896.

Mr. HAZEN. Was not Mr. Cook, the general storekeeper dismissed?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, he was superannuated at a later period, because of his condition of health.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. EMMERSON. One at a time, please. Now, as to the case of Mr. Demille, the Liberals came into power in 1896. Mr. Demille was a Liberal. Mr. Demille's family belonged to the county of Albert, which county I represented for twelve or fourteen years, so I knew something about them. He received employment under the Liberal government, largely, I suppose, because he was a Liberal. He held a position down to 1904, and then his services were dispensed with. But that did not arise from what Mr. Blair did, nor was it because of any change of government. It seems to be the doctrine of my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen), that the mere fact that a man is a Liberal is a reason for his dismissal. Mr. Watson Reid I have known for years. He lived in the county of Albert when I had the honour of representing that county. He is a Liberal, no doubt of it. But he never took an active part in politics. He may have attended public meetings on either side, but he was recognized by the people generally as a man who would take no part in politics. He received his training as an architect in the United States, but returned to his native province. While not actively engaged in his profession, he has designed a number of residences that would do credit to the best architect in New Brunswick. He was engaged to supervise the building at Hillsboro because it was the first Dominion building erected there, and the object was to make it a credit to the country. Simply because of his qualifications, he was selected as an inspector. As to this job as inspector, Mr. Reid does not care a snap of the finger, I venture to say, whether he has it or not.

I am speaking of the principle, and I was calling the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the circumstances of this case. I was not making any complaint on behalf of Mr. Watson Reid, but I was saying that as he had been engaged from the very inception of the building, he should be kept on until it was finally completed. I made no reference to other sections. I have not contended that the Liberals did not dismiss from office very many men, but only after investigation. The great complaint against the Liberal government in 1896, and for a year or two afterwards, was that they did not act. The Conservatives had been in power for 18 years, almost every position in the public service of New Brunswick was held by a Conservative, and it was the complaint of those who had supported the Liberal party that there was no possibility of their being recognized—I am only speaking of facts. That the government did not respond to their appeal is either to its credit or its discredit; to its discredit perhaps from a party point of view. They suffered in the province of New Brunswick because they did not listen to the appeals to make dismissals. There may have been some dismissed without investigation, but that was not the case in the county of Westmorland, and my hon. friend from Restigouche (Mr. Reid) says there was not one such case in his county. But all up and down the province these complaints were made. I want to tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he has not had the opportunity

of knowing New Brunswick that I have had. I have resided in Westmorland, and my duties required that I should go up and down in every county, in every section, indeed in every school district in the province of New Brunswick officially. Therefore I know something about the complaints of the people in 1896 as regards the inaction of the Liberal party in not removing Conservative office-holders. So much was that the case, that in the last election it was openly stated that if the Conservatives came into power they would sweep every Liberal out of office, instead of retaining their opponents as the Liberal government had done. It is amusing to listen to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries contrasting their utterances with the declaration of principles made by their leader in 1896 from the floor of this House, and in the very first speech which he ever delivered as a member of the House of Commons. Any one who would read the declaration of principles laid down by the right hon. gentleman in 1896 and contrast it with the unblushing confessions of his colleagues in this House to-night, confessions of their adherence to the policy that to the victor belongs the spoil, will be struck with the contrast. And now we have the Minister of Public Works suggesting that the defeated Conservative candidate should be considered as a sufficient authority to warrant dismissal. It seems to me the doctrine is being carried far beyond anything that has ever been accepted in this House. I agree that men who took their offices in their hands during an election and openly espoused one party or the other, should receive their congé. Will my hon. friend deal in the same manner with respect to those officials who took an active part in the last election in opposition to the candidates of the Liberal party? If he will take my word as a representative of the county of Westmorland, I can give him the names of office-holders in the railway service, in the customs service, in the postal service, who openly and flagrantly espoused the cause of the Conservative candidates. When I asked that question of the leader of the government the other night he said: well, he would take that into consideration. My hon. friends opposite affect to feel outraged because an official takes an attitude against their party, but they smile, and laugh, and jeer when there is a complaint made against an official who espoused their party cause in the election.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Might I suggest that it is a smile of surprise that there is a solitary Tory left in the public service.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I have listened to many astounding things from my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, and that is the most astounding of them all. I am not going to stand here and pose in any hypocritical manner with respect to the attitude of the Liberal party. But the Liberal party dismissed after charges were made—I am speaking now of the section of the country in New Brunswick with which I am familiar—they dismissed parties, and when vacancies occurred they appointed their own friends to office, and in that I hold they were right. When hon. gentlemen opposite take that course they will receive no criticism from me. But let us be fair and manly. If they will only dismiss on representations of their Conservative friends who are members of this House, and in the case of defeated candidates, on statements made on oath and on sworn evidence, after investigation, then I do not think that the country at large will complain of their course.

We are not contending that men should be retained in office who have been partisans, but we are contending that men who are discharged should have fair-play, should have a trial, should not first be executed and then have their trial. That is the position of the Minister of Public Works, he beheads the man, and then seeing him writhing in the dust says: Oh, if you will come forward now that your head is off and make an explanation which is satisfactory I shall replace the head. I do not think that is fair, I think that men who are charged should have a fair trial, and an opportunity of refuting, if they can, the charges made against them. If they cannot they must take the consequences, and they cannot even expect the support of their own friends.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski). Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised by the utterances of the hon. members opposite about dismissals. It is true that before to-day I knew that lawyers can venture to whitewash a negro, but I could not believe that there were amongst those gentlemen some of them as bold as to shield so reprovable deeds which the late government have been guilty, and deeds that I have witnessed myself during so many years. Above all I could never believe that men like the hon. member from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) and from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) who absolutely knew by themselves all what has happened from 1896 to 1911, could reproach the Conservative party, as they have done, on account of dismissals, when that party has not done yet the tithe of dismissals ordered by the Liberal party.

I am sorry my hon. friend from Westmorland cannot understand what I have

been saying. But to state that there were no dismissals in 1896 without investigation is untrue, and I can prove it. I have a list, and I have letters referring to men who were dismissed from 1896 to 1900 without an investigation, without any cause being given for their dismissal. I shall again read for the information of my hon. friend from Westmorland a letter which I submitted to the House the other evening:

Campbellton Station, Jan. 2, 1897.

Mr. Theophile Michaud,
Section Foreman,
Amqui.

Dear Sir,—I am instructed to notify you that after the 15th of the present month your services will be dispensed with. This will give you the usual 14 days' notice. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours truly,
JAMES PATTERSON.

Here is another one which is shorter than that, three days' notice:

Rivière du Loup Station,
October 28, 1896.

George Dubé, Esq.,
Sectionman,
St. Alexandre.

Sir,—I am instructed by the chief engineer to notify you that your services will no longer be required as sectionman on the Intercolonial railway. You will, therefore, consider yourself discharged after the 31st of this month.

Just three days. That man with a family was dismissed without the 15 days' notice. This man wanted to know, as the hon. member for Westmorland is saying now, the reason why, and he wrote to his superior, and received the following reply:

Moncton, N.B., Nov. 2, 1896.

Mr. George Dubé,
Ex-sectionman,
St. Alexandre Station, P.Q.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 30th ult., asking the reasons for your discharge from the service. I do not know of any reports against you. My order was from the general manager and was repeated to Mr. Yeo.

Yours truly,
P. S. ARCHIBALD,
Chief Engineer.

To show you how bad a man that was, and how dishonest, I shall read you another letter. After being dismissed he went on another road, and served there for six or seven years. At the end of that term he asked for a certificate from his chief, and you will see what he got:

New Carlisle, Quebec,
June 17, 1907.

To whom it may concern:

George Dubé has been in the employ of this railway for over six years and is only leaving for causes to his advantage. I can thoroughly recommend him as an industrious, sober, and eminently trustworthy man, and am sure will give every satisfaction in any position he may fill.

CHAS. D. SCOLES,
General Manager,
Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway.

That is the kind of men they were discharging in my county in 1896, and later on. I have here a partial list, about one-tenth, of the men discharged in my county at that time:

List of employees of the Intercolonial railway dismissed in 1896.

Th. Rioux, Ste-Luce.
God. Boulay, Sacré Cœur.
Jos. Bernard, Bic-ouest.
Sylvio Coté, Bic-ouest.
Ernest Rioux, St-Fabien.
Cyp. Thibeault, Ste-Flavie.
Marcel Lebrun, Ste-Flavie-ouest.
J. B. Therriault, Ste-Flavie-ouest.
Eugène Roy, Ste-Flavie.
Alph. Lebrun, Ste-Flavie.
Michel Morin, Cedar Hall.
Théop. Michaud, Amqui.
Théodore Thériault, Causapscal.
Amédée Lepage, Beau Rivage.
J. C. Gallant, 1900, Sayabec.
F. X. Anctil, 1905, agent, Métis.
God. Boulay.
Macaire Morin.
Cléophas Damour.
T. V. Cooke.
P. S. Archibald.
Geo. Skeffington.

Mr. HAZEN. Were they all given an investigation?

Mr. BOULAY. They were given an investigation in the same way as George Dubé was.

I observe on the order paper a question by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) asking how many dismissals of postmasters there have been in the county of Rimouski. There are about twelve, and to equal what was done in 1896 I have about 40 more to ask.

I do not intend to do it because I have still some idea of what is honest and what is humane, and I will spare the people who deserve to be spared. I expect that after this the members of the Liberal party will not again refer to the question of dismissals. If they did right in 1896 how is it wrong now in 1912 for us to restore the poor men whom they unjustly dismissed? It is nothing but fair, now that the Conservative party is in power, that they should put back in their places all those men who were unjustly dismissed by the Liberals in 1896. I can tell my hon. friend from Westmorland that all those men whose names I have mentioned have not been put back yet on the railway, but in justice to these poor fellows who have waited for fifteen

years they will have to be. Let me tell you the means the Liberals took to dismiss the last Conservative sectionman on the railway in my district. They imported a track-master who was working on another railway and he declared he was glad to call himself a friend of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and having that man who was a Grit, of course they could discharge whom they pleased, and so, the last Conservative in the railway in my county, J. C. Gallant, was dismissed in 1900. I think I have given sufficient cases to the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) to induce him to refrain from talking any more about dismissals. He now asks from the Minister of Public Works the indulgence of giving his friends an investigation before dismissing them, but if the Minister of Public Works or any other minister did that I would certainly blame him. The rules of the Intercolonial railway say that an investigation is to be given to a man dismissed within fifteen days after he is dismissed—not before he is dismissed, remember—and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) who has been Minister of Railways, must know that rule. The hon. member for Westmorland was not so scrupulous in 1904. When I spoke the other day in French, and I suppose he did not understand me, but he could have read my words after they were translated, I made a severe charge against him as a public man. It was his duty as minister to protect the patrons of the government railway against his own employees, and he failed to do so. I was insulted badly by one of the sectionmen right on the railway premises and I was ordered to go home by him. I reported the facts to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) when he was minister, then I wrote to the government, then I wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the chief of the minister, but no justice was ever rendered to me. No investigation of any kind was ordered, and that is why I have recently put a motion on the order paper to ask for all the papers concerning that affair, and when I get them I presume I shall discover that orders came directly from the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) who was then Minister of Railways, not to give an investigation. I think I have said enough to remind all those who are on the other side of the House now that when they were on this side of the House, they did not carry out the practice which they now recommend should be followed.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it would indeed have been a matter for surprise had the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) refrained from addressing the House anent this question of dismissal of government employees. As a matter of fact the hon. member is throughout the district of Quebec, the recognized executioner of the Conservative party.

Sir, it would seem that much vaunted advance of civilization was an unknown factor as far as this matter is concerned. In olden times when victims were sacrificed, their bodies were strewn with flowers. Nowadays the member for Rimouski, not content with having poor employees deprived of their means of living, deems it becoming to add insult to injury. That shows very poor taste on the part of the hon. member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of Mr. George Dubé, of St. Alexandre, all the men whose names have been mentioned by the hon. member as having been dismissed, were living in the county of Rimouski, whose representative in 1896 was a friend of the government. Mr. George Dubé himself resided in the county of Kamouraska, which, in 1896, was also represented by a member friendly to the government.

Hon. members all seem to concur in the opinion that whenever a member, under his personal responsibility, charges a civil servant with offensive partizanship, the minister is bound to accept his statement. We do not object to that. But the hon. member has not mentioned the name of a single employee who had been dismissed without inquiry, on a charge brought against him by others than members of this House.

As I stated a moment ago, he will soon have made for himself a name as an informer against government officials.

There is not a constituency in the province of Quebec—and I state it as a compliment to the hon. member who apparently is proud of it—wherein heads have fallen in as large numbers as in this county of Rimouski. It is a fact known to all that postmasters have been dismissed without inquiry and without notice.

Mr. BOULAY. How many?

Mr. LAPOINTE. I wonder whether my hon. friend takes pride in it, but as a matter of fact, after these postmasters had been dismissed, he found himself under the necessity of requesting that a certain number of them be reinstated, the people having become indignant at the way things were carried on.

Now the hon. member is not content with playing the part of the executioner in his own constituency; his ambition requires greater scope. He has gone beyond the limits of the county of Rimouski, and you will be surprised to learn, Mr. Speaker, that, at his request, a man in the employ of the Intercolonial, at Fraserville, in the county of Temiscouata, so worthily represented by my friend Mr. Gauvreau, was

summarily dismissed, without previous notice, without inquiry, by means of a simple letter which was sent to him stating: Your services are no longer required. That employee who had been contributing for fourteen years to the superannuation fund of the Intercolonial, wrote to the Minister of Railways inquiring as to the reasons which had brought about his dismissal, what were the charges made against him, and requesting an inquiry. The minister answered: Sir, you have been dismissed on a charge of having taken an active part in the last elections and of being guilty of offensive partisanship. You have been dismissed on the recommendation of Mr. H. Boulay, member for Rimouski, who stated that to his personal knowledge you had been guilty of offensive partisanship. Now that officer is not acquainted with the member for Rimouski, has never spoken to him. And the hon. member states that to his personal knowledge that man has been guilty of offensive partisanship.

Well, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. Minister of Public Works thinks of that? If he accepts the statement of government members as regards the wrong-doing of government officers residing in their constituency, is he going to accept such statements when it comes to dismissing officials outside their constituencies?

Then, it seems to me the hon. Minister of Public Works has bad grace to quote the case of England. In Great Britain, he contends no government official has the right to take part in elections. As a matter of fact, is it not true that civil servants in Great Britain are debarred from interfering with politics, whether in favour of one party or the other? Both parties are agreed on that point. And it is known in Great Britain that no public servant has the right to work for any party. Should that rule be enforced here, the hon. minister would have to act on our statement whenever we complained of the doings of some official who had worked against us. As for myself I would be in a position to mention some employees of whom we have reason to complain; and that would provide him with a good opportunity to show that he really means what he says.

I repeat it, in none of the cases mentioned by the hon. member for Rimouski, did the complaints emanate from others than members of this House supporting the Liberal government then in power and representing the constituencies wherein those officials resided. So that the speech made by the hon. member is in no sense an answer to the reason set forth from this side of the House.

Mr. LAPOINTE.

Mr. BOULAY. (Translation.) The hon. member for Kamouraska has just made statements the truth of which it would be very difficult for him to prove. He stated that I demanded the dismissal of postmasters whom I afterwards caused to be reinstated. I may say to the hon. member that he has been very wrongly informed, as all the postmasters who have been dismissed have been so dismissed in order to reinstate those who had been discharged in 1896 and subsequently. The object then was to make amends for the harm done in 1896, and not a single one of the postmasters dismissed on my representations of late has been reinstated.

The hon. member for Kamouraska stated that Mr. Talbot was an Intercolonial railway employee at Rivière du Loup. Well, for the information of the hon. member who does not seem to be very well posted, I may say that Mr. Talbot's work was being performed between Levis and Campbellton. So that it is not a River du Loup official, but a district official whose dismissal I requested, and I did so knowing him to be a party heeler, who has been canvassing votes all over on the trains, and who was the keeper of the black list of Conservative employees at River du Loup. That is the reason which induces me to request his discharge, and nothing else.

I think I have answered satisfactorily the charges wantonly made by the hon. member for Kamouraska. Let me close by congratulating him on having addressed the House in French, anl I hope hon. members on the other side will follow suit.

Mr. NESBITT. Were it not for the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) that civil servants should not take any part in politics, I would not say anything in this debate, and I only do so because silence might be construed to give consent. I do not agree at all in that doctrine except where civil servants are disfranchised by any statute. They are citizens of this country just as the rest of us, and the difficulty I see is that the government take the ground that civil servants have not the rights of ordinary citizens. But the government themselves are simply civil servants, in a higher grade no doubt, but still they are but servants of the Crown. Therefore unless we pass an Act disfranchising our public officials, I do not see why they should not exercise the rights of citizens as other citizens do. Of course if you take from them the rights of citizenship, you deprive them of the right to vote, then you take from them the right to take any part in politics, but that you have not

done yet. I am absolutely in accord with the right hon. the First Minister in the speech he made in 1896, which was quoted here the other night, and agree that civil servants should be punished just the same as anybody else for misdemeanours. In the opinion I have expressed that until disfranchised, our officials should be entitled to exercise all the rights of citizenship, I am alone in this House, judging by the opinions we have heard from both sides within the last two weeks, but I cannot help that. I have my own views on everything, no matter what, and am not disposed to change them without what I consider good cause. In the riding of North Oxford, our experience is apparently unique. Within my recollection, there have been no public officials dismissed in that riding either by the provincial or the Dominion government. In fact my predecessor, the late Mr. James Sutherland, whom a great many in this House knew, not only did not dismiss anybody in 1896, but made appointments to the government service indifferently from Liberals and Conservatives. I know that Liberals in that county thought that in this he was unjust. I know that there was a good deal of clamour on the part of certain Liberals, who thought that his conduct in this respect was unjust and unfair, but that did not cause him to alter his course. I know also that he was always glad to assist any young men in the riding, whether Liberals or Conservatives, any way he could, to the best of his ability. My experience, therefore, in the riding I have the honour to represent, is apparently, from all I have heard in this House, very unique. That no doubt is why I have no hard feeling against any public official who takes part in politics. I hold that civil servants are simply human beings like the rest of us and should be treated as such. Why should a village postmaster, for instance, getting a salary of $150 or $200 or $300 a year, have to give up his birthright on that account? I think it is absolutely unfair to require that he should practically divest himself of his manhood simply because he is drawing a little money from the public purse. I have nothing more to say except to express the hope that the precedent set by the riding of North Oxford will be followed throughout the Dominion. So far as I am concerned I shall never hesitate to assist to the best of my ability any man, young or old whether Conservative or Liberal, in the riding. I have never questioned the politics of any man when I could do anything for him.

Mr. SINCLAIR. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would save a good deal of time and discussion if he would be more open and frank. I endeavoured to extract from him his consent to give an investigation into a case of very great hardship in my constituency but have not yet been able to get him to do so. I refer to the dismissal of the caretaker of a public building at Canso, which case was similar to that mentioned by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), namely, the dismissal of the caretaker at Westville. The caretaker at Westville was ordered out of the public building on the 31st of December without any charge being made against him that he was aware of and without any intimation that any investigation would be given. The caretaker at Canso also received a letter notifying him to move out of the building. I requested the hon. minister to grant an investigation and also give this man a little time in which to find shelter for his family. I must say that I have not been very well treated by my hon. friend, because I have not yet received a reply to my letter, though it was penned some months ago. I did, on several occasions, draw his attention to the matter, but he always put me off with some irrelevant remark, and has not yet offered to give me the investigation I asked for. I notice also that in answering some questions which I put to the hon. minister, he was anything but frank and open. When asked who recommended Mr. Chauvin as commissioner, he replied that he was recommended by the head of the department. By that I suppose he meant himself. And no doubt he meant that no one recommended Mr. Chauvin, but that the minister selected him of his own accord. Then he was asked whether Mr. Chauvin was the defeated Nationalist candidate in Labelle county in the general election of 1908 and his reply was: 'There is no record in the department.' What do you think of that reply? Here we have the assistant leader of the Nationalist party of the province of Quebec, who does not know who his own candidate was in that election. There is no record in the department, and consequently we cannot get that information from him. But perhaps he will tell me now whether this man was really the Nationalist candidate who ran in the county of Labelle?

With regard to the case at Canso, the candidate who was opposed to me in Guysborough does not reside in that county, but resides in Sydney, which is about a hundred miles from Canso, so that he must get his information from some of his political friends at Canso. I have received so many letters from officials of various departments in my constituency in regard to the efforts made to drive them out of office that I have made some inquiries as to where these efforts started from, and I was informed that complaints were invited by means of a printed form which was sent to the neighbours of the officials in the various

districts asking them if they had any complaint to make against anybody; and these complaints made by anybody go to the Minister of Public Works, and he acts on them. That is the kind of evidence on which the heads of officials are cut off in the county of Guysborough. I do not admit the statements made by some hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to what took place in 1896, and subsequently, so far as my constituency is concerned. I know that the dismissals made there were made after investigation. Captain Douglas travelled along the coast, and where a legitimate complaint was made against a man, he held an investigation, summoning witnesses, swearing them, hearing the evidence, and giving an opportunity for cross-examination, and then made his report. No one can complain of that; it is a fair trial. There were not very many dismissals, on the Intercolonial railway. For example, at Mulgrave where a large number of people were employed to my best recollection there were only three men dismissed, and these were dismissed for good cause. The late Mr. Blair was a generous hearted, and broad-minded man who was not in favour of dismissal, and he did not entertain complaints unless they were made by responsible people, and then he gave investigations. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has given us a long list of dismissals made in 1896, but it does not contain any in connection with the Intercolonial. We were told by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that all up and down the line the slaughter had taken place. I can not speak for up and down the line, but I can speak for one corner in the province of Nova Scotia where it did not take place unless there was good cause for it. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works should define his policy on this matter. That he has not done so is one reason why he has had these long discussions when he brings his estimates forward. The hon. Minister of Customs did better. He came out squarely and frankly, and stated his policy in the following words:

> When a defeated candidate makes charges against an official of active partisanship, I have so far sent these charges as given to me to the commissioner appointed for the purpose of investigating them, and he is advised to notify whoever makes the charges and the official against whom the charges are made.

There we have a statement of the method in which the minister proposes to act. We have not yet had anything of that kind from the Minister of Public Works. He has not stated the principle on which he will act for the future. I feel that he should not get his estimates passed until he states definitely and clearly his policy on that important question. I hope he will do so to-night. I do not think he is justified in saying that it is too expensive to send a man to investigate a complaint against an official. The most important and valuable thing we have in this country is justice and fair-play, and the Dominion can afford to pay for it. There are three of these axemen or headsmen appointed in the province of Nova Scotia. Why does he not say that one of these men will be employed in every case in which complaints are made against an official of the Public Works Department, to visit the place and hold an investigation, and inform himself whether the statements made are true or not? If he will declare his policy in some such way as that, I shall be satisfied; I will take his word that he will carry it out, and I think he will find that it will be to his own advantage to do so.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). So far as the county I represent is concerned, there is no very serious complaint on the ground of dismissals. I did call attention the other evening to a case that I thought was a hardship, and I think that is probably the only case in the county. The reason is that in that county practically all the old officers of any kind are Conservatives. In 1896 there were very few dismissals by the Liberal party, certainly none of officers occupying prominent positions. All the good offices were held by Conservatives, and are still held by them. I may say, however, that they have always conducted themselves like gentlemen, and have never been offensive partisans, though they are pronounced in their political views, and are always ready to give expression to their convictions if anyone wants to discuss politics with them. As long as officials do not go out of their way to be offensive or insulting, do not go about seeking to provoke a quarrel, I do not consider them to be offensive partisans. I do not think that the fact of a man going to a public meeting, and even asking questions, is an evidence of partisanship. The hon. member for Westmorland has stated that the leaders of the Liberal party have been accused of not having been as mindful of the demands of their friends in the way of giving them offices as they should have been. I have heard again and again charges made against the Liberal party that they were not dismissing Conservatives as they should have done; and to-day, when you meet Liberals and discuss the matter with them, they will say: 'Your fellows are going to get it in the neck, they are going to be dismissed right and left, and it is good enough for you; you deserve it; how did you treat your enemies after 1896? How did you remember your friends?'

There is no doubt that, speaking generally, the Liberals did not dismiss, except for good cause and usually offered investigation. There are many Liberals properly dismissed now. Many have gathered

around the various services in the past fifteen years and who are really not required. Some, perhaps, are not competent to perform their duties, and yet it was pretty hard for the late government's friends to turn them out. So far as these are concerned, we have no complaint to make. But when it comes to turning out an active, capable, efficient man, and replacing him, as in many cases with a man certainly no better qualified, if as well, I think it is time to call a halt. The Minister of Public Works has said that on the recommendation of the sitting member he would dismiss a man who was represented to him to be an offensive partisan. To that we can scarcely make objection if we are going to recognize at all the idea of partisanship not being permitted in an official. But the minister says that he will accept the recommendation even of a defeated Conservative candidate against an office-holder. I agree with those who have said that, in such a case the minister should go a little more slowly; he certainly should not dismiss officials on such a recommendation in the summary manner he has done, but should make inquiries. But what about the cases in which neither the sitting member nor the defeated candidate makes complaint. In my county the defeated candidate is a gentleman of the highest honour, a man of integrity and of the highest personal character, who has made himself highly respected in every way. Though I differ from him politically, I am bound to say that as a man, and a party man, he is above reproach. But the Conservative party in the county of Antigonish were not satisfied with him to dispense patronage. I do not know whether they felt he would be too upright and honourable for them. But the 'hungry horde' met in conclave and decided upon a mode of action by which the spoils of office might be divided amongst them. In such a case what will the minister do? Here are those seeking office—'the hungry horde' as they are called by the 'Halifax Herald,' the leading Conservative paper of Nova Scotia, and supposed to be the personal organ of the leader of the government—assembling and parcelling out offices among themselves.

The recommendations do not come either from the sitting member or from a defeated candidate. The defeated candidate is ignored—he is treated with the greatest disrespect. They form a sort of patronage committee, the jackals; they make representations to the government. Will the government listen to them? Is this to be a jackal government? I hope that when the minister answers the questions put by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) he will take the House into his confidence and tell us what he proposes to do in cases of that kind. So far as the principles as enunciated by the minister were concerned, on the whole they were certainly good and should meet with the approval of both sides of the House. And he spoke in such sympathetic terms that one would really believe that the injuries perpetrated hitherto, will not be repeated in the future. I wish we could be satisfied that his practices are going to be in accordance with his preachments. But when we find that men have been dismissed without an hour's notice, dismissed under such circumstances as have been related here by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), we cannot but look with suspicion upon some of the principles we hear enumerated even by ministers here in this House. I submit that it is not a proper thing to hang, draw and quarter a man first, and then give him a trial. Yet that is virtually the position the Minister of Public Works is taking. I would ask him to state what he proposes to do when neither the sitting member nor the defeated candidate makes representations regarding dismissals, but the representations come from a committee of those seeking office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not presume to speak for this side of the House as a whole, but I know there is a great deal of disappointment and dissatisfaction by reason of the statements made by the Minister of Public Works to-night. We had been led to understand, when the question of dismissals was under consideration in this committee, and the Customs estimates were before us, that where the sitting member did not take the responsibility of making a charge, but the charge was made by somebody outside of the House, notice would be given to the official concerned and a fair opportunity for him to put in his defence and to have his case investigated. But the Minister of Public Works has upset all our expectations based upon the statement made on the former occasion by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid, Grenville). The hon. minister (Mr. Monk) must see that it is very desirable that a uniform rule should be laid down and followed by all the departments. Then I think he will see that the hon. members for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), Inverness (Mr. Chisholm), and Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) are entitled to the information which they ask for in regard to the officials to whom they refer. I was going to suggest to the minister that possibly he might allow item 140, 'Dominion Public Buildings,—Renewals, improvements

and repairs,' to stand, allowing us to proceed with other items; and then when this item is taken up perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would be able to give the information for which hon. gentlemen have asked to which they are fairly entitled; also, if he would allow me to make the suggestion and did not think me too presumptuous, he might, after consultation with his colleagues, be prepared to give us information which would indicate a uniform course in these matters on the part of the different departments, not having one minister go by one rule and another by a different rule, thus confusing the public mind as to the course to be pursued. If it is intended to act upon the request of the committeemen or the defeated candidate without investigation, let it be so stated. But do not let one minister say that in all cases where a charge is not made by a member of parliament there will be an investigation, that every man shall have a fair chance to defend himself, and then another minister act upon some entirely different principle.

I throw out this suggestion, I do not know whether it will meet the views of hon. gentlemen who are asking for the information. But I think that might be satisfactory, and then my hon. friend could get on with some other items, and when this item 140 is taken up, he may perhaps be in a position to give the information that is asked for.

Mr. MONK. I think item 140 has been passed. But we might leave open any other item that might be found convenient. I do not think hon. gentlemen in the committee have, some of them at least, followed the explanation I gave this evening. I am bound to say that to those who have been in parliament for many years, and who witnessed what took place when the former government came into power in 1896, there is something profoundly absurd in all this discussion. I alluded briefly to what occurred in my own constituency and I know a number of others of that kind, and I mitigated my statement by saying that at that time the doctrine had not been as fully laid down as it has been since, in discussions, resolutions, and in the House. But I venture to say that if the people of this country knew the amount of time we have wasted in the discussion of this subject since parliament began sitting this year, there would be an outcry. It has been calculated that the sittings of this parliament cost the country over $10,000 a day, and we have been spending I do not know how many days on this discussion, which seems to me perfectly idle. It is somewhat discouraging.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid that if my hon. friend persists in making reflections against hon. members on this side of the House, who are not conscious of having wasted one minute more than hon. gentlemen opposite, he will not make progress with his estimates.

Mr. MONK. I believe that a great deal of valuable time has been wasted. It is easy to understand the position of the government, mine is perfectly clear, and I cannot understand how the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) can have any doubt whatever as to my own position. I cannot discuss a case when the papers are not familiar to me. I have consented to a motion to bring down the papers, and an opportunity will be given to discuss each case when the papers are before the House. As to investigations, I stated a moment ago that investigators had been named in each province, and that for my own part, where a prima facie case was made out for an investigation, I would grant it with pleasure. What more can I say? As regards complaints against public officials, I expressed the opinion that I did not believe that we should act merely and exclusively on the complaint of the sitting member, but that the evidence of other respectable citizens in the constituency was entitled to consideration. I do not see that I could go much further. I have in every case where an investigation has been asked, consented to it, and facilitated it. Now what sense or reason can there be in the complaint of a moment ago by the hon. member for Guysborough, that I would give no information in reply to questions? I have answered every question placed upon the order paper so far as I could. He asked me upon what recommendation Mr. Chauvin had been appointed, and I had stated four minutes before that I chose Mr. Chauvin myself, knowing that he was a just and fair man, and all gentlemen who have spoken to me about that choice have approved it, those who are interested and those who are not. I was asked if Mr. Chauvin was the Nationalist candidate in Labelle county in 1908. I do not know. A question of that sort should not be put to ministers. I do not know whether he was a Nationalist candidate or not, I took no interest whatever in that election. I do not know who is a Nationalist and who is not. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the session is wearing away. I am anxious to give as much information as I can on these items under discussion, and in relation to those items I have endeavoured to make my information as complete as possible. I cannot discuss each individual case unless I have the facts before me, but I am bringing down the papers in each case. My hon. friends complain

that they have applied for an investigation. I have no knowledge of that whatever. Whenever an investigation has been asked of which I have any knowledge, I have been prepared to grant it. I would not say that a minister in every case must grant an investigation; but when a fair case is made out for an investigation I would deem myself most unjust not to consent to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend see how absurd it is to dismiss a man first upon the recommendation of a political committee, or the defeated candidate, and then hold an investigation?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must not assume that in any case I have acted upon the recommendation of a political committee, I would not dream of doing such a thing. The very fact that a political committee recommended a dismissal would place me on my guard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How about a defeated candidate who gets his information from a political committee?

Mr. MONK. If I have at any time acted upon the complaint of a defeated candidate, it was when he articulated that complaint in a proper manner; I have, I think, in one or two cases.

Mr PUGSLEY. What would be a proper manner?

Mr. MONK. Where he states positively what is the particular case of offensive interference by a public official. Mr. Chairman, I would ask our friends opposite not to push this too far. They have made a protest, which is right and proper, I do not make any complaint of that. But there have been numberless injustices in 1896, and a great many since—not always cases of dismissal, but unjust treatment of public servants. No end of them have come under my notice. Men have been placed ahead of others who have been a longer time in the service, and who found themselves retained at inferior salaries, without any complaint against them whatever. We are anxious to deal justly in all these cases; but I would suggest to my hon. friends that all this froth and pathos—it is nothing else to me—can be pushed a little too far, and might work an injustice to their own friends who are in the public service, against whom there is no complaint, and whom we are anxious to treat fairly and justly.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much pleasure to the remarks of the hon. members who are complaining of the dismissals which have been made in their respective counties. There has occurred there what has already occurred in the county of Montcalm which I have the honour to represent. In my county several postmasters have been dismissed, and also several postmen without any notice, inquest or legitimate reason whatever.

Mr. Bourassa, the Nationalist chief, will never forgive me my victory over his own candidate. And I can assure you that since then public employees in my county have got a hard time of it. Postmasters are dismissed one after the other, postmen also tumble down in great numbers, and I am informed that we are only at the beginning of it. As the hon. member for Rimouski has said, there were still left 42 other dismissals to make in his own county. In my county, we must now be nearing the half-hundred mark.

When I hear the hon. Minister of Public Works speak of 1896, it seems to me that he does not remember 1878, when the Conservative party came to power. In scarcely five years, there were dismissed over 400 Liberal employees who had been nominated under the old administration. And those same gentlemen are now wondering that some kind of revenge was taken in 1896 for all the injustices which had been perpetrated in 1878.

The hon. member for Jacques-Cartier has told us that in his county there have been many dismissals. But he has not cited a single name; he has not shown us a single case, and I am just waiting for him to give us the number of dismissals in the county of Jacques-Cartier. I know that county as well as he does, I am living there since 25 years and he will not impose upon us in that respect.

They speak of dismissals and they want to make us believe that in their proceedings they are only inspired by charity and clemency. Yes, in expelling all the Liberal employees. Such is their clemency. Do not lose the time of the House in discussing such matters, says the Minister of Public Works, they are not worth the while. No, it must be foolish to spend a couple of hundred dollars in each case, when poor fellows are thrown into the street, and are left to their misery in the dead of winter. Postmasters have just been discharged without notice, without inquest and without giving them a chance to defend themselves.

They say to us: If you know of any cases of unjust dismissals, show them to us, and we will set matters right when the time comes. Yes, when they are already turned out in the street.

Such is the way of proceeding of those hon. gentlemen. They tell us: Do not lose the time of the House uselessly. Well, we will take up the time of the House, and we will take of it what is necessary to denounce your infamous policy in thus turning out those poor fellows from the public service.

Those hon. gentlemen think that we are losing time uselessly. Were they of the same opinion last year, when they were blocking during months and months the vote of the necessary credits? They even went so far then as to declare that they were ready to stay months and months to put obstacle to the voting of the Liberal appropriations.

You are now thinking that we treat you hard to-day in playing the same game, when we only ask for justice.

You must know that if we have not the numbers on our side, we can certainly muster up as much courage as you.

Dismissals have been made in the county that I represent. A great many have already fallen, persuant to the demands of the candidate who was beaten by me. And I can assure you that he keeps up a good grudge against me. They have spent $20,000 in trying to get the best of that scoundrel Lafortune, that mountebank, that humbug, that man of nothing, as the Nationalist chief Bourassa was wont to say, and they are naturally furious to see that they have not triumphed over me.

Commissaries have been appointed, Mr. Chauvin, brother-in-law of Mr. Bourassa, was appointed a commissary. He is the man who has been charged with an inquiry. I can assure you that we may expect some queer kind of justice from him.

On the evening of the 21st of September, Bourassa was positively out of his wits to see that D. A. Lafortune had bitten the dust. We have crushed that mountebank, was he saying everywhere. But he had crowed too early, and when the latest reports came to hand he could very well see that it would take a dozen men like him to have the best of me.

But the defeated candidate will never forgive me for my triumph over him.

And those gentlemen of the government will take the word of the beaten candidate for decreeing dismissals in my county. Of the beaten candidate, Mr. Marion, who has been condemned by public opinion; who has been overtaken in the very act; who has declared, on his word of honour, things which were absolutely compromising in order to effect his triumph over me, we have shown the falsehood of all that by solemn declarations which have been submitted at the time.

Here is the very man whose word of honour they are willing to take in order to make a report against the employees of my county. When we are back to power—which will come before long—when we shall have resorted once more to public opinion, the dismissals which have been made against us will then be so many agents in our favour to show the grave injustices committed towards those men.

The hon. Minister of Public Works takes the word of those candidates. He takes information which is not sustained by facts. Let those heads fall, says he, and then afterwards we will try to repair the injustices committed. The hon. minister has been during a long time a professor of criminal law. If his teaching to students run along this way: When a man is accused, behead him, and afterwards you can go on with his trial. That would be assuredly a nice teaching.

I have the honour to be the King's attorney, in Montreal, and before having a man convicted, whatever should be the crime of which he is accused, I would not pass condemnation before hearing him. Such is the sound doctrine of criminal law, and in civil matters the same rule must be followed. Complaints have first to be submitted, before proceeding with dismissals. Those people must have the right to defend themselves, and we would be there to meet your commissaries. But, no, everything goes on behind closed doors. First, let us pass condemnation, let us discharge those people, and then we will go before parliament and we will say that we are willing to be good and charitable. Do not discuss those matters, will say those gentlemen, you are losing the time of the House, it is ridiculous, it is absurd. Well, the ridiculous side of it is with you. The nonsense, here, consists in committing injustices. The time of the House does not belong to you any more than it does to us. The opposition possesses as much right to be heard as yourselves, and you must know that we will abide with that privilege as often as you will give us the occasion.

We hear about estimates for postoffices everywhere. I have obtained for the county of Montcalm the sum of $15,000 for the erection of a postoffice at St. Jacques l'Achigan; but I can assure you that I do not see that amount any longer in the estimates of this year. I do not know if the hon. Minister of Public Works intends to deprive me of that postoffice, but it looks very much like it. I have asked if the plans have been prepared; I have asked how far they have gone with that question, but I hear nothing more about it. I fear very much that those $15,000 which have been voted to me last year are now a thing of the past. They will say in the county of Jacques-Cartier: You have not built our postoffice. we have been boycotted and now the tables are turned on us. I say no; there have been works erected in your county under the old administration, just as you have had a great number of your friends placed into positions to our own detriment. Every one knows that a great number of Conservatives have been given positions in public offices by the Liberals. I do not know if you will do as much; I do not know if you will do as much as the fourth part

of what we have done. There has been in the cabinet of Sir Wilfrid Laurier a man who is now gone. I will say nothing against his memory, but he has greatly protected the Conservatives because he was himself an old Conservative. I mean Mr. Israel Tarte. A great many Conservatives have been protected by that minister, and there are a great many to-day occupying positions in the department because they have enjoyed the protection of Mr. Tarte.

I cannot tell whether the Minister of Public Works will show himself as generous towards our people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have only this to say: I must protest energetically, in the name of the electors whom I have the honour to represent, against the rigourous, unjust and illegal proceedings of the Minister of Public Works who discharges men guilty of nothing reprehensible, men whose misfortune has been to do their duty and to belong to the Liberal school, which is the true and sound school, having nothing to do with that new and heterogeneous school called the Nationalist-Conservative, Reformist-Coalitionist-Oppositionist school. There are a dozen or so of such schools.

After those gentlemen have come to power, all those schools at once vanished and were merged into the only Conservative school. To-day the adepts of all those different schools vie with each other in telling parliament: We are of the Conservative school.

Grand master Bourassa, the Nationalist chief, had promised me what is now taking place. If we come to power, was he wont to say, I can assure you that those Liberals will be turned out of the public offices. He is true to his word. That is the first promise that he has ever kept. He changes his opinions as often as he does his linen.

And when I heard to-night the Minister of Public Works complaining about some difficulties we were raising with regard to the voting of his appropriations, I then remembered having once heard him say everywhere that Liberals were bad administrators and real spendthrifts; that the public moneys we used to have voted for postoffices was so much money thrown to the winds, and so much waste to help political patronage. Well, you will soon hear him ask you a postoffice for his constituency; he will take the one that was to being erected in my own county for the county of Jacques-Cartier.

Before long you will see that sums of money are asked for the erection of post offices in his county, to the detriment of my own county. And he will then think that I am out of temper. Yes, Mr. Minister, and I deny you the right to deprive me of what has been voted by this very House for my county. You will certainly do all you can to take away that post office from the county of Montcalm; so as to give satisfaction to your consort, Henri Bourassa, who has not been able, though he paid us three great visits and brought over in my county a lot of people, to get the best of me. Well, you will do all you can to please your consort Henri, but you will not prevent the people of Montcalm to say that you have been unjust.

I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, for the moment, but I reserve myself for another opportunity, when other injustices will be revealed.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L. Islet). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I had no intention to speak to-night, but the words just spoken by my hon. friend the member for Montcalm force me to break silence.

I find it to be my duty to publicly express the high admiration which I profess for my worthy friend, the hon. Minister of Public Works. He bears with great dignity the mantle which was formerly that of Sir George Etienne Cartier, and that is in brief the greatest elogium I could make of my hon. friend. I know him to be inspired with a spirit of justice and kindness, and of that I warmly congratulate him.

I may also have the right to say what has taken place in the county of L'Islet in 1896, and also relate what is going on there to-day.

In 1896, twelve postmasters were dismissed without inquiry by the Liberal party. Heads of families were thus discharged without inquiry, and turned out in the street without further notice. Lots of worthy people who were working since many years on the Intercolonial were thus summarily discharged, without even the shadow of an inquiry to protect them against such proceedings, simply because they were connected with Conservative families. Several poor postmasters were thus discharged, one especially who was 75 years old, at St. Jean Port-Joli, and who had no other means of subsistence.

And now, what do we see in that same county? There were only three postmasters dismissed, and their places have been filled by those who had been discharged in 1896. There was not a single dismissal on our national railroad, the Intercolonial, in L'Islet, and there was none either on the Transcontinental. When I asked the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) to dismiss men who had insulted me at public meetings, who had even taken an active part at public meetings, the hon. Minister of Railways formally declared to me that he would not be able to do so without an inquiry.

I have reason to be satisfied with the conduct of the present administration with regard to dismissals, which you will find to

have been only inspired by principles of order and justice.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does not the minister think we have done a good day's work and that we may adjourn?

Mr. MONK. There are a number of items for public buildings in Quebec that we might pass. When the committee meets again I will be able to furnish the information which has been asked for.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). These items for public buildings in Quebec were allowed to stand at the request of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who is not here to-night. I think I can promise the hon. minister that no delay will be involved in the postponing of these Quebec items.

Mr. MONK. Then we might adjourn.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Monk, the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 22, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of Harbour Commissioners.—Mr. Hazen.

Steamboat Inspection Report for year ending 31st March, 1911.—Mr. Hazen.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Hon. F. COCHRANE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to reduce the commissioners in number from four to one. It is felt, now that as the railway is far advanced and questions of policy are largely decided, it is not necessary to have more than one commissioner.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHWAYS.

Mr. COCHRANE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 77) to encourage and assist the improvement of highways. He said: This Bill is to carry out one more promise made by the present government when in opposition, that a certain amount of money should be granted to the different provinces to build and improve highways. The Bill, is perhaps, a little meagre, but this is because it has been impossible to decide in detail just what is the best way of carrying out the plan proposed. So we propose doing it largely by order in council until we get more definite information. The money will be decided the same as our subsidies for the different provinces, and the object will be to work in with the different local governments. We shall have to get their permission in any case before going on, either with them or alone, and in deciding what roads shall be improved or where the work is to be done.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. May I ask my hon. friend to tell us upon what principle or basis the division is to be made amongst the provinces?

Mr. COCHRANE. Either with what they choose to grant, or if they do not like to grant anything at all, we will go on, with their consent, to fix a standard of roads to be constructed, and then the Dominion can go on either with or without the assistance of the provinces. But they would be taken into consideration and it would be arranged what routes should be followed in construction or what roads should be improved. I hope the provinces will join and will contribute; but there is nothing in the Bill to force them to do so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is there no proportion as between the provinces, on the basis of population or anything else?

Mr. COCHRANE. That lies largely with the provincial governments. I hope they will contribute. But, so far, we have not been able to take it up with them and ascertain on what basis they would like to carry it out.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Are the expenditures contemplated to be made out of revenue or out of capital account?

Mr. COCHRANE. Out of revenue, I should think. Did I understand the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ask how the money would be divided among the several provinces?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was asking the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) to tell us if there is any basis of allotment as among the provinces. The provincial subsidies are based on population; is this based on population?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, I explained that it was to be on the same basis as that upon which the subsidies are granted to the provinces.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Have the government in view any stated amount which would be appropriated for the several provinces?

Mr. COCHRANE. That will come up in the supplementary estimates. I do not know that the amount is yet settled.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It will be payable out of revenue?

Mr. COCHRANE. Out of revenue.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SOUTH RENFREW.—SPEECH OF THE MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.

Before the orders of the day are called:

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). I desire to draw the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to a statement appearing in the 'Evening Journal' of Friday evening, January 19, purporting to be an account of a convention which took place in South Renfrew, at which the hon, Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid, Grenville) spoke. According to that account it would appear that the Minister of Customs made the statement that the Georgian Bay ship canal would be immediately begun. My question is: Was the Minister of Customs authorized by the government to make such a statement, and is the government ready to declare its intention with respect to the immediate construction of the Georgian Bay ship canal?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may say to the hon. member (Mr. Devlin) that I never mentioned the Georgian Bay canal in any remarks that I made at that convention.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose that indicates the extent to which we should place confidence in the statements of the ministerial newspapers. I desire to call attention to a statement I find attributed to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid, Grenville), not in the 'Journal,' but in the 'Free Press.' That hon. gentleman is reported having said in South Renfrew:

> When the Liberal party, by means of lavish expenditure of money and by other unfair means, succeeded in defeating our honoured leader, Hon. R. L. Borden, in Halifax, and we asked them to allow his election in Carleton by acclamation so that he could lead us from the opening of the session, G. P. Graham and others refused and made us wait until the House met and they kept Mr. Borden out of the House as long as they could, although Carleton never elected anybody but a Conservative, and the election was a mere matter of form. For this kind act they now ask us to allow Mr. Graham to be elected by acclamation.

As to this, I may say, in the first place, that, as everybody knows, in 1905, Mr. Graham was not in the House. Further, nobody ever approached me with regard to facilitating the election of my hon. friend, Mr. Borden, until the day of the opening of the session. And certainly nothing was done by the government of that day to delay the election for one single moment. Mr. Kidd, who was the member for Carleton, resigned on January 9, 1905. The Speaker issued his warrant on January 12, the government issued the writ of election on January 21, and the election was fixed and took place on February 4, and on that day the present Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) was elected by acclamation. So the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid, Grenville) is absolutely inaccurate.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. KNOWLES. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) to the remarks I made on Thursday. The hon. gentleman was not present and I asked that they be called to his attention, which, I have no doubt, was done. The point was with regard to returns brought down concerning the Regina census. The return, as read, was a supplementary one, and the original was not brought down. I ask that it be brought down or an explanation made as soon as possible.

Mr. BURRELL. It was brought down in that way because in the census office we recognize Regina district only; there is no separate commissioner for Regina city. So far as Regina city is concerned there are practically no returns to bring down except the instructions usually issued with regard to the carrying on of the work and the returns made. There is nothing to bring down.

Mr. KNOWLES. I will put the question again. My motion asked for a return of all documents in connection with the taking the census in the city of Regina, and of all protests in connection with that matter, and if there were not certain protests made against the correctness of the census in the city of Regina.

Mr. BURRELL. We cannot bring down from the departmental files all incidental references to one place and another place. All we can do is to take from the departmental files what regards direct references to the city of Regina. We may have for instance, from twenty, thirty or forty different places, incidental complaints, and remarks about other places in connection with the taking of their own census. But, we cannot be expected to go through all the files of every department, and find out what incidental references are made to another city.

THE GRAIN BILL.

Mr. KNOWLES. I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) when the Grain Act will be dealt with. If he cannot give us an idea now, will he be good enough to tell us a week ahead, if possible? Will he also send word to the secretary of the Grain Growers' Association of

Saskatchewan, as they intend sending a person to interview the government?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). We may be able to bring it down about the first of next week. I may say that notice has been given to the associations in the west, and gentlemen are on their way here to do a little interviewing on the matter.

THE TOWER CLOCK.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Before the orders of the day are called I would like to be allowed to address a question to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), on what appears to me to be a question of urgent public importance. The tower clock, which has acted in a peculiar manner since the very beginning of the session, has stopped for the last ten days altogether. I should like to know from the Minister of Public Works whether this falls under the general head of dismissals, or whether it is symptomatic of the general condition under which we may expect the country to drift since the change of government; and if the hon. gentleman will have the matter attended to.

Mr. MONK. This is even a more complicated matter than dismissals, on account of the arrangement made by the late government in regard to the clock. I find that in order to have the clock attended to I must communicate with Mr. Belanger. But Mr. Belanger himself is not the party directly responsible, he must communicate with Mr. Lapierre, who has a contract about the clock. It is due to this circuitous arrangement with regard to the clock, probably, that it has not been put in order sooner. I have myself taken the trouble in the matter to-day to communicate again with Mr. Belanger, and have extracted from him a promise that he will communicate with Mr. Lapierre. As soon as I have been able in this way to reach Mr. Lapierre, I suppose the clock will be attended to.

THE ALBERTA GREAT WATERWAYS RAILWAY.

Mr. OLIVER. I disire to ask if the government has reached a decision in regard to the disallowance of the Alberta Act regarding the bonds of the Great Waterways Railway?

Mr. DOHERTY. I may inform the hon. gentleman that the government has reached a conclusion to leave the Act to such operation as it may have under its terms.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I wish to inquire of the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) when we may expect the supplementary estimates?

Mr. KNOWLES.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am unable to give a definite answer.

VACANT SENATORSHIPS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I wish to ask the Prime Minister if the vacant senatorships in Nova Scotia have been filled; and if not, when it is expected they will be filled?

Mr. BORDEN. No. There are two vacancies, I think, that have not been filled; One of them has existed for some months, and the other very recently occurred. The question of filling them is under consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. I may say that one of them was under consideration by the late government for several months before they retired.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I should suppose the present government would have been in more haste to fill it.

VACANCY IN SOUTH RENFREW.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask if the issuing of the writ for an election in South Renfrew is still under consideration also?

Mr. BORDEN. I beg to inform my right hon. friend that it is.

CANADA'S NAVAL POLICY.

Mr. MURPHY. I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. the Premier to a dispatch that appeared in the Ottawa 'Citizen' and other ministerial papers, on Friday last, the 20th instant, purporting to give the substance of an interview with the Hon. George H. Perley in London, in which he says:

> It is impossible for the Canadian government to touch the naval question yet.

I would like to ask if that is the decision the government has come to, and if Mr. Perley made this announcement after consultation with the British Admiralty.

Mr. BORDEN. My attention has not been directed to the press dispatch alluded to. The government have had no communication with Mr. Perley on the subject since he left on his holiday. The attitude of the government with regard to the matter has already been explained to the House, and requires no further statement.

Mr. MURPHY. My right hon. friend has not answered my second question: Did Mr. Perley make this announcement after consultation with the Admiralty?

Mr. BORDEN. I have no information whatever on the subject. I have not heard from Mr. Perley with regard to that ques-

tion. I have simply had a letter from him informing me that he was having a very delightful holiday, and that the weather had been very good.

SOLICITOR GENERALSHIP.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would ask the Prime Minister if a decision has been reached as regards a Solicitor General?

Mr. BORDEN. No, the vacancy has not yet been filled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Under consideration?

Mr. BORDEN. Under consideration.

VOLUNTEER BOUNTY ACT.

Mr. KNOWLES. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) if he is able to give us any information of what will be the contents of this Bill on the Order Paper to amend the Volunteer Bounty Act?

Mr. ROGERS. I may say that this matter is also under consideration. The hon. gentleman will get the information in a very few days.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—Mr. McKay.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. White (Renfrew).

Bill (No. 70) an Act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Keewatin.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 71) respecting a certain patent of the Spirella Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Blain.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Barnard.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GOVERNMENT FERRY SERVICE BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. Did the Prime Minister on or about the 23rd day of December last send to Mr. McLean, M.P., Charlottetown, a telegram in the following words:—

Ottawa December 23.

'To A. A. McLean, M.P., Charlottetown.

'In reply to representations of Nicholson and yourself during the past two months, I beg to inform you that the government has determined to undertake the establishment of a government ferry service between the island and the mainland. This will involve the changing from narrow to standard gauge of the Island railway. This improved service will do away with three short hauls, and it is hoped will result in great advantage to the people.

'(Signed) R. L. BORDEN.'

2. Did the Prime Minister have before him on the 23rd day of December, 1911, an estimate from competent experts and engineers of the cost of a government ferry service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, or of the cost of changing the narrow gauge to the standard gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway?

3. If so, what was the estimated cost of each of said services respectively?

4. Who were the parties who made or prepared the respective estimates?

5. Was any order in council passed in regard to the proposed services? If so, when?

6. Was the Prime Minister aware, on December 23 1911, that an election for the provincial legislature of Prince Edward Island was to take place on January 3, 1912?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2, 3 and 4. Estimate was prepared by the proper officers of the Department of Railways and Canals and was submitted to the Prime Minister by the Minister of Railways and Canals. This estimate was placed before the Prime Minister before the said telegram was sent. The information as to the estimated cost of the service will be given upon the proper item in Committee of Supply.

5. No, but items were placed in the estimates.

6. The Prime Minister had no official information as to the alleged election, but such notice as appeared in the public press was available to him.

PURCHASE OF GOODS BY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

*Mr. MACDONALD asked:

1. Has any order for goods been given by the Department of Public Works since October 1, 1911?

2. If so, have tenders been asked for in each case? If not, what orders for goods have been given without tender, to what firms respectively, and for how much in each instance?

He said: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the form of this question, I understand that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) took some objection to the extent of the information that it would be necessary to gather in order to answer the question. With his permission I would

ask that the question stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. MONK. The first question and the first part of the second question were answered. To the first question the answer was, 'yes' and to the first part of the second 'no'. The second paragraph of the second question was left in abeyance at the time the question was put. I think my hon. friend will recognize that it would be a great inconvenience to the department to be obliged to secure all this information. If he could place it in a more specific manner it would be more conveniently answered. These purchases are made right and left all over the country and if my hon. friend could tell us about the date, or with regard to what locality he desired this information, we could get it for him. Otherwise, it would have to stand as an order for a return and it would involve a very considerable amount of work on the part of the department. If there was any special purchase or any special firm with regard to which the hon. gentleman desired information it might be possible to give it to him.

Mr. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend agrees that the matter is one which should be made the subject of a motion for a return I will limit it in the way he suggests.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

POSTMASTER AT ST. GERMAIN.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Kamouraska,

1. Who was postmaster at St. Germain, county of Kamouraska, from 1896 to 1905?
2. Was a change made in 1905? If so, what was the reason for the change, and who was appointed posmaster in 1905?

Mr. PELLETIER :

1. J. A. Moreau.
2. Yes, a pretext was found to dismiss this postmaster, but the real reason for his dismissal was the fact that he refused to help the political party then in power. Mr. Michaud was appointed postmaster in place of Mr. Moreau.

RIVER JOHN MAIL CARRIER.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the mail carrier between River John station and the post office, in the county of Pictou?
2. What amount is paid to him for his services?
3. What was the amount paid for similar services previous to December 31?
4. When does the department propose to call for tenders for this service?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Charles T. Gammon.
2. $58.50 per annum.
3. $58.50 per annum.

Mr. MACDONALD.

4. Price being satisfactory, tenders will not be invited.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. When did the government first decide to establish rural mail delivery in rural districts?
2. At what date were the first boxes ordered?
3. Were tenders asked for the making of the boxes?
4. Who got the contract and at what price?
5. Where is the manufacturer's head office?
6. Have boxes been purchased from any other source? If so, what sources?
7. Was the contract let by tender and what was the price?
8. Where is the head office of the manufacturers?
9. How many boxes have been installed?
10. How many boxes are not now in use, what was their cost, and where are they stored?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. August, 1908.
2. On August 14, 1908.
3. No.
4. (a) International Mail Equipment Company, New York. (b) $3 per box.
5. The head office of manufacture in Canada is 119 Adelaide street, Toronto, and in United States, New York city.
6. No.
7. (a) Answered by No. 3. (b) Answered by No. 4.
8. Answered by No. 5.
9. 18,844 up to the 31st December, 1911.
10. (a) 90,333. (b) $270,999, of which $150,000, the cost of 50,000 boxes, is not to be paid until the boxes are used. (c) 76,708 boxes at Toronto; 13,625 at the different inspectorates.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAR FERRY.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Is the government aware that there appeared in the Charlottetown 'Guardian' in its issue of December 29th last the following:—

Premier Borden pledges a Car Ferry and Standard Gauge for the Prince Edward Island Railway.

His telegram to A. A. McLean, M.P., a most important message. Will do away with three short hauls. Good work done by Queen's representative in securing this great boon.

'Mr. McLean, M.P., received last evening the following most important despatch from R. L. Borden, Ottawa, and has kindly placed the same at the service of the 'Guardian' for the information of the people of Prince Edward Island;

Anglo-American Telegraph Company, Ltd.,
Ottawa, Ont., December 28, 1911.

A. A. McLean, M.P.,
Charlottetown:

'In reply to representations of Nicholson and yourself during the past two months, I

beg to inform you that the government has decided to undertake the establishment of a government ferry service between the island and the mainland. This will involve the changing from narrow to standard gauge on the Island railway. This improved service will do away with three short hauls, and it is hoped will result in a great advantage to the people.'

(Signed) R. L. BORDEN.

'The 'Guardian' ventures the opinion that no more important message has come to this province since confederation than this. It is the official announcement that a car ferry will be established, the Prince Edward Island railway be made a standard gauge road and that the three short hauls will become a thing of the past.

'All honour to Premier Borden for so promptly making good the promise he gave before attaining power. And all honour to Messrs. McLean and Nicholson, who in three months after their election have been influential in securing this great boon for the people of Prince Edaward Island.'

2. Did the right honourable Prime Minister send the telegram referred to? If so, at whose request?

3. Was the request in writing? If so, what were its terms and contents?

4. If the telegram was sent, how many days previous to polling day in the last general local elections held in the province of Prince Edward Island was the said telegram despatched?

5. What was the date of polling in said local elections?

6. Were the representations mentioned in said telegram, if sent, made in writing, and on what dates were such representations made? If in writing, will the government set forth the contents of such writing or writings, and the date thereof respectively, or lay a copy or copies of same on the table of the House?

7. If not in writing, what was the nature and purport of said representations, and at what date or dates were they respectively made?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. The increased cost and inconvenience of the three short hauls had been brought to the attention of the Prime Minister in parliament on several occasions, and also during his recent visit to Prince Edward Island. The Prime Minister in parliament, and during his recent tour in Prince Edward Island had condemned the existing system and strongly advocated an improved service which would dispense with the three short hauls.

4 and 5. The government have no information.

6. Representations were both oral and in writing. Copies thereof will be laid on the table of the House if moved for.

CIVIL SERVICE INVESTIGATION.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Having reference to the statement of the Minister of Customs, quoted in 'Hansard' of the present session, page 1124, as follows: —'When a defeated candidate makes charges against an official of active partisanship I have so far sent those charges as given to me to the commissioner appointed for the purpose of investigating, and he is advised to notify whoever makes the charges and the official against whom the charges are made,' has this practice been adopted by the other departments of the government as well as the Department of Customs?

Mr. BORDEN:

In all cases where inquiry seems reasonable or necessary, having regard to all the circumstances, it will be granted. Due weight will, however, be given to the statement of a member or defeated candidate who has personal knowledge or who otherwise satisfies the minister that his information is thoroughly reliable.

CANADIAN MARINE INSURANCE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it the intention of the government to co-operate in the establishment of a Canadian Marine Insurance, in order to reduce the insurance rates on the St. Lawrence?

2. Was the Postmaster General speaking for the government when he declared himself in favour of a Canadian Lloyds, at the Builders' Exchange dinner on Tuesday the 9th of January last?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto)

A careful study is now being made by the Department of Trade and Commerce into the question of Marine Insurance as affecting shipping in Canadian ports. When this information is gathered the government will carefully consider the whole matter with a view to remedying a condition of things which appears to be seriously retarding the commerce of Canada through its own ports.

Mr. PELLETIER. As to the second part of the answer, when I spoke on the occasion in question I especially declared that I was not speaking on behalf of the government, that I was making a suggestion to the members of the shipping interest of the country.

DISMISSAL OF GEO. CRESINE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has James Cresine, Quarter Master on the SS. 'Scotia,' operating at Mulgrave, N.S., been dismissed?

2. If so, at whose instance was this dismissal made?

3. Was there any complaint lodged against him? If so, what was the complaint and who made it?

4. Has there been any investigation? If so, what was the result?

5. How long has Cresine been in the service?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. 'George' Cresine, quartermaster on the steamship 'Scotia,' has been dismissed.
2. G. A. R. Rowlings, Sydney, N.S.
3. Affidavit of Joseph Cesale. Canvassed in the interests of the Liberal candidate.
4. Investigation being held by H. P. Duchemin, Sydney, N.S.
5. Since November, 1901.

DISMISSAL OF MR. MULLALY.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is Mr. Michael Mullaly still in the employment of the Post Office Department? If not, when was he dismissed?
2. At whose request was he dismissed, and why was he dismissed?
3. Was an investigation made as to his conduct? If so, by whom?

Mr. PELLETIER:

Mr. Mullaly, having been accused of active political interference, was asked if it was true, and he denied it.

As there were very serious doubts as to this denial being sincere, the Postmaster General invited Mr. Mullaly to his office in Quebec, and asked him if he would make the same denial on oath. His answer was in the negative. He then fully admitted that he had allowed himself to be carried away by his enthusiasm but admitted he knew he was violating the rule. He then asked not to be dismissed and to be allowed to resign. This was granted. Subsequently he said he would not resign, and he had to be dismissed.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—HOLIDAY AND SUNDAY PAY.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Did the honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals issue or cause to be issued instructions to the Managing Board of Government Railways at Moncton, to the effect that no person employed by the Intercolonial railway at Moncton not being members of an international labour organization should be permitted to receive time and one-half for labour performed on holidays and Sundays, and that members of such international organizations only shall receive such time and one-half for said holidays and Sundays?
2. Is the minister aware that orders and regulations to the effect above stated are said to have been in operation and effect at Moncton since January 1st of the present year-
3. Are such orders or regulations in effect or operation at all other points on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways? If not operative at all points, at what particular points or divisions of the said railways are they not in effect or operative?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.
2. No.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

3. No such regulations are in operation at any points or divisions on the Intercolonial railway or Prince Edward Island railway.

MAIL CONTRACT, STE. MONIQUE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the mail contract of Ste. Monique, county of Nicolet, held by Mr. Nestor Provencher, mail carrier, been annulled? If so, for what reason?
2. Have tenders been asked for a new contract?
3. Does the Postmaster General intend to ask for tenders when mail contracts are annulled or have expired?
4. Would a mail carrier lose his contract if without injury to the service he take part in elections?
5. What is the rule of the Post Office Department in this matter?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. This contract was awarded to P. Trudel, who transferred it to N. Provencher. The contract has not been annulled. One of its clauses provides that it can be terminated after three months' notice when the Postmaster General thinks such notice should be given in the public interest. This three months' notice has been given.

2 and 3. This contract is for an amount below $200. The necessary precautions have been taken to make sure that there will be no increase in the price and that the change will be in the public interest, and consequently it is not necessary to call for tenders.

4 and 5. Each case must be decided on its merits.

MR. GLADU'S ELECTORAL AGENT.

Mr. MONDOU:

Who was the electoral agent of Mr. Oscar Gladu, a candidate in the county of Yamaska at the federal election held 21st September last?

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Anatole O. Comire, physician.

CHARLES FOREST'S COVE BREAKWATER.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has the contract for the construction of the breakwater at Charles Forest's Cove, Richmond County, N.S., been awarded?
2. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the work during the present year?
3. Have the deposit cheques of the unsuccessful tenderers been returned?

Mr. MONK:

1. No.
2. No.; no amount has been provided therefor in next year's estimates.
3. All security cheques have been returned.

BREAKWATER AT PORT RICHMOND.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has the contract for the construction of the breakwater at Port Richmond, Richmond County, N.S., been awarded?
2. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the work during the present year?
3. Have the deposit cheques of the unsuccessful tenderers been returned?

Mr. MONK:

1. No.
2. No; no amount has been provided therefor in next year's estimates.
3. All except the lowest, which has been returned.

CHAPEL COVE BREAKWATER.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has any petition been received from the residents of Chapel Cove, L'Ardoise, Richmond county, N.S., asking for an extension to the breakwater built there last year?
2. Is it the intention of the government to extend the breakwater during the present year?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes, and forwarded to District Engineer for report.
2. When the engineer's report is received, the report will have careful consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation leading to the establishment of a department of health?
2. Did the Right Honourable Prime Minister, on or about December 4, 1911, or at any other time inform Dr. Chabot, the junior member for the electoral district of Ottawa, that he would be appointed as minister of the proposed department in the event of it being established?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The matter is under consideration.
2. Dr. Chabot has not at any time mentioned the subject to the Prime Minister nor has there been any discussion or communication on the subject between them.

POSTAGE ON POLITICAL LITERATURE.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex):

1. Was application made to the Post Office Department by Honourable Mr. Perley, then chief whip of the Conservative party, for permission to use the mails for sending out Conservative literature without payment of postage after the dissolution of the last parliament, and after the time had expired within which under the regulations of the department such rights existed?
2. If so, was such permission granted and taken advantage of?
3. What are the names of the newspapers sent out by mail from the offices of publication during the last Dominion election campaign which were unpaid for by the persons to whom they were addressed, and upon which the postage paid was at the regular rate for newspapers sent to subscribers, or if a higher rate was paid the excess over the regular rate was refunded?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. The Postmaster General finds nothing on record about this in his department.

3. 'The Globe,' Toronto.
'The News,' Toronto.
'The Star,' Toronto.
'The World,' Toronto.
'The Weekly Sun,' Toronto.
"The Daily Telegraph and Sun,' St. John, N.B.
'The Semi-Weekly Telegraph and News,' St. John, N.B.
'The Daily Standard,' St. John. N.B.
'The Advance,' Maxville, Ont.
'The Western Chronicle," Kentville, N.S.
'The Daily News,' Port Arthur, Ont.
'The Reporter,' Kincardine, Ont.
'The World,' Cobourg, Ont.
'The Sentinel-Star,' Cobourg, Ont.
'Le St. Laurent.' Rivère du Loup en bas), Que.
'The Gold Hunter,' Caledonia, N.S. (Queen's County).

A refund has been made, but illegally, and without sufficient authority, and all those to whom such refund has been made, have been notified to pay.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The minister's reply to the first and second sections of this question is that he finds nothing on record about this in his department. Although there may be nothing on record I would think the Postmaster General might have learned in his department whether such an application was made.

Mr. PELLETIER. It is hard for me to answer for my predecessor in office. I am asked about a thing that occurred before I was Postmaster General and I can only speak from the records in my department. Perhaps my hon. friend would put the question to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am quite willing to answer it.

Mr. PELLETIER. The question is not put to you.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I will adopt the suggestion of the Postmaster General and ask my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. LEMIEUX. I beg to state that the day after dissolution——

Mr. PELLETIER. I rise to a question of order. The question should be put to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) in the manner provided by the rules and then ample opportunity will be given him to answer it.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Is the point of order well taken, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is. It is competent for any member to put a question on the paper asking for information from another member of the House, but he must do so in the regular way.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It seems to me I am entitled to more than the Postmaster General has given. The Postmaster General still has his deputy postmaster General and if the information can be had by inquiring from him it is his duty to bring it down.

Mr. DEVLIN. As a matter of information on the point of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order has been dealt with.

Mr. DEVLIN. I rise to another point of order. When the Postmaster General delegates his powers to a member of the House with instructions to answer for him, is not that hon. member entitled to answer?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think there is any point of order in the point raised by the hon. member (Mr. Devlin). If information is desired of any member of the House or of the Cabinet regarding public matters before the House, the rule is that he is entitled to put the question on the Order Paper in the usual way. I do not think it would be right for the Postmaster General or any other hon. gentleman to make rules of his own.

ABENAKIS INDIAN AGENT.

Mr. MONDOU:

1. Is Mr. A. O. Corrine, a physician of St. François du Lac, county of Yamaska, in the employment of the government as Indian agent of the Abenakis tribe of St. François?
2. If so, since when, and what salary does he receive?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Dr. A. O. Comiré, physician of St. François du Lac, in the county of Yamaska, is Indian Agent for the Abenakis tribe of St. François.
2. Dr. Comiré was appointed Indian Agent by order in council of 29th April, 1898. He is paid a salary of $400 a year.

UNGRANTED LAND.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many acres of public lands in the surveyed portions of the provinces of Manitoba, Sackatchewan and Alberta are still ungranted, the title of which still remains in the Crown, and what is the acreage in each province?
2. How many acres of public lands in the surveyed portions of the said provinces have been reserved as school land?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Manitoba.. .. .. 3,896,800 Acres.
   Saskatchewan.. .. .. 14,192,000 "
   Alberta.. .. .. 13,731,200 "
2. The area reserved as school lands in the surveyed portions of the province of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta is as follows:
   Manitoba.. .. .. .. 1,300,495 Acres.
   Saskatchewan.. .. .. 3,706,589 "
   Alberta.. .. .. 2,767,634 "

The above figures are only approximate.

SASKATCHEWAN HOMESTEAD INSPECTION.

Mr. THOMSON:

1. How many homestead inspectors were there employed in the province of Saskatchewan by the Department of the Interior on October 1, 1911, and what were their names?
2. Have any of these inspectors been dismissed from office? If so, what are their names, and what reasons are given for their dismissal?
3. Has the department appointed any other person or persons to the position or positions so vacated? If so, what are their names and what were their previous occupations respectively?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Twenty-two (22): D. McLeod, A. McLeod, M. B. Budgeon, J. Moffatt, L. Duggan, W. F. Nichol, D. J. McCarthy, G. H. Clouston, G. G. Smith, G. A. MacKenzie, W. Milburn, R. P. Pentland, A. Skene, F. Kennedy, C. Sutton, L. C. Porteous, A. Nurse, A. W. Brooke, F. J. Vollmer, J. T. Dodds, L. O'Connor, E. D. Gowan.
2. Yes. F. Kennedy. For offensive partisanship.
3. Yes. P. R. Brandt. Farmer.

IMMIGRATION OFFICER SEVIGNY.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Is Mr. Sevigny, the new immigration agent at Montreal, residing at Valleyfield or Montreal?
2. Has he made any claims for travelling expenses since his appointment? If so, what is the amount of same?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. He was residing at Valleyfield when appointed, but is now residing at Montreal.
2. No.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of the minutes of all meetings of the Ottawa Improvement Commission since

its inception, showing the date of all such meetings, the persons who attended the same and the business transacted thereat; with a copy of any and all other records of the proceedings of the said commission. Also a statement of the amount expended by the said commission in each year, setting forth the purpose for which it was expended; and a statement showing the annual income of the commission at present, and what portions thereof are appropriated for maintenance and for the payment of interest respectively. Also a statement showing the site, area and cost of all lands or assessments or development thereof.—Mr. Bennett (Simcoe).

For a copy of all letters, reports or other documents relating to the removal from office on May 1, 1903, of John Fraser, postmaster of Stellarton, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a tabulated statement showing the number of dismissals in the Post Office Department since the first day of October, 1911, in the nine provinces of the Dominion. Also the names of the postmasters so dismissed, the locality, the cause of dismissal, the names of the petitioners praying for such dismissal in each case, and the names of the petitioners opposing said dismissals.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to prosecutions under the Fishery Act against John McCabe, David Porter, Joseph Foster and Duncan Murray, in the county of Pictou, and also relating to a suit of Porter versus Murray in the county court for district No. 5, Nova Scotia, and the connection of the department with the same.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, and other orders in council in connection with the calling for tenders for the construction of the proposed branch line of railway from Estmere to Baddeck, in the county of Victoria, or bearing upon the reason why none of all said tenders were accepted.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, reports or other documents relating to the proposed winter harbour at Sarnia, Ontario.—Mr. Pardee.

For a copy of all letters correspondence, reports or other documents relating to the erection of an armoury at the town of Sarnia, Ont.—Mr. Pardee.

For a copy of all papers and other documents concerning the proposed investigation against P. L. St. Pierre, postmaster at St. Paul d'Abbottsford, county of Rouville, Quebec.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all orders and directions of the government, or of the Postmaster General or other officers of the Post Office Department, relating to the rate of postage upon newspapers sent out during the recent Dominion election campaign, and paid for by persons other than to whom they were addressed; also a copy of all correspondence between the government, or any department therof, and newspaper publishers relating to the same matter.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents relating to the dismissal from office of William C. Robichaud, fishery overseer for the eastern district of Gloucester county, and the appointment of his successor or successors.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports or other documents relating to the dismissal from office of Jerome A. Doucet, fishery overseer for the western district of Gloucester county, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams or other documents relating to the dismissal of P. J. Veniot, collector of customs at Bathurst, New Brunswick, and the appointment either permanent or temporary of his successor.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, recommendations applications and other documents relating to the appointment of a post office inspector at Moosejaw, Saskatchewan.—Mr. Knowles.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, charges in writing and other documents relative to the suspension of Angus Smith, pilot of the D.G.S. 'Earl Grey.'—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of the province of Ontario, with regard to the extension of the boundaries of the said province.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of the treaty between Great Britain, the United States, Japan and Russia for the suspension of pelagic sealing, and all correspondence regarding the same from the initial negotiations to the present day.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of the province of Quebec, with regard to the extension of the boundaries of the said province.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

ASBESTOS STATISTICS.

Mr. BELAND moved :

For a return showing the total value of imports of asbestos manufactures imported into Canada since the 21st September, 1911, divided by countries of origin, and the total amount of duties assessed thereon, and the classification of manufactured asbestos goods by countries, divided into paper, millboard, cloth, sheet packing and tape, plain. Treated for automobile use, as brake band lining, thread and yarns, steam and other laid packings and gaskets. Pipe coverings, magnesia, plaster of paris, air-cell and miscellaneous, itemized; asbestos shingles, sheets, &c. The name of shipper and the port of origin; name of consignee and port of entry, and the ultimate destination of each shipment of entry. The weight or measure in square feet, or ad valorem, specific, or both; the percentage of duty o en, specific, or both; the percentage of duty assessed; the price per pound or square feet at which goods were entered for duty. In the case of any goods having been admitted duty free, in bond or for any other reason, particulars of each entry, and the reasons for admittance without duty. And in the case of any manufactures of asbestos goods having been entered as raw material, for subsequent manufacture in the Dominion, such as asbestos paper, sheathings, or millboards, cloth, plain or rubbered for gasket manufacture, &c., the reason for allowing such entry,

and full details as to shipper, port of origin, port of entry, ultimate destination, consignee, and an itemized list of articles, with weights, square footage, entered value, &c.

Mr. REID. (Grenville). I do not think this motion can pass in its present form, it has not been customary to publish particulars of individual importations, and it is considered inadvisable under ordinary circumstances to disclose individual transactions at the customs from documents furnished for revenue purposes and which honest importers expect to be treated as confidential. Possibly this motion could be amended in such a way that we could give the hon. member the information he desires.

Mr. BUREAU. Can the minister suggest in what way he desires the motion amended.

Mr. REID. (Grenville). It would have to be redrafted and it would be better to let it stand.

Motion stands.

TOBACCO GROWERS OF YAMASKA.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved for:

A copy of all correspondence and papers referring to the granting of special aid to the tobacco growers of La Société Co-operative de la Vallée de Yamaska.

He said: The county of Rouville had formed a co-operative society among the tobacco growers in the valley of Yamaska. During last session they sent a delegation to Ottawa asking for some aid towards the construction of a factory. After the general election, I renewed the request made by these tobacco growers of the county of Rouville to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, and I am glad to say that I received a letter from him a day or so ago stating that he would implement the promise made by the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I beg to thank my hon. friend publicly for what he has done for the tobacco growers of the county of Rouville.

Motion agreed to.

STE. AGATHE POST OFFICE, TERREBONNE COUNTY, QUEBEC.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers and reports in connection with the investigation recently held at the St. Agathe post office, county of Terrebonne.

He said: When I was Postmaster General, I had to dismiss the postmaster at Ste. Agathe, not for political causes, but because of certain charges brought against him. The postmaster happened to be a friend of the political party I represented. He was replaced by a lady who was highly recommended both by the people of Ste. Agathe and by the summer residents of that place. She is a niece of the late hon. Mr. Marchand, who was at one time the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec. This lady's management of the post office has given general satisfaction to the community. But there have been rumours of late that this lady would be dismissed, and replaced by another party. Quite an agitation has been going on amongst the residents of Ste. Agathe, and especially amongst the summer residents, many of whom are well known in Montreal. They came to me because I happen to reside in Montreal, and they appealed to my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), to maintain that lady in her position, and not displace her. I do not say that any decision has been arrived at by the Post Office Department, but I appeal to the Postmaster General not to make any change in this case. There are no charges whatever against this lady; she keeps the post office in a perfect manner. The Postmaster General will find any number of letters in the department praying for the continuance of this lady in the position of postmistress at Ste. Agathe.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). There is no objection whatever to bringing down the papers asked for. I suppose the House has been very much astonished to hear that this is not a case of dismissal already. The records, when they are brought down, will show that there are requests for the dismissal of this postmistress and also petitions against dismissal. They have been in the department for quite a long time. As my hon. friend has stated nothing has been done. The papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF C. MICHAUD, POSTMASTER AT ST. GERMAIN DE KAMOURASKA.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska) (Translation) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, recommendations and reports respecting the dismissal of C. Michaud, postmaster at St. Germain, Kamouraska, and the appointment of his successor.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the course of the debate which took place in this House, in connection with the numerous dismissals effected by this government, either of postmasters, or other public officers, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) stated that, should he discover some mistake for which he was responsible, he would be glad to correct it as soon as it would be brought to his attention. It is because I am satisfied that a grevious mistake has been committed in connection with this dismissal

that I propose laying the facts before this House, in the hope that the hon. minister will carry out his promise and make amends for the wrong inflicted.

In 1896, when the old government came into power, the postmaster of St. Germain, Kamouraska, was Mr. Joseph Moreau. Mr. Moreau, is a leading business man in the county as well as one of the leading men of the Conservative party in the electoral district of Kamouraska. He was not dismissed by the Liberal government when the latter came into the power; in fact, Mr. Moreau retained his postmastership for a period of nine long years. It was in 1905 only that he was dismissed. During those nine years, Mr. Moreau in no way relented from working with all his might in favour of the Conservative party and against the Liberal party; as a matter of fact, he is one of our most bitter opponents in the county of Kamouraska; I refer especially to what he has done during the general elections of 1904, when I was a candidate in that constituency. However, I never asked that he be dismissed. Nevertheless, in 1905, without any steps having been taken by myself or any of my workers in the constituency, I was informed through a letter received from the hon., then Postmaster General Sir William Mulock, that the postmaster of St. Germain had been relieved of his office for having defrauded the department and I was requested in consequence to suggest the name of some other person to take his place. On receipt of that letter, I proceeded to the department and I was not a little surprised to learn then that the grounds for Mr. Moreau's dismissal was that he had taken advantage of his position as postmaster to pay wholesale merchants in Quebec or Montreal by means of stamps the property of the deparment, thus increasing by 40 per cent his salary. For you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that the remuneration of postmasters is proportionate to the amount of stamps sold by them, and that such sale is the basis on which they are paid. That is the fraud which the deparment charged Mr. Moreau with having committed, and even a letter was written to me to that effect. As I stated a moment ago, that was the only reason for his dismissal. Accordingly, I was not a little surprised to learn through an answer given by the postmaster general that the reason alleged in 1905 for Moreau's dismissal was only a blind, the true motive being his refusal to work in the interests of the Liberal party. Now, I state under my responsibility as a member of this House, that I never requested his dismissal, neither in 1905, or at any other time, and that I never requested his dismissal through others, on the ground that he had not worked in the interests of the Liberal party. Although he had always been a most bitter opponent, we always continued to employ him as postmaster.

Following on his dismissal in 1905, I suggested the name of another wholly qualified and very respectable person, Mr. Chrysestome Michaud, of St. Germain. Mr. Michaud fulfilled his duties as postmaster to the satisfaction of all. So little did he interfere in politics that he did not even cast his vote at the last election on September 21. Notwithstanding which, three or four weeks after the election, without inquiry, without notice, without any notification whatever, Mr. Michaud was dismissed and replaced by the man who in 1905 had been relieved of his duties for having defrauded the department.

As I stated on opening my remarks, and I now repeat it, I cast no blame on the hon. genleman, except possibly for not having exercised sufficient scrutiny in the matter and having put too much faith in the truthfulness of his informers.

My hon. friend is not cognizant of the facts which I am now bringing to his attention, and I am satisfied that the people who insisted on that charge have not supplied him with all the facts. Therefore, I trust that after looking into all the circumstances—and I shall refer later on to the matter—he will set things right as he has stated he was disposed to do, whenever it would have been shown to him that a mistake had been committed, and I trust that the postmastership of St. Germain will be restored to Mr. Michaud, who has managed it to the satisfaction of all citizens, not having even voted at the last election, and that it will once more be taken away from the man who was deprived of it in 1909, for the reasons I have pointed out and which proved inimical to his reinstatement.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). I do not for one moment hesitate in accepting the word of the hon. member for Kamouraska. I am satisfied that, if his memory serves him right, the facts are such as he has described them. However, their is a strange coincidence occurring in this case, and I shall point it out presently.

I should say that I take the whole responsibility for the reinstatement of Mr. Moreau. I did not reinstate him, as my hon. friend has just stated, because I was unaware of the circumstances. I reinstated him with a full knowledge of the circumstances, and ready to assume responsibility for such action before the House. Mr. Moreau is a true and honest man, and the member for Kamouraska will not deny it. Now that man has been branded by the Post Office Department as a dishonest man, and that in the most unfair way that could be imagined. Here are the facts.

Previous to the coming in use of postal notes, it was a recognized right of postmasters to make up in postage stamps the change needed to complete a remittance. As the former Postmaster General the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) is aware, when the use of postal notes came into force, postmasters were instructed not to use any longer postage stamps for such remittances, but to use instead postal notes. Mr. Moreau received similar instructions. Postal notes are for amounts of 20, 25, 30 cents, etc., but there are no notes for intermediate amounts. So that, if a man wishes to remit by post an amount of 23 or 28 cents, he will take a postal note for 20 cents and complete it with a 3-cent stamp. That is the rule of the department. That is all Mr. Moreau has ever done. His reputation as a citizen is unsullied. I reinstated him, because I am satisfied as to his honesty and respectability. And that is the man who in 1905 was branded as a dishonest man. I reinstated him, in order to restore him in the enjoyment of his good name.

The file contains a report of the inspector who was sent there and that report states that Moreau used postage stamps for remittances under 20 cents. Who will find fault with that? It was his right to do so, since there are no postal notes of a lower figure than 20 cents. The inspector warned Moreau—and he says so in his report,—to be cautious in that respect.

In the departmental files, there is a report from the secretary of the department who had not seen Mr. Moreau, who has not visited the locality, and that report states that this man endeavoured to increase his salary through the unlawful sale of postage stamps. That report is not even signed by the secretary, it is only a sheet of paper containing some typewritten matter.

I corrected that wrong, and I am not sorry for doing so; I would do the same thing over again to-morrow if there was occasion for it.

The hon. member for Kamouraska claims that he has not asked for the dismissal of Mr. Moreau on account of his not working in his interests. Here are the facts, and the strange coincidence which I mentioned on rising to address the House: A day or two before the election took place in Kamouraska, a friend of the hon. member called on Mr. Moreau and told him: If you do not vote and you do not work for the party you will be deprived of your postmastership on the day following. The hon. member cannot deny that, the fact is evidenced by a declaration under oath which is on file.

It may be that the hon. member has friends who are over-zealous. I do not impute the deed to him personally, but I repeat it, he had friends who were over-zealous. Mr. Moreau made up his mind not to heed the warning, he went to cast his ballot, and after he had voted, strange to say, the threat which had been made was given effect to.

The papers moved for will be laid on the table. My hon. friend, whenever he wishes to look over those documents in the department, will be welcome, and he will find there the proof of the facts I have stated. Whenever I make a mistake, I am manly enough to admit it and make amends for it; but in this case no mistake has been made.

I have the pleasure of knowing personally Mr. Moreau. The hon. member knows that I am acquainted with a goodly number of people in the county of Kamouraska, which is quite familiar to me. As for Mr. Moreau, I am ready to answer for his perfect honesty and to say that his dismissal was unwarranted and without justification. That is why he has been reinstated.

Mr. Moreau, when the facts were brought to his knowledge, was greatly surprised, the only notice he received was a short note stating that he was dismissed. Nothing more. Had there been any reason to complain of some mismanagement on his part as postmaster, should he not have been told you have attempted to increase your salary by 40 per cent, you are a dishonest man and that is why you are dismissed. Should he not have been put in a position to clear himself of such a charge? No, he was condemned without having an opportunity of vindicating himself. I am satisfied that if the hon. member will come to my office—and I extend the invitation to him—and if he will look through the papers, he will have to acknowledge that this man should not have been condemned as a thief without having been heard.

I shall bring down all the papers moved for and the hon. member will see that I was justified in acting as I have done.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I shall wait until the papers promised by the hon. minister are brought down before replying to him; however, let me say once more that Mr. Moreau's dismissal was not effected for partisan motives. In 1905, I was entrusted with the distribution of patronage in the county of Kamouraska, and I give him my word of honour that I did not take any steps personally or through any one else to secure his dismissal. It was effected solely through the department, without any request on the part of any body.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—Mr. Bickerdike.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Marriage Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the task devolving upon me to-day in regard to this measure is one which I could have wished had been in the hands of one better able to deal with this question than I believe myself to be. However, as I said in introducing the Bill in the month of November last, I believe the matter to be of great importance to the national life of this country that, as no one else had introduced a Bill, I thought it was my duty to do so. I know of no subject that is more vitally important to the interests of this nation than the great subject that this Bill deals with. The question of marriage and the results of marriage needs no statement from me or discussion on my part as to its importance or significance in the national life of the country. We have in this country a state of affairs which, I am satisfied, requires a remedy at the hands of some parliament. The whole question that is involved in this Bill is as to the result of marriages taking place in any part of this Dominion or, for that matter, anywhere else in the world, of people living in this Dominion who are married according to the ceremonies that are lawful in the locality where the marriage takes place, and as to the effect of these marriages in one province of this Dominion, or, perhaps, in more than one province, but in one province, as far as I know. Of course, in all legislation we have to do with evil. The evil here does not consist, in my humble opinion, in the fact that the courts of the province of Quebec have made a certain pronouncement which, I must say, in passing, for what it is worth as a lawyer, I do not think is of importance as a legal pronouncement. I am not a Quebec lawyer, and, therefore, I am not entitled to put that opinion before this House. I am a humble member of the Dominion parliament representing not only the constituency which has honoured me by allowing me to represent it for nearly twelve years in this House, but I must take my part as a member of parliament and the representative of that constituency in remedying all evils which occur to me as one of the 220 odd members of this House who are sent here for the purpose of doing that very thing and performing that very duty.

Let me make myself clear at the outset. I do not care, for the purpose of this Bill, or its discussion, whether the decisions of the courts of Quebec are well founded or whether they are not according to Quebec law. What I do say is that the evil is that there is a doubt cast upon the result of a marriage lawfully performed according to the laws of the province because the parties to that marriage, one or other of them, may be of a different religion either to the person who performs the ceremony or of a different religion as regards each other, a ceremony which is valid according to the law of the province and may be pronounced a valid ceremony except for the fact that the parties belonging to different religions. The parties to this ceremony have allied themselves to each other under the most sacred conditions that a man and a woman can conform to in allying themselves to each other for the purpose of the procreation of children and for the welfare of those children in a lawful, legitimate and proper way. I want to be quite well understood on this question. The evil in my mind is the doubt. I say it is our paramount duty as the highest parliament in Canada to remedy that doubt if we can. We cannot afford to have that question looked upon with doubt from any other country whose attention may be directed towards us. I care not what immigration laws you make, I care not how wisely you may inaugurate any system for the building up of Canada, of trade, of immigration, of development of any kind, if you allow any doubt to exist in any part of the civilized world as to the results of marriages that are supposed to have legally taken place according to the ceremonies which have been legally promulgated or promoted, because, if you are going to allow that doubt to exist, you are going to stop the national life of this country in a way that is more important than any trade or immigration policy or any other question affecting the development of the country. What has happened is this: Because of certain ecclesiastical decrees issued from a foreign country in regard to marriages in Canada relating only to the religion of one class of the community, or at least to one class of religion in the community, it has been decided, not by all the judges, but by one, two or three judges in Quebec, that marriages between persons of different religions, although the parties in every other respect are admitted to be perfectly legally qualified, to have observed the proper ceremony and in every other respect to have complied with the law, are not binding and doubt is thrown upon the fruits of such a marriage and upon the legitimacy of the children who may be born of that union. The object of my Bill, therefore, is to settle that doubt. What is the position in regard to it? Here I have a Bill brought in, drawn by myself,

submitted to other people it is true, devised as well as may be, to meet that evil. I do not want to go one iota further than is necessary to remedy the evil. The Bill has been before this House now for about two months. It was purposely introduced by me early in the session in order that during the Christmas and New Year's holidays it could be discussed by every one who took an interest in it, and in order that every one might have ample time to consider it, because I know it is a most important question.

In the Bill as printed one letter has been omitted by the compositor which makes a difference in the sense. In the 11th line the word 'person' should be in the plural, 'persons', 'the religious faith of the persons so married'. Of course it is nonsense to talk of a person marrying, there must be more than one.. I shall move to amend this when the Bill gets into committee.

This question must be dealt with by us entirely in the interest of the nation, entirely regardless of what any particular religion or sect of people may want us to do. I am approaching it in that way. I believe that this legislation which I am asking the House to pass is in the absolute interest of everybody, of every Christian creed, in this country. I have no doubt that, if adopted, this legislation will result in greater happiness to the whole people of this country, greater prosperity and greater national honour to the country as a whole than we have to-day with a doubt existing on this matter.

I have spoken emphatically about the evil. Let me illustrate the necessity of prompt action, let me point out to the House what I humbly believe to be the growing state of the evil. Since these one or two judgments were given in the province of Quebec, people have been aroused on both sides on this question. We find, for instance. The 'Orange Sentinel' demanding, and within its rights in demanding, in its issue of December 7, 1911, after the introduction of the Bill, that my Bill should go further, that it does not go far enough because it does not make a criminal of a priest of a certain church, who would go further into our houses and discuss our matrimonial relations. I do not think there is any such evil existing in this country. I do not propose to put any such clause as that in my Bill. That is the law they have in Italy, but with all deference to 'The Orange Sentinel' I do not think we are in Italy to-day. This is Canada, and I think if proper, calm, reasonable measures are passed we will have no need of enacting anything of that kind. I do not know that there is such an evil in the country and I do not know that it is necessary to have such a special law aimed at the priest of any church any more than it is to have a special law aimed at the medical profession, at the legal profession or at any other profession.

But if we do not apply some remedy we may get to be Italy in this country. That is why I say that delay or procrastination or hesitation about doing our duty here will not be tolerated by the people, is not right and ought not to be tolerated by gentlemen of our standing in this House, charged with making laws for the whole country. I say, and I thank God I can say sincerely, that we are not in this country in the same position as they are in Italy, but with all respect to everybody in this country and in this House, I submit that if we do not take some reasonable and proper course to enunciate that the effect of these marriages is as my Bill proposes to make it, we may get into the position where even I would admit that a year or two hence we will have to have such a law as the 'Orange Sentinel' says I should attach to my Bill.

Let us take the other side. A certain priest of the Roman Catholic church in Winnipeg, on December 24 last,—and the irony of it is that this was published in the Christmas newspapers, the 'Globe' and 'Mail'—granted an interview. I have taken great care to have this interview verified; I have made inquiries and I find that this priest of this church revised this interview before it was published, approved of it as it was printed, and it is his own actual language. That interview reads:

A PRIEST'S VIEW OF THE MARRIAGE QUESTION.

Father Comeau would Perform Secret Ceremony in some Cases.

(Canadian Press Despatch.)

Winnipeg, Dec. 24.—Rev. Father Comeau, resident priest of St. Mary's church here, has made the following statement to an evening paper in regard to the recent Ne Temere case at St. Boniface, when he refused to permit a Catholic woman to see her Protestant husband unless they were remarried by the church. 'Suppose a Roman Catholic and a Protestant wish to get married. We will imagine the husband to be a Catholic. The parties are married by a Protestant minister. The moment the marriage is contracted the husband has forsaken the Catholic doctrine and can be no longer recognized as a true Catholic. The only way he can come back into the fold is by getting his legal wife to be married to him by a Catholic priest according to the conditions of the Catholic church, that is, that she will not interfere with the practice of his doctrine, and the children will be brought up in the Catholic faith. If the wife refuses and he insists on going back to the church the husband must take a vow never to live with her again.

'If, when reinstated as a Catholic, the man wishes to marry another woman, the cere-

mony to be performed by a Catholic priest,' asked the reporter, 'may he do it?'

'Well,' was the reply, 'we try and get the man to seek a divorce from the state first, because, in the eyes of the law, he is still married, and, while the church does not recognize it, we do not want to lay ourselves open to prosecutions. There is a way out, and that is by having a secret marriage.

'Take this as an intance: I am sent away to a mission a long way up in the country. When I arrive a man comes to me and says: "Father, I have committed a sin for which I am truly repentant. Three years ago I was married to a Protestant woman by a Protestant minister. Later we separated. We did not get a divorce, and now I am living with another woman. Will you marry us?" I might say: "I will run the risk and marry you in the eyes of God." I then get two witnesses whom I can trust never to reveal what has taken place, and I marry the parties in secret. After this they can never part, as there is no such thing as divorce in the Roman Catholic church. Then they are married in the eyes of God and the church, though perhaps not according to the law of the state. If the former wife should get to know of the second marriage I might be prosecuted. One never knows.'

Sir, I know that that is not the doctrine of my fellow citizens of this country who profess the Roman Catholic religion. I am using that illustration to show the evil that exists in this country. I cite the language used by that one man, a priest of the church, because he is encouraged to use it by virtue of the law I am seeking to amend by the action of this House. I do not believe that any of my Roman Catholic citizens of St. Catharines believe that to be true Roman Catholic doctrine. I cannot for one moment believe they would advocate polygamy and bigamy and conspiracy to commit both of these crimes and that they have a right to do so in the eyes of God and of the law. I know that this is not a true statement of the views of these very respected people of this country, and I have a great respect for most of them. I live beside them, I associate with them, and I thank God my children associate with them; I want them to associate with them, and I do not want them to be afraid to marry them for fear of any such false un-British and unstatesmanlike doctrine as is here enunciated. But it shows how the evil is going on that in December, 1911, this priest expressed such views as that, just as the 'Orange Sentinel' thinks that the evil is so great that we must put a ban on any priest coming into a Protestant's house to discuss his marriage relations or anything else with him.

I wish to be always as candid as I have the reputation of being, and I think I deserve that reputation; if I have a fault I think it is perhaps my utter and undue candour; but I want to say here, looking at the present leader of the opposition and reflecting on the great power and majority he had behind him until September of last year, that I think he and his government are a great deal to blame for this situation.

I want to tell him that three years ago when the Ne Temere decree was promulgated in the province of Quebec, and which caused all this trouble, he must have known, representing all classes of the people as he did for fifteen years, of the conditions as they then were. But he was not without a reminder. The hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) drew it to the attention of the government away back in March last year, and Sir Allen Aylesworth speaking for the government on the question, and with all respect I say it, trifling with the matter, gave the answer. I quote from 'Hansard' page 6269:

VALIDITY OF MARRIAGES.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. Under the laws of Canada or of the several provinces, are marriages valid when contracted between persons of different religious beliefs? If so, in what cases?

2. Has any one the right to urge persons who have contracted such valid marriages to disregard them on the ground that they are invalid?

3. If such right does not exist what is the remedy?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. There is no Dominion legislation on the subject.

The solemnization of marriage in the provinces is, under the British North America Act, matter entirely of provincial jurisdiction.

Section 92 of that statute enacts that in each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say:

12. The solemnization of marriage in the provinces.

Sir Allen Aylesworth answered that the solemnization of marriage is under entire provincial jurisdiction, but that is not the question he was asked, and to part two of the question the answer has no relevancy.

Then the present Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) in the same session asked a long series of questions on this very important matter which is dealt with in this Bill of mine, and Sir Allen Aylesworth again replied:

1. The government or any department of the government has no knowledge in relation to the matters referred to in these questions other than such as may be gathered from newspaper articles or references upon the subject.

He appears to have great contempt for the newspapers which are the chief medium of communicating information to governments as well as to the people. We will see from this that the Minister of Justice under the benign influence of his

leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier shows a great policy of masterly inactivity. The member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith), and the member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) asked questions about it, but they were answered that the provinces had to do with the solemnization of marriage and neither the government nor any department of it has any knowledge in relation to the matters referred to. But, the government is supposed to have knowledge of such an important public question. Every one in this country had knowledge of it, and when these members of the opposition drew the attention of the late government to the matter it was time that the government should do something. But, that government while it was busy trying to smash confederation by advocating reciprocity for the benefit of the United States was equally masterly in trying to smash confederation on the question of marriage between people living in different provinces of the Dominion. It was the duty of the Prime Minister and his Minister of Justice to have knowledge of these matters, and to discuss it at the council board, and to see that while confederation lasted it was not possible that Canadians marrying in one province when they moved to another province would have doubts cast on the legitimacy of their children. If there was no other reason than that, this Bill of mine ought to pass so as to settle for all time a form of marriage ceremony which is lawful throughout the Dominion. There are half-a-dozen ways of getting married in the province of Quebec, and if a man and woman select any of these forms that is prescribed to be lawful, then it must not be that ten years later a man who has a grudge against him will be able to say without being liable for criminal libel, that there is the slightest streak of illegitimacy on the offspring of that marriage. And, Sir Allen Aylesworth under the benign influence of the then Prime Minister, in answer to the member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) instead of saying that the government was going to do something about it gave an answer which meant that the government would taken no action.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). What does your own Minister of Justice say about it?

Mr. LANCASTER. I have always found that my own Minister of Justice is able to speak for himself, but I am representing a constituency in this parliament and I am speaking for myself. My hon. friend (Mr. Chisholm) should be manly enough to speak for himself and not swallow all that Sir Allen Aylesworth said simply because it was the statement of a Grit Minister of Justice. Then Mr. Taylor of Leeds put this question on 'Hansard,' page 8585:

Mr. LANCASTER.

LEGALIZATION OF MARRIAGES.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Has the Dominion government power to legalize or validate any or every marriage solemnized anywhere in Canada?

2. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain the power of this parliament in that regard?

3. If not, does the government propose to take any steps for that purpose?

4. Has the opinion of the law officers of the Crown been asked or obtained upon this question?

5. Does the government propose to obtain the opinion of the law officers of the Crown thereon?

And what did Sir Allen Aylesworth answer:

1. The government does not consider that it possesses any such power.

2, 3, 4 and 5. The government has not considered the advisability of taking any of the courses suggested.

Why did not Sir Allen Aylesworth say that parliament did or did not possess any such powers, instead of giving the evasive answer that the 'government' did not possess such powers. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Chisholm) wants to compare Ministers of Justice, but I would point out to him that when the same question was asked of this present government the present government was manly enough to say that while the government had no power, the question as to parliament having power was in dispute and would possibly require judicial authority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCASTER. These hon. gentlemen opposite who now cry sarcastically 'hear, hear,' took what Sir Allen Aylesworth said with abject submission, although they must have known that his answer was an evasion of the question put. That is the kind of quibbling that I complain of. My hon. friend (Mr. Chisholm) wants to compare Ministers of Justice. I may or may not agree with the present Minister of Justice on this question; I have had no conference with him about it. He does not know what I am going to say and he may not know at this minute what he is going to say himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, and the reason is that being a Conservative he is willing to wait until he hears the argument and the discussion before he pronounces his opinion, and the whole horde behind the benign leader of the opposition applaud the statement—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is scarcely parliamentary for the hon. member to use the word 'horde' as he has used it. When he

speaks of hon. members as the whole horde behind the leader of the opposition, the expression in my judgment is not permissible in parliament.

Mr. LANCASTER. Of course I withdraw the word, Mr. Speaker. I say that hon. gentlemen supporting the leader of the opposition applaud with derision my statement that the Minister of Justice in this government will not make up his mind as to what he is to say about an important public question until he hears it properly discussed, and that just illustrates the blind faith that those gentlemen opposite evinced in their leaders for fifteen years. So far have they descended that it is apparently a disgraceful thing for a minister of the Crown to keep an open mind on public questions until he hears what the representatives of the people have to say about them. The gentlemen opposite are prepared apparently to agree to anything that their leader says or does and they do not expect any one to exercise his own judgment upon a question after hearing it discussed. Then, finding that Sir Allen Aylesworth, Minister of Justice, was playing on the word 'government' instead of 'parliament,' Mr. Taylor of Leeds asked,

1. Has the parliament of Canada the power to legalize or validate any or every marriage solemnized in Canada?

2. Does the government consider it desirable that steps should be taken to prevent cruelty and injustice by reason of marriages contracted in good faith before a duly ordained clergyman, but afterwards, declared invalid?

3. Does the government propose to take any steps for this purpose or in this connection?

and Sir Allen Aylesworth answered as follows:

1. The question calls for an opinion upon a matter of law in regard to which the government would desire to be advised if necessity arose?

2 and 3. The government is of the opinion that it has no power or jurisdiction in the premises.

Now, am I not justified in saying that the late government, and their Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) were playing with the question, and thus intensifying the existing evil? I presume that Sir Allen Aylesworth had some opinion of his own in regard to the law, but he failed to give it. And I have no doubt that should a similar question be put the Minister of Justice in this government, he will not tell us that he wants advice, but on the contrary will give us his opinion whether it agrees with mine or not. For I do believe that any minister of the Crown behind the present Prime Minister would be ashamed to say, when asked a question like that a second time, and when the word 'parliament' is inserted instead of the word 'government'—that the question called for an opinion on a matter of law in regard to which the government was desirous to be advised if the necessity arose.

After this prelude let us see what the Bill is. My Bill undertakes to provide that marriages celebrated by any lawful authority shall be considered valid, notwithstanding—and here is the whole evil that is to be remedied—nowithstanding any difference in the religious faith of the persons married, and without regard to the religion of the person performing the ceremony. My Bill is purposely double barrelled. There is an evil in the country which it is our duty here to remedy. This is the place to remedy it, and to get away from quibbles and technicalities I propose that we shall enact here, by original jurisdiction, that these marriages are valid under the British North America Act which sends the general subject of marriage and divorce to the Dominion parliament. Further, under the second clause of the Bill, I propose to have parliament say that if there is a law providing to the contrary, it is over-ruled by this statute. The Bill goes on to say:

2. The rights and duties, as married people, of the respective persons married as aforesaid, and of the children of such marriage, shall be absolute and complete, and no law or canonical decree or custom of or in any province in Canada shall have any force or effect to invalidate or qualify any such marriage or any of the rights of the said persons or their children in any manner whatsoever.'

One would think, on reading these questions I have quoted, and the answers of Sir Allen Aylesworth, that the Dominion parliament never before had dealt with this question. Well, there is on our revised statutes as far back as 1906 an Act respecting marriage, passed by the Dominion parliament, and that Act provides that it is lawful for a man to marry his deceased wife's sister. That is not the law of the province of Quebec, it is not the canonical law of the Church of England, yet the parliament of Canada has decreed that, as a matter of civil law, that such marriages should be permitted, and no one has ever attacked that Act, nor has it ever been declared ultra vires. The question as to whether parliament can deal with the subject of marriage is, Sir Allen Aylesworth said, one on which the late government would want advice. But I do not know what better advice a Minister of Justice would want than a statute ten years old, which was passed by this parliament, which was never attacked, and was never repealed by the government of which Sir Allen Aylesworth was a member. That Act of the parliament of Canada declared against the common law of England, and against the canonical law of several churches, that you can marry your deceased wife's sister so

long as the ceremony provided by law is gone through.

Now, let us have common-sense in the matter, let us ask ourselves where is the remedy to be found. I shall go into the question of provincial rights in Quebec because that is the only argument I have heard anywhere as to why this Bill should not be passed. Let us see if this parliament has authority. Under the British constitution there must be some parliament that has power, and no hon. member will say that the Imperial parliament has power because the British North America Act has sent all these things to the Dominion, or to the provinces. The British North America Act says marriage and divorce must be dealt with by the Dominion parliament, and section 91 of that Act reads:

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the class of subject, by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the province; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared, notwithstanding anything in this Act, the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated.

And within these classes is the subject of marriage and divorce. There is no restriction there. It says for greater certainty, 'marriage and divorce', and there is no condition whatever prescribed. Then comes section 92 as to the power of the provincial legislature:

In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects, next hereinafter enumerated.

Then within these classes is 'the solemnization of marriage in the province'.

Now, the solemnization of marriage is one thing, the status of the people married is one thing, and whether that marriage is valid or not is another thing. I have given the question a good deal of consideration for the last year or more, and I have no doubt with regard to the solemnization of marriage, that the whole power of the province ends as soon as two people are married. The results of that marriage, the status of the children, the question whether that marriage is valid or not, are questions that must be left to the Dominion parliament to settle. That is not only my own opinion, but I have authority for it. Had Sir Allen Aylesworth looked into the sessional papers of 1877, when a government of his own political faith was in power, and when the question was submitted to the law officers of the Crown in England, he would have found a communication from Lord Grenville, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the Governor General of Canada, dated the 15th of January, 1870, a few years after confederation. Two questions were submitted to the law officers of the Crown in England on this very matter.

The questions asked were simply because the country was in doubt as to whether the provinces or the Dominion had the power to provide for the publication of banns and the issuing of licenses—whether that came under the head of 'solemnization of marriage' or of 'marriage and divorce'. These were the questions asked:

a) Whether the authority to issue marriage licenses is vested in the Governor General under Her Majesty's Commission or in the Lieutenant Governor of the several provinces.

b) Whether the power of legislation respecting the publication of banns or the issue of licenses rests with the general or local legislatures.

In answer to the above the following opinion was given by the law officers:

It appears to them that the power of legislating upon this subject is conferred on the provincial legislatures by 30 Vic. cap. 3, section 92 (B.N.A. Act) under the words 'the solemnization of marriage in the province.' The phrase 'the laws respecting the solemnization of marriages in England' occurs in the preamble of the marriage Act (4 George IV cap. 76), an Act which is very largely concerned with matters relating to banns and licenses, and this is, therefore, a strong authority to show that the same words used in the B.N.A. Act, 1867, were intended to have the same meaning. 'Marriage and Divorce' which by the 91st section of the same Act are reserved to the parliament of the Dominion, signify, in their opinion all matters relating to the status of marriage, between what persons and under what circumstances it shall be created and (if at all) destroyed.

There are many reasons of convenience and sense why one law as to the status of marriage should exist throughout the Dominion, which have no application as regards the uniformity of the procedure whereby that status is created or evidenced.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it does not seem to me that there was any excuse for the Minister of Justice of the late government to say that this government needed advice upon the subject. The law officers of the Crown had said that the Dominion parliament had inherent right to make laws on this subject. Notwithstanding that the laws of one of the provinces did not allow marriage with a deceased wife's sister this parliament declared that such marriages should be legal.

Now, I am obliged to point out what I believe to be the real objection, an objection, which, it seems to me, this parliament cannot listen to for a moment. I have here the 'Catholic Register' of January 18, 1912, in which appears this short editorial:

Mr. Olmstead is very fearful lest Protestant wrath be aroused against the Church of Eng-

land on account of its 'deceased wife's sister' law, just as it has been roused against the Catholic Church on the 'Ne Temere' question. He need have no fear. If the worst comes to the worst our Anglican friends will buckle down and accept any legislation which parliament sees fit to enact. Standing for principle is not now and never has been an Anglican characteristic.

That covers the whole issue in this country to-day. I am an Anglican. I know that the laws of our church say that this is not the right thing to do. But, to the credit of the Anglican church be it said, as soon as the Dominion parliament declares: We are the state and we make such and such laws—the Anglican church respects the Dominion parliament and says: We will obey those laws. This that I have quoted is the thin edge of the wedge. They sneer at the Anglican church for disregarding their ecclesiastical canon; sneer at them for being loyal to the government and the institutions of this country, and for obeying laws made by parliament. That is exactly the position to-day and we may as well face it. This country wants the issue faced, and it has got to be faced; —who is to decide as to the legitimacy of our children the church or the parliament of Canada? Don't let us run away from it. Our children will bless us if we settle the matter. My children and my grandchildren, if I have any—and I hope I shall—will bless me for settling it—for not being a coward and afraid to settle it in this year of grace 1912. No one, I believe, will accuse the humble person now addressing you of being a bigot in religion. Hon. gentlemen on the other side may accuse him of being a little bigoted in politics. Perhaps I do not misrepresent the case if I speak of myself as a Tory of the Tories, and even a little bigoted in politics, for I always want to be on the Tory side and believe that the Tory party has done more for this country than its opponents. I cannot help feeling so. But no one believes more fully than I do, that a man's church makes no difference in regard to his communion with his neighbours. I know of no religion in this country that has not admirable adherents. I do not know of any boys or girls that I do not want my children to associate with merely because of their religion. I do not believe that any man will say the member for Lincoln is a religious bigot. But here is a question we have to face, and I give the 'Catholic Register' credit for its candour in bringing it forward. The question is this: If the church says that this or that is to decide the legitimacy of the children and the state of married people, is that to be the law of the land or is a parliament to be able to say: That is not the law. But parliament-made-law must prevail. That is the issue; that is what we have to deal with.

Now, what are the articles of the Quebec Civil Code in regard to this matter? They are not at all clear. Under the head 'Solemnization of Marriage,' this is not provided for. The decisions in Quebec rest upon section 127 of the Civil Code, which provides:

OTHER IMPEDIMENTS.

The other impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions, as resulting from relationship or affinity or from other causes——

It is only under these words 'other causes,' the religious difference of the parties is said to be an impediment to marriage.

——remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities.

Now, let me point out that this is provided in a chapter as to 'the qualities and conditions necessary for contracting marriage,' and it is not in the chapter which is headed with the very words of the British North America Act, under which alone they have the right to deal with this matter at all—'Solemnization of Marriage.' What I have read is indefinite, it is true, but its object must be, of course, to more or less effect what it intends to effect. But the next chapter is as to 'The Formalities relating to the Solemnization of Marriage,' and there is nothing in that chapter looking to the assumption of jurisdiction in Quebec on this subject. And yet the 'solemnization of marriage' is considered by the law officers of the crown as relating to the forms to be used, and is the only subject which, under the British North America Act, is assigned to the provinces. Though they have a chapter dealing with that subject, they do not say in it that a difference in religion is an impediment; in effect they say it is not because they put it in a different chapter and relating to a different subject.

Now, there are some decisions of the courts. I go into this matter at some length because it is persistently argued that the provinces must not be interfered with in this matter of provincial jurisdiction. The judges of the province of Quebec do not agree in their decisions. In the Hebert case which has raised so much controversy lately, one judge decided two things. He decided that a Protestant minister cannot legally marry two Catholics; and, secondly, that the validity of a marriage between Catholics in Quebec must be decided by the Church and not by the State courts. Now, let us face that. When did we lose confidence in the judges of our land to decide all questions? What is the reason that our judges should not be allowed to decide these questions as well as others? Where is there anything in the British constitution that permits in any

way any courts excepts those established as the tribunals of the land to give decisions of this kind?

Who would say that the jurisdiction of that court did not include marriage and divorce? Every session we have people bringing cases here for divorce, and they are not granted until we pass the Bill. We are deciding that people shall be declared unmarried; will any one seriously tell me now, manfully facing this matter, not trying to shirk a vote by urging any plea of provincial rights—will any one seriously tell me that when we can divorce a man we cannot also say that he shall not be divorced, by any church court, or any other court? Hon. gentlemen argue that we should establish a divorce court, but how can we do so if this question of provincial rights stands in the way? Are we to allow each province to say whether a man's marriage is valid or not? You cannot divorce a man until you find out whether he was legally married, and this parliament enters into that question, to see if he has been lawfully married, and if it finds he has been, then it passes an Act of parliament granting him divorce. What argument can be brought forward, that is founded on sound reason, supporting a contention that this parliament has not power to declare a marriage valid if it has power to declare it invalid? The Quebec courts have always held that the civil courts have sole jurisdiction when the parties are Catholics. Are you going to have one law in Canada for Catholic citizens, and another law for Protestants? Now let us face this question. If one of my sons, or my little girl, happens to fall in love with some Roman Catholic and marries him or her, why should I object? I want the confederation to be a reality, I want social intercourse with my fellow citizens in Quebec, whether they want me there or not. I want my boys to travel into Quebec, and my little girl too, if necessary. If the people of that province are good citizens, I care not what religion they are of; I am willing that my children should marry with them and procreate children, and so help build up this nation in an honourable and proper way. Does not every citizen of this country want the same thing? Who is to decide when one of the consorts is a Protestant and the other a Catholic? Why must there be one tribunal for the Catholic and another for the Protestant? Have we not on the bench of this country Roman Catholic judges deciding civil questions? Who will say that they do not give good decisions on every other matter except marriage, and that they cannot decide that matter just as well as any civil matter? We have our benches composed of both Roman Catholic and Protestant judges, applying the law equally to every suitor that comes before them. They do it in railway cases, they do it in land suits, they do it in alimony cases, and in every other kind of cases in Quebec, and everywhere else in Canada, and why can they not decide marriage cases? Why, are you going to disrupt confederation by saying that judges of all religions are able to decide whether a man is legally married or not if he is a Protestant, but have not the authority to decide if he happens to be a Roman Catholic? One law for Canada we must have upon this question, and we are going to disrupt confederation if we do not have that law. Now, what do the Quebec courts say? They have always held that the courts have sole jurisdiction where parties are not Catholics. That has been held in the following cases:

Dorion v. Laurent (1843), 17 L. C. J., 324.
Mignault v. Haferman (1866), 10 L. C., 137.
Connolly v. Woolrick (1867), 11 L. C. J., 222.
Burn v. Fontain (1872).

All these decisions of the Quebec courts are unanimous, that when the people are not Catholic the civil courts have the right to decide the question as to whether a marriage is valid or not; but they have not that power when one is a Roman Catholic and the other a Protestant, or when both are Roman Caholics. Now, we have judges differing on this subject; we have Judge Archibald deciding that he has power to declare a marriage valid, and others deciding that they have not the power, but that in the province of Quebec the ecclesiastical court has the power. I was surprised at what I saw the other day in one of our newspapers, I thought there must be some exaggeration, some newspaper mistake, something that was going to stir up unduly the passions of the people. I picked up the Toronto 'Globe' of Friday last, and here is what I find in a special despatch from Montreal to that paper:

MRS. BLANCHET PRESENTS HER DECREE.

Appeals for an Annulment of Marriage on Ground of Consanguinity.

(Special despatch to the 'Globe'.)

Montreal, Jan. 19. The Roman Catholic marriage laws are again in the limelight. The petition seeking annulment of the marriage of Dame Anna Meunier with F. X. Blanchet has again come before the courts, the plaintiff having filed the religious decree which was missing in her first papers.

What was she doing? She was going to the civil courts to get a judgment annuling her marriage on the evidence simply of an ecclesiastical decree, just as I would get a judgment against any hon. gentleman in this House upon proof of the facts if I were suing him upon a promissory note. The note is the foundation of the

judgment, and in this case the woman presents that judgment to the civil court in Quebec. Then:

The decree reads as follows:—

Archbishop's Palace, Montreal, Nov. 3, 1911.

—Re the marriage case of Meunier v. Blanchet, Mrs. Anna Meunier, 20 McGregor street, Montreal: Madam,—I am directed to announce to you that His Grace the Archbishop of Montreal has pronounced a sentence of nullity of marriage in the case that you have submitted. Yours very truly, (Signed) Emile Roy, Chancellor.

That is what is going on. An ecclesiastical court, not judges appointed by this parliament, not judges appointed by this government and responsible to it, but an ecclesiastical court of a certain religion has undertaken to say whether a man is lawfully married, although he has gone through a legal ceremony. Now, my Act does not prevent any people going anywhere like this, but my Act does say that when they go through any forms of marriage which are legal in any province, then that marriage must stand good, notwithstanding any difference in the religion of the parties, and that no canonical or ecclesiastical court or judgment shall have any effect in annulling it. Let me go back a little further for the benefit of the present leader of the opposition, and for the enlightenment of the ex-Minister of Justice who did not know anything about this, and who wanted legal advice. I have Lefroy's work on Legislative Power in Canada. Who was Sir Hector Langevin? He was Solicitor General at the time of confederation. What was the British North America Act? How was it brought about? Everybody knows it was a bargain made between representatives of the various colonies, which bargain was sanctioned by the British parliament. The British North America Act was not an Act of the British parliament forcing a constitution upon us, but it was an Act agreed upon by representatives of all the provinces, pointing out what things should be reserved for the provinces, and what other things should be reserved to the jurisdiction of the Dominion. That was a wise thing to do, and a thing that has worked well for Canada and will work well if we do not fall short of doing our duty, else no constitution at all is any good. Sir Hector Langevin, as one of the delegates, explained the meaning of the word 'marriage.' The discussion will be found in the Confederation debates; but I also find this part of it in the work of Lefroy. I will quote from page 488 of this work, published in 1897. I find this note on the section:

As to 'marriage and divorce' and 'solemnization of marriage in the province,' reference may be made to the speech of Solicitor General Langevin in the debates on confederation in the parliament of Canada (at p 388), where he says: 'The word "marriage" has been placed in the draft of the proposed constitution to invest the Federal parliament with the right of declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the confederation, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rights of the religious creeds to which the contracting parties may belong.'

There is the whole question, the object of Confederation was to invest the Federal parliament with the right of declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid.

All my Bill says is that if a marriage takes place by any ceremony in itself lawful, they must clear away from it any question of religion and, if otherwise it is a lawful ceremony, then it shall be valid. Sir Hector Langevin is an authority sufficient for me. He belonged to Quebec, he was Solicitor General, and I suppose my friends will say that he was a Conservative, and that is all you can say against him. Now, he declared that the question of the validity of the marriage laws belongs to the Dominion parliament. He thought so in making the agreement. That is the opinion of the man who wrote the agreement. The opinion of a man who did not have anything to do with the making of an agreement, which must, therefore, be construed in the light of the ordinary sense and dictionary meaning of English words, would be important, but this is the opinion of a man who was a party to the agreement in putting section 91 into the British North America Act, and which declared that the validity of marriage must always be a question for the parliament of Canada. In addition to that we have the declaration of the law officers of the Crown of England which I have quoted that the whole effect and status of marriage belongs to the parliament of Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will my hon. friend read that extract again?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, this is what Sir Hector Langevin said at Quebec, page 388 of the Debate on Confederation:

The word 'marriage' has been placed in the draft of the proposed constitution to invest the federal parliament with the right of declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the confederacy, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rights of the religious creeds to which the contracting parties may belong.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that Mr. Lefroy, when he wrote his book, addressed a letter to Sir Hector Langevin, and the answer of Sir Hector Langevin is quoted

in the book. Will my hon. friend be good enough to read the answer of Sir Hector Langevin?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is in a foot note.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes. He says, in fact, that that is exactly what he meant, and he reduced it to writing. In the foot note is the following:

It appears from the official report of the debate that the above words were read by the Speaker from some written document, and when asked by the present authority to explain the source of this extract, Sir Hector Langevin most kindly supplied the following information of a letter of August 25, 1894: 'I was entrusted by my leaders, Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier, with the explanation not only of the general features of the proposed constitution, but also of some very important details which they could not have given in their own speeches without having lengthened their speeches unduly. My explanations were those of the government, and on the question of marriage and divorce, in order that there might be no equivocation or misunderstanding, it was agreed between my colleagues and myself that I would put in writing those eight lines that you quote in your letter.

What I read were the eight lines that were in the letter. Sir Hector Langevin was very careful and he used the words 'valid,' and 'invalid.'

Then, we have this pronouncement of the law officers of the Crown in England that I have quoted and that uses the word 'status.' That is the whole gist of this Bill—that the status cannot be questioned, that we cannot afford to have in Canada any of these questions arising anywhere in the world as to there being any doubt in any part of this Dominion as to the question of marriage, or as to any marriage or as to the legitimacy of children being affected by any peculiarity of religion that you and your spouse may happen to have enjoyed before you entered into the marriage state.

Now, we have a decision here. It is the case of the city of Fredericton vs. the Queen, 23 Supreme Court Reports, p. 505. It is not an express decision upon the marriage question, but it has an important bearing upon the question of marriage. The question of marriage is there introduced as an illustration of the point the learned judge is deciding. Mr. Justice Gwynne, in that case said at page 568:

Solemnization of marriage, that is to say, the power of regulating the ceremony—the mode of its celebration—is a particular subject expressly placed under the jurisdiction of the local legislatures, as a matter which has always been considered to be purely of a local character.

Then he points out that all other matters connected with marriage are vested in the Dominion parliament; that is to say:

——the competency of the parties to the contract to enter into it—the effect upon the status of the children if presumed to be de facto entered into by persons not competent by law to enter into it—its obligatory force when entered into—the power of dissolving the tie when entered into.

These things, Mr. Justice Gwynne, says, absolutely belong to us.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Did he say that in the Supreme Court of Canada?

Mr. LANCASTER. He said that in deciding a case in the Supreme Court of Canada. I think I have said enough to show that there is very grave doubt whether we have not jurisdiction in this House whatever technical points may be raised by those people who argue that the provincial law has something to do with it. I am only speaking for myself, but I want there to be no doubt about the attitude that I take, I have not the slightest doubt about our jurisdiction to pass the Bill which I have introduced. I would not have troubled this House about the little part of this matter, the ceremony, the solemnization, the regulation of the banns and the issue of the license, except that these are the only matters mentioned by those who are trying to prevent this Bill being passed. But I say now that we do not need to trouble ourselves about that at all and for the reason that I hinted at very early in my remarks. It is that we have jurisdiction to remedy any evil that is in existence or that arises from any question that is in doubt. This parliament has inherent jurisdiction as a British institution to remedy an evil unless that authority is clearly taken away from it. I will concede for the purpose of my argument that both the province and the Dominion have more or less to do with the question. Then, who is going to control it? What is best for the country? Who has the paramount right? Sir James Whitney, in the province of Ontario, will have a provincial law that says that an electric railway company may not run its cars on Sunday. That company applies to this Dominion parliament and gets its railway to be declared a work for the general advantage of Canada. Our Railway Act does not prevent it from running cars on Sunday. As long as it was a provincial matter and as long as the Dominion did not undertake to remedy it the province had some right in the matter. Take the question of prohibition. It went to the Privy Council. It was held there that the provincial government had power to enact prohibition, but it was also held that if the Dominion parliament chose to have prohibition from Prince Edward

Island to Vancouver they could enact such a law and that the provinces could not then have a liquor license Act if they wanted one. Here the whole question of marriage and divorce is assigned to the Dominion parliament by section 91.

If there is any question as to whether the right to pronounce upon the status and validity of a marriage goes with jurisdiction over the solemnization of marriage rather than with jurisdiction over the general question of marriage and divorce, then I say that, in my capacity as an ordinary member of parliament, it is my duty in this House to take the jurisdiction to remedy an evil respecting marriage if it exists in this country, if I am able to do so. Once you recognize that there is an evil somebody must act. If you leave it to the provinces, saying that although the whole question of marriage and divorce as a general thing is assigned to the Dominion, you are content to be cowardly enough to sit down, although you occupy a seat in this House, to shirk the question and be willing to have nine different laws in nine different provinces as to what is a valid marriage in Canada. I say it is up to us members of this House, it is up to me as a member of this House of Commons when I recognize that an evil exists, not to bother about nice questions having no merit behind them, not to seek for an excuse to avoid the issue, not to seek to shirk my responsibility, but, when I find that the main question is consigned to us by the British North America Act to deal with on general terms, to say: We will pass an Act and make a law that these marriages are to be valid and binding if we think that is a proper law to pass.

The main argument against my Bill is that it is an encroachment on provincial rights. I do not concede that there is anything in that argument, and I have spent some time in discussing that question, because I do not believe it is a bona fide contention.

As to the Bill itself, I have been told by a few gentlemen that it does not go far enough, not only for the reason I mentioned in the opening when I referred to the 'Orange Sentinel,' but because it contains the words 'duly performed according to such laws.' It has been said to me that once I put the condition precedent that a marriage in any province must be duly performed according to such law, I am at once saying that if there is a law in any province which makes it illegal for a Protestant and Catholic to marry I am not making such a marriage legal, and that the provision of my Bill can be got around in that way. But you must take the context.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does any other province than the province of Quebec, recognize these impediments?

Mr. LANCASTER. Not as to a marriage in civil law.

Mr. DEVLIN. Would the effect of this Bill be simply to reach the province of Quebec?

Mr. LANCASTER. No, it would be to have one uniform law all over Canada. I do not say that the province of Quebec does what my hon. friend said, the judges do not quite agree about that, but, as I tried to make plain, the very fact that it is suggested that in Australia or Russia or anywhere else, it can be held that although lawfully married according to the laws of a country except for the question of religion, your religion is going to interfere with your status in Canada if you go to any province, that is what I say is an evil and what I want this parliament to say is that the question of the religious faith of the parties to a marriage that is otherwise legal and according to law, shall not invalidate that marriage in any province.

Mr. DEVLIN. Leaving the religious difference, will the effect be to invalidate article 127 of the Civil Code of the province of Quebec?

Mr. LANCASTER. No, except in so far as you try to apply article 127, by saying that because the two people are of different religions they are not lawfully married; to that extent it will prevent it, to that extent it is aimed to prevent it, because I say that is a question which the Dominion parliament has a right to say shall be legal all over the country.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will article 127 still remain as law if this Bill passes, according to the opinion of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. LANCASTER. No, I want to make myself plain. I am trying to knock out part of the effect of article 127. I shall read article 127:

> The other impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions, as resulting from relationship or affinity or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities.

Under that, some of the judges in the province of Quebec decided that the question must be decided by the ecclesiastical courts and not by the civil courts of the country, and nearly all the judges of the courts of Quebec, as I understand, held that, under that section, if people are of different religions that is one of the impediments, although not mentioned as such in the clause, that would invalidate the marriage. I am trying my best to pass a law that says that in so far as article 127 of the Civil Code indicates, that the difference in religion, and that alone, will in-

validate a marriage otherwise lawfully solemnized, that article of the Code shall be overridden for the benefit of the whole of Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is there any article of a civil law of any province or the Dominion other than this article just quoted by my hon. friend, which might be affected by this Bill in any way?

Mr. LANCASTER. Not that I know of, but I want to make this Bill effect a uniform law from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island, so that in all parts of this Dominion, if two people go through a ceremony that is lawfully authorized according to the regulations prescribed for the solemnization of marriage in any province, the question of what religion they profess, if of different religions or not, shall not enter into the question of the validity of the marriage or throw any doubt upon the legitimacy of the children who are the fruits of that marriage.

I hold that section 127 is not authorized by the British North America Act. I claim that it is ultra vires of the province and indicates that they are assuming to exercise a jurisdiction to which they are not entitled, and we are going to be blamed for allowing them to do so. I want it to be understood, and that is why my Bill is double-barrelled, not only enacting that this thing, as a matter of original jurisdiction, is being enacted, but that if the Bill conflicts with the legislation of any province, we are deliberately overriding that law of the province.

Mr. DEVLIN. I understand the object of this Bill is to get over the difficulty of article 127 of the Civil Law of the province of Quebec?

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not trying to get over any difficulty of article 127, I am trying to make a uniform law, not one that lawyers will have to be asked about, let alone going to the Privy Council, but one so plain that the child who can read in the first or second reader in the public school can take the statute and know what is going to happen when he grows up in Canada.

I have no patience with legal quibbles and with having to go to courts and Privy Councils to decide what should be plain. Lawyer, as I am, I hold it to be my duty as a member of this parliament to make laws that the people of Canada can understand. We have a right in Canada to say what the status of married people shall be and I propose to say so in the plainest language and if any hon. gentleman can make the language plainer than it is in my Bill, so that every man, woman and child of intelligence can understand it, I will thank him for doing so.

Mr. McLEAN (Prince Edward Island). Does the hon. gentleman think that this Bill will supersede the divorce laws in force in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, British Columbia and Nova Scotia?

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think anything of the kind. The divorce laws to which the hon. gentleman refers were conceded to these provinces when they entered the union and the Confederation Act does not apply to them because they came in after the British North America Act by a different statute which protects them. Besides I am simply proposing a Bill adding a clause to the Act which says that the marriage of a deceased wife's sister shall be lawful, and I am declaring that whether you are of the same religion or not as the person whom you marry that the marriage shall be binding, and I am not going one iota further than to remedy the evil which exists. The divorce laws to which the hon. gentleman refers are not an evil so far as I know, and my Bill does not interfere with them at all. What I say in the Bill is that if the people of any province, whether in Quebec or anywhere else choose to go to a Protestant minister or to a Roman Catholic priest, both being entitled to marry people under the laws of Quebec, and if that priest or minister marries them, then the question as to whether the parties are of the same religion or not shall not be an impediment and the marriage shall be binding.

At Six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LANCASTER. When the House rose at six o'clock I was answering the hon. member from Wright (Mr. Devlin) with regard to article 127 of the Civil code of Quebec, but that is not the only article of the code which should be considered by the House in connection with this matter. Articles 161 and 129 are very instructive with regard to my contention that this parliament alone has the right to deal with the matter. Article 129, which deals with the formalities relating to the solemnization of marriage, says:

> All priests, rectors, ministers and other officers authorized by law to keep registers of acts of civil status, are competent to solemnize marriage.

This clearly applies to every denomination—to everybody and any religious sect who has the right to perform the ceremony:

But none of the officers thus authorized, can be compelled to solemnize a marriage to which any impediment exists according to the doctrine and belief of his religion, and the discipline of the church to which he belongs.

The Civil Code of Quebec itself does not pretend to say that if the persons married are of a different religion their marriage is invalid, but simply that no priest or minister shall be compelled to celebrate a marriage in violation of his own convictions. For refusing to do so, he shall not be submitted to any penalty. That, however, does not say that should he do so the marriage will be invalid. This article 129, which I have quoted, I have taken from the code of the province of Quebec:

All priests, rectors, ministers and other officers authorized by law to keep registers of acts of civil status, are competent to solemnize marriage.

So that what is really required is proof of the marriage, and that is to be found in the registry. Those who are authorized to keep such records shall be permitted to perform the ceremony of marriage, but none of them shall be compelled to do so against his convictions.

The judgment given by the first court in this Hebert case decided two things. It decided, first, that a Protestant minister cannot legally marry two Catholics; and second that the validity of marriage in the province of Quebec between Catholics is decided by the Church and not by the court. But there have been decisions in other cases to the contrary effect. There are two cases, the decisions in which were opposed to that given in the Hebert case, and would show that the Hebert marriage was valid. There is the case of Burns against Fontaine decided in 1872, and there is also the case of Delpit against Cote decided in 1901. The decision in the latter, which was given by Mr. Justice Archibald, has been very much discussed more especially during this controversy. If these judges had had the Hebert case before them, they would have given in that case a very different decision from that which was rendered. There were also the cases of Laranne against Evans in 1880 and Desroches against Degris in 1901, which were decided after the Delpit and Cote case. Mr. Justice Lemieux decided in the case of Desroches vs. Degris that the validity of a marriage must be determined by the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical court—not that he would, as a judge, come to a different conclusion from that arrived at by Judge Archibald, but that he had no power because the matter was one for the ecclesiastical court to decide. But that is exactly what makes the trouble and what this parliament must settle in the interests of the state.

Just one more word in case the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is still in doubt as to what the leaders of his own party thought about this matter. I propose to read the statement of the hon. Edward Blake, who was at one time Minister of Justice in a Cabinet to which the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) belonged. Mr. Blake was another gentleman who did not wish to disrupt confederation by commercial union or reciprocity, but left his party because that party advocated such a policy. In the Debates of 1882, page 491, will be found Mr. Blake's remarks on the Bill to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and in these remarks he clearly laid down the principle that the question of the validity of marriage was one which pertained to the Dominion parliament and not to the local legislature. He said:

When you find marriage given to the federal legislature, and when you find the solemnization given to the local legislature, you have in the strongest way declared that all that was to be given to the local and taken away from the federal was the solemnization of marriage. There has been this subject of discussion, and the law officers of the Crown at an early period were asked by the then hon. leader of the government to advise as to whether, with reference to the Confederation Act, it was not an attribute of the federal government or parliament to deal with the question of licenses in connection of the solemnization of marriage.

That is the very question which we are debating this afternoon, and on which an answer was given by the law officers of the Crown in England:

They decided, and I think rightly, that that power properly fell within the local legislatures, because it was in point of fact part of the solemnization of marriage; but to go further and say that the whole law of marriage is with each local legislature, subject only to this exception, that the federal parliament has a right to declare that a marriage valid according to the law of the local legislature shall be valid through the whole extent of the Dominion, is not, in my opinion, to interpret in any proper sense our Constitution, but is to give it a meaning which cannot fairly be drawn from it. I maintain that we have the right clearly to determine between what parties it shall be legal to contract marriage and between what parties it shall not be legal, and to determine all that for every province of this Dominion, but to determine how a marriage between persons who can lawfully contract it under our laws shall be solemnized, it is not within our power to adjudge. That is disposed of by the local legislature, and therefore, I think the motion of my hon. friend from Bellechase (Aymot) is not only unnecessary, but is a misinterpretation of the true meaning and construction of our constitution, and I shall certainly vote against it.

There could not be stronger language to prove what I am contending for, and that

is that the whole question, except the keeping of records and deciding who shall be competent to solemnize marriage comes within the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament.

Just one word as to the language of my Bill and I am through. It provides that:

> Every ceremony or form of marriage heretofore or hereafter performed by any person authorized to perform any ceremony of marriage by the laws of the place where it is performed, and duly performed according to such laws, shall everywhere within Canada be deemed to be a valid marriage, notwithstanding any differences in the religious faith of the person so married and without regard to the religion of the person performing the ceremony.

I put emphasis upon the word 'any' because some hon. gentlemen, on reading this Bill have taken the meaning which I think it will not bear and which was not intended; and in committee I shall be glad to adopt any language more suitable.

I cannot see how I could more clearly state what I mean. I hope I have made it quite clear that if a ceremony is performed according to the law by a person authorized to perform it, then that marriage shall not be invalidated by reason of differences in religion.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point, may I ask him: Did any courts ever decide that a marriage solemnized according to the laws of the province of Quebec is illegal?

Mr. LANCASTER. I can hardly answer that without an explanation. The courts have decided that if a certain church says that mixed marriages are unlawful then they are unlawful, and for no other reason than that there is a difference in the religion of the parties. That is, they have decided that a marriage legally performed in every other respect except on the point of difference in religion is invalid. Of course, they have not decided that a lawful marriage is invalid, but they have decided that a marriage is unlawful because of this difference in religion of the parties notwithstanding that it is performed by an authorized person, was duly registered, the age limit observed and no other impediment existing. Now, what I say is that if there is an evil, we have inherent power to legislate concerning that evil. Of course, if the majority hold that there is no evil, then what I say goes for nothing.

I should be glad indeed if, when the House goes into committee on the Bill any hon. gentleman can suggest how that which I have endeavoured to express in the Bill can be better expressed. I think that as I have put it, it is plain and definite. But if I have failed in that respect and and hon. gentleman can suggest a plainer way to put it, I shall be glad to accept his suggestion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have occupied the time of the House for nearly two hours. My justification is the extreme importance of the subject. I trust I have not wearied the House. I have tried to do my duty.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) be good enough to point out which of the cases to which he has referred he reads as having decided that mixed marriages, merely because of the difference in religion, were invalid?

Mr. LANCASTER. Larramee vs. Evans and Doroche vs. Degree. In these the ecclesiastical courts decided that because they were mixed marriages they were invalid. And the civil courts held that they had no power to make a decision, but were bound by the decisions of the ecclesiastical courts. In that way they have decided that these marriages are not good, and they decided simply because the ecclesiastical courts said so.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). The subject which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has brought to our attention, is undoubtedly a very important one. The marriage relation is the whole basis of our civilization; and it is concerned with the moral and religious life of the whole people. Upon the validity of marriage depends the sanctity of the home, and the establishment of the relation is concerned with the every day affairs of life in the way of the descent and transmission of property; and in that way as well as in the way I have first mentioned, it touches most nearly the every-day life of the people. I concur entirely with my hon. friend in this respect, that the most important consideration of all is absolute certainty as to the formalities to establish the relation. It is perfectly evident to all of us that the law should, as far as possible, be absolutely certain and plain.

The basis of the marriage relation, as every one knows, is the consent of the parties; and in all civilized countries rules of law have been enacted by which the marriage relation must be established and can only be established with certain formalities and by means of certain ceremonies. It has been the aim and object, I think, all all legislation that publicity, as far as possible, should be given to the establishment of the relation in order that fraud and imposture may not be practised.

Now, my hon. friend, in the very able address which he has delivered, has spoken of the relation of state and church in this country with regard to this matter. So far as that is concerned, every one of us knows that under the laws of Canada, and under the laws of every province in Canada, the decree of any church cannot invalidate the civil law. That is perfectly manifest. And if the decree or the rules of any church have any effect, so far as the civil law is concerned, it must be by reason of the laws of Canada or the laws of some province of Canada giving effect to that decree or those rules. But it is necessary for us to remember that in a country that has a Federal constitution as Canada has, the state for certain purposes and in certain respects, means the executive government and parliament of Canada, and for other purposes and in certain other respects, the state means the executive government and legislatures of the various provinces of Canada.

My hon. friend has referred to the decisions upon the validity of marriage in the province of Quebec. Undoubtedly important questions have arisen and have been decided in that province. These questions, so far as I understand the decisions of the courts of that province, have principally arisen in respect of the marriage of two Catholics before a Protestant clergyman or in respect to the marriage of a Catholic and a Protestant, before a Protestant clergyman. As I understand the results of these decisions, they are as follows:

By some judges the marriage of two Catholics in the province of Quebec by a Protestant clergyman has been held valid; by other judges, however, such marriages have been held invalid. The question has arisen entirely upon the construction of the Civil Code of the province of Quebec. The ground upon which those judges have proceeded who hold that the marriage of two Catholics before a Protestant clergyman is invalid, would as I understand the law of Quebec—and I speak with all deference, because I do not pretend to be very familiar with that law—those judgments proceed upon reasoning which would render equally invalid the marriage of two Catholics if performed before a Catholic priest who was not the parish priest of the parties, or who was not authorized by him. The rule, as I understand, that has been administered in the province of Quebec is that two Catholics must be married before the parish priest, or before some person who has been authorized, with certain formalities by the parish priest; therefore the marriage by some other Catholic priest in that province would be just as invalid as the marriage before a Protestant clergyman in the province of Quebec. There are decisions in the province of Quebec which hold that the marriage of two Catholics before a Protestant clergyman in that province is a perfectly valid marriage, although, as I have said, there are other decisions which arrive at a precisely opposite conclusion.

Now, speaking with deference to the views which my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lancaster) entertains with regard to the judicial decisions of that province, I have always understood, and I have been so informed by members of the bar of the province of Quebec who have carefully considered the question, that the marriage of a Catholic and a Protestant before a Protestant clergyman in that province has always been held valid under the law of that province.

Now, my hon. friend has introduced a Bill, to which he has called attention at considerable length, but at none too great a length, in view of the importance of the subject. The first paragraph of his Bill is in these words:

> Every ceremony or form of marriage heretofore or hereafter performed by any person authorized to perform any ceremony of marriage by the laws of the place where it is performed, and duly performed according to such laws, shall everywhere within Canada be deemed to be a valid marriage, notwithstanding any differences in the religious faith of the person so married and without regard to the religion of the person performing the ceremony.

Now, as I understand the object of my hon. friend, and the language of this Bill, he desires to provide by a statute of Canada that a marriage of two persons before any person authorized to perform the ceremony in any case, should be valid, although, according to the laws of the province, that ceremony between these persons ought to be performed before some other official. In other words, if the legislature of the province of Ontario should enact that two Protestants in that province must be married by a Protestant clergyman, the object and intention of my hon. friend's Bill would be to provide that if those persons, notwithstanding the law of the province, were married by some other official authorized to perform the ceremony of marriage, in any case, that marriage would be valid, although according to the laws of the province it would not be valid. I understand that is the object of my hon. friend's Bill. Now, take a further illustration; if in the province of British Columbia, a law were passed that a person of European descent, and a Japanese, or a Hindu, must be married with certain formalities before a certain official, that marriage, if performed before some other official in contravention of the law of the province, could be validated by a statute passed by the

parliament of Canada. That as I understand, is envolved in the argument in support of our power to enact the Bill which my hon. friend has placed before this parliament.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what I mean so far as religion goes, it does not deal with differences of nationality. I am dealing only with religious differences.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, perhaps I did not put his argument quite fairly. I was dealing with the constitutional aspect of the case, and am coming to the other aspect in a moment. If I am right, so far as the constitutional aspect of the case is concerned, such a Bill would be just as good law, and would confer just as full power to override a statute of the province of British Columbia as would the legislation now proposed. I think my hon. friend will agree with me in that regard. Or if, in any province of Canada, a provincial legislature should provide by its law that the marriage of a white person to a coloured person should be performed with certain formalities and before a certain official, it would be competent, according to the view which my hon. friend has so ably argued, for this parliament to declare that the marriage of these persons, if celebrated before some other official in contravention of the law of the province, should nevertheless be valid. Now, the question arises as to whether the parliament of Canada possesses the power to override provincial legislation in that regard and to that extent. I would like to submit in respect to that matter the following considerations.

(a) By the Canadian constitution as embodied in the British North America Act, section 92, subsection 26, the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to and includes marriage and divorce. The constitution declares, however, in section 92 subsection 12 of the same Act, that in each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to the solemnization of marriage in the province. It is perfectly clear that the words 'marriage and divorce' would include the solemnization of marriage if that subject had not been assigned to the exclusive jurisdiction of the province under the language just quoted. The result has been expressed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in these words :

> Solemnization of marriage in a province is enumerated among the classes of subjects under section 92, and no one can doubt, notwithstanding the general language of section 91, that this subject is still within the exclusive authority of the legislatures of the provinces.

It has also been held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that a provincial legislature has authority as plenary and as ample within the limits defined by section 92 as the Imperial parliament in the plenitude of its power possessed and could bestow. Within these limits of subject and area the provincial legislature is supreme, and its jurisdiction exclusive.

(b) The formalities prescribed by a provincial legislature as necessary to constitute a valid marriage seem undoubtedly within the meaning of the word 'solemnization.' It thus appears that with respect to those formalities the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures is exclusive.

(c) The opinion of the late Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Aylesworth, the opinion of the present Minister of Justice, and the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, K.C., are to the effect that legislation such as that now proposed is not within the legislative competence of the parliament of Canada.

(d) To the same effect is the opinion of an eminent lawyer of the Ontario Bar whose opinion upon the case submitted I will lay upon the table for the information of the House.

(e) On the other hand the hon. member who has introduced this Bill is himself a lawyer of eminence and great experience and he is strongly of opinion that this Bill is within the competence of parliament. Other lawyers who are members of this House entertain the same view. While I do not share that opinion, I am bound to respect it.

In view of these considerations it seems desirable that the question of the legislative competence of parliament to enact such a Bill should be submitted for the opinion of the highest tribunal in the empire. The whole basis upon which the proposal to enact this Bill rests is that the validity of certain marriages should be placed beyond question. If I understood my hon. friend in the opening part of his speech he said that the whole evil was the uncertainty. But if the power of parliament to enact that legislation is itself in grave question, the result desired cannot be attained. The government has therefore determined to submit for the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada the question as to the legislative competence of parliament to enact this Bill, and any further questions necessary to define clearly the power of parliament to legislate in such matters. The case will be carried on appeal to the judicial committee of the Privy Council in order that a final and authoritative determination may thus be obtained. Pending such determination it is not desirable that the Bill should be proceeded with, and

accordingly I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before the debate is adjourned I would ask to be allowed to say a word. I regret exceedingly that I cannot see my way to consent to this disposition of the matter. I do not think that anybody will accuse me of being anything but desirous of agreeing with the right hon. leader of the House (Mr. Borden) in any possible way I can. But, in view of what I have said, and said with all sincerity, I could not agree to that disposition of this Bill. If the Bill were passed and sent to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, I might be willing. I am always willing to compromise upon matters. I recognize that I am only one member of this House and that my opinion must not be supposed to prevail, no matter how strongly I may feel about it. But, there is a way of dealing with this question that does not prejudice it before the Supreme Court or the Privy Council. That would be to pass the Bill, if the House on the merits desires to pass such legislation, with a clause in it that prevents it coming into operation until the question of jurisdiction has been determined. There is ample precedent for it. That is what I suggest, and if my right hon. friend wishes to not unduly prejudice this matter and at the same time accomplish all that he has argued for to-day, we have a precedent that I might quote in the Act to amend the railway Act, 1903, passed in 1904 and being chap. 31 of the Statutes of 1904. We had a matter under consideration there with which it was very strongly urged that the provinces and the provinces alone, it being a question of property and civil rights, should deal. We were enacting that Dominion railways should be obliged to compensate the widows and children of employees when the latter were killed, notwithstanding the employees might have signed an agreement absolving the railway company from the results of their negligence. The railways, seeking to avoid a decision on the merits —we all know what they are capable of doing—used this question of provincial rights in order to shelve the matter, and they said, and said with some degree of justice and with some show of reason that impressed itself even upon my mind for the time being, but afterwards I rejected it, that it was a question of contract, that the province had all to do with it, that we had no right to interfere. They argued that the province had to do with questions of insurance, workman's compensation, liability for accident, &c., and that we had nothing to do with them. What did this parliament do? They decided that they had the power to pass the Act and they passed it, but with a clause providing for a reference to the Supreme Court. I need not trouble the House with the merits of the Bill. After providing that these railways should not be able to say as against the widow or children of a deceased employee killed by their negligence that they should not be liable, parliament enacted this clause:

> Upon the passing of this Act the Governor in Council shall submit to the Supreme Court of Canada for its determination the question of the competency of this parliament to enact the provisions hereinbefore set forth; and in the event of the said court determining that the said provisions are within the powers of this parliament, and the time for appeal having elapsed,—or in case of appeal being taken and prosecuted, then in the event of it being determined by the judicial committee of the Privy Council that the said provisions are within the powers of parliament as aforesaid, —the Governor in Council shall thereupon name a day, by proclamation, for the coming into force of this Act, and this Act shall take effect and come into force upon the day so named accordingly.

I do urge upon the right hon. Prime Minister that if we are to deal with this matter we should deal with it now and put a clause, if you like, in the Bill to that effect. Those who are so sure that provincial rights prevail here will not be hurt. The Act will not come into force if they are right upon this question, but if they are wrong and I am right and you shelve this Bill to-day, do not take any action upon it, adjourn the debate indefinitely and put an academic question only to the Privy Council without the force of a Bill behind it to show what parliament wants enacted, then it seems to me that the case is prejudiced. Feeling as I do upon this question, much as I respect the desires of my leader, I cannot preserve my self-respect and consent to it. I am not going to say any more about it. I have said all I can say here and I have probably said more than some gentlemen think I ought to have taken the time to say to-day. To those who might say to me that I should follow my much respected leader in this respect, I say that if I am true to myself I cannot then be false to any man.

Mr. T. G. WALLACE (Centre York). Mr. Speaker, before the amendment is put to the House I just wish to say that I am in complete accord with the sentiments expressed on this Bill by my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) and am in favour of the Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I think that the way to reach a conclusion on this matter is to have some definite form of legislation passed and then go to the courts. I will be willing to have the question decided in the speediest and best way by having the legislation proposed to-day enacted by this House. It is all very well to send

academic questions to the judicial committee of the Privy Council and to get answers, because then we have not settled the question. This is the most important question in so far as this nation is concerned that is now before the people. The nation depends absolutely on the maintenance of the family relation and the certainty of the marriage tie. Following the argument of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), if every province is to be allowed to make a definition in regard to marriage, so many definitions may be made in so many provinces that confusion will result and we will have no marriage law in this country. If Quebec can make one definition as to the solemnization or as to the status of marriage, she can make twenty, and if Quebec can do it, Ontario can, British Columbia can, and each can in a dozen different ways—nothing but confusion will result, and the only way out of it will be the revision of the constitution, and when that point is reached there will have to be a revision of the constitution so that the state—and by the state I mean Canada—shall define what constitutes a valid marriage in this country, that no one else shall have that power and that there shall be only one form of contract.

We are forcing ourselves to come to a point where we shall have in this country only a civil marriage, we will come to this that we will have to override the churches and the other authorities, and make marriage purely and simply a civil contract. If it is to be a civil contract it must be within the jurisdiction of one power and no power is so competent, for the certainty of the subject and for the protection of everybody and especially for the protection of the children of this country in the matter of legitimacy, to exercise that authority as the central or the federal power. So the sooner we have the question tested the better and, therefore, I urge that we send something practical forward for the test.

My hon. friend who is supporting this Bill has probably overlooked the fact that in the view of the province of Quebec and the laws of that province, a marriage has not taken place. His argument is based largely on the conception that a marriage has taken place. The ruling there evidently is that a marriage has not taken place because the law has not been complied with. Therefore, if there be all these definitions, a definition in every province and a dozen prohibitions of different kinds in the different provinces, I say that only confusion awaits us, and, therefore, it becomes the duty of Canada and of the federal power, either by an amendment to the constitution or otherwise, to make marriage a civil contract within the jurisdiction of the Dominion alone. For that reason I would like to see the question go forward and for that reason I am prepared to vote for the Bill proposed this afternoon.

Mr. H. CLARK (North Bruce). I would not like this debate to end without saying a word or two in connection with this Bill. I could not add if I tried any word to the argument advanced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), and can find no way in which to question his judgment as to the jurisdiction of this parliament to deal with it. I, therefore, wish to say that I am in complete accord with the remarks, and the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster).

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). I did not intend to speak on this Bill, and I do not know that I would have spoken on it had there not been the most unprecedented scene here to-night, I venture to say ever witnessed on Canadian soil. Everybody on both sides of the House admits frankly in private and will not deny in public that the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln is one of the most important measures ever brought before this House. There is not a member of this House who is not aware that the Canadian public is as deeply interested in this measure as in any measure that ever came before the House, and yet 221 representatives of the people are prepared to allow a measure of this kind to be brought before this House and to be passed out of the House without even a discussion.

It is not for me to say whether the legal grounds adduced by the hon. member for Lincoln are sound or not. I quite appreciate the statement of the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Mr. Borden) that there is a profoundly difficult legal question involved, but I cannot forget that a Minister of Justice years ago after studying this same statute, the British North America Act, came to a conclusion which was entirely upset on every point by the law officers of the Crown in England when the matter was left to them. Therefore, I feel that I am bound to use my own judgment when such a matter comes before the House. It seems to me with all respect to the argument advanced by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, that the point has not been touched at all. Everybody admits that the local legislatures have exclusive jurisdiction as to the solemnization of marriage, there has been no dispute as to that or as to the jurisdiction of this House. Every member is aware that the fathers of confederation, warned by the experience of our neighbours to the south where the residuum of power was left to the states and only allotted power to the federal authority which led to the unhappy civil war, took the opposite course and under our constitution all power is allotted to the federal authorities save in so far as a portion is

clipped out and allotted to the provinces. Therefore, when the British North America Act said that the solemnization of marriage was allotted to the provinces, if there had not been a word further on the subject the Dominion would have had exclusive jurisdiction on everything relating to marriage and divorce. But as if to make assurance doubly sure, the Act went on and gave marriage and divorce to this House as a part of its jurisdiction. Therefore, we have exclusive jurisdiction as to everything affecting marriage except its solemnization. Then it comes down to the meaning of solemnization of marriage.

I quite understand that there can be a difference of opinion as to what these words mean, but I think that no two lawyers in the country would differ on the main point that the only question now before us is what is included under the words 'solemnization of marriage.' It seems to me that these words relate to the formalities which precede and accompany the ceremony. I would take it that the solemnization of marriage included nothing more than the forms, whether by license or banns, the selection of a person to perform the ceremony, and the forms which are necessary to complete the solemnization of marriage. We must not forget that the Roman Catholic, the Anglican, and as far as I know every Protestant church and, in days gone by, the Jews all held the same view, that marriage is a contract made by the people themselves, not by the clergy. The priest does not marry, the Anglican clergyman does not marry the couple. One has but to look at the service of the Anglican church to see that, the man takes the woman, the woman takes the man. In proof of the contract a ring is produced and then, but not till then, the priest says: Inasmuch as you have made your contract, and proved it by a ring, I declare you to be man and wife. The essence of the whole ceremony is that the two people make a contract, and whoever the official may be, he is merely a witness to the contract. As to who is to be the witness, as to how the marriage is to be performed, the province has a right to legislate, but suppose British Columbia should lay down one form of marriage for whites, and a different form, or appoint different persons to marry whites and blacks, or blacks, I would be very sceptical as to their jurisdiction because I would think the moment they began to legislate in that way they would be touching the status of the parties, and I do not think they have anything to do with that.

It seems to me that inasmuch as this question is exciting so much interest, and is not one of those religious questions where a difference of opinion depends on principle, but the only question involved, even in Quebec, is an ecclesiastical rule that has not at all been binding, when we know as a matter of fact that throughout the world marriages were not even required to be performed in churches up to the thirteenth century, when we know that the Tametsi decree was passed in order to avoid clandestine marriage, that the blood may be pure, and children inherit what is rightfully theirs, and when we are told that the Ne Temere decree is to prevent clandestine marriage, and when difficulties have arisen owing to that decree, it seems to me the government might have supplemented what they have said in asking to have this Bill stand over until the Bill can be referred to the Privy Council.

They might have said in the meantime, we will make such representations as can be made to endeavour to secure that the Ne Temere decree will be withdrawn from Canada so that Canada may be made as free as Germany, for instance. There can be no point of conscience on a Catholic, apart from the order of the church, when one country is free from this decree and another is not. I submit that the government of the day should endeavour to secure the freedom of Canada altogether from this decree and that done, a great deal of bad feeling, and possibly a great deal of future trouble would be saved to this Dominion. Then as to the question to be submitted to the Supreme Court and the Privy Council, if the only question to be submitted, and I am now speaking from my own standpoint, is as to the power of this House to pass the legislation, I think I am entitled to surmise difficulty may arise, just as a number of years ago the Manitoba School question was submitted to the courts, and when the decision had been given Conservative members of a Conservative government went up and down the country stating that although the courts had decided we had jurisdiction we were not bound to exercise that jurisdiction. I state now, so that there may be no subsequent misunderstanding, that as I appreciate the situation, if the government leave this Bill to the courts it will be on the implied understanding that if the courts decide we have jurisdiction, then of course we must exercise jurisdiction, and pass legislation in the direction of the Bill before us to-night. How absurd it would be for us to ask the courts if we have the power to pass a piece of legislation, and the courts saying we had the power, then that we should not pay sufficient respect to the courts and to ourselves as not to pass the legislation. If the questions are to be submitted, why should we not come to a conclusion now which might relieve this country from the embarrassments which beset us. It has come out in the course of the discussion that there has been a difference of opinion from the legal point of view in the province of Quebec, and so far as I am able to understand, though

divergent judgments have been rendered by the courts of that province, none of these judgments have been taken to a higher court. If a kindred point is to be submitted why not take advantage of this opportunity to submit all the points, so that we may know exactly what the law is in the various provinces. And then if it should be held that we have the right to legislate here, surely we can legislate with more intelligence, more propriety, and more success if we know what the law is, than if two or three years hence when this legislation comes back we are confronted with the puzzling proposition that we do not know what powers we have with regard to Quebec. Therefore, we will have to submit another case to the courts, and perhaps be tied up for two or three years longer. I submit in conclusion, that while I have spoken on this subject with diffidence and regret, I felt that in justice to my constituents, I should make this appeal to the House. We must not forget that we represent not one single county, or one single riding, but that under the constitution we were elected to represent all the people of Canada, and those of us who are sitting here are sitting here to represent and protect the innocent girls, be they Protestants or Roman Catholics, who have gone through the ceremony of marriage believing it to be a binding ceremony, and to protect also the children of these poor women, who would never have been brought into the world had their mothers not believed that they were legally married. It is a tremendous responsibility resting on the shoulders of a member of this House, to think that possibly he has power to right wrongs that exist in regard to the mothers, the women, and children of this country, and are we to take such little interest in it, that an important measure like this is to be allowed to pass over without discussion, and be relegated to consideration three or four years hence.

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). Were it not for the remarks of the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) I would not have spoken; I certainly had no intention of speaking on this subject. I agree with every word the hon. member has spoken with regard to the historical aspect of this marriage question. I do not think any member in this House, whatever his religious belief may be, will differ from the hon. member in what he has said about marriage in the view of the Roman Catholic Church or any other church. The only point with which I differ from him is as to the best method of getting this question settled peaceably and finally in the interests of the people at large. I doubt very much myself whether the best way to get the matter settled is for us to pass an Act

about which there may be doubt and difficulty, leading to litigation more prolonged than would be the litigation involved in a reference of this matter in the way proposed by the right hon. the leader of the government. Nobody on either side of this House will, I think, disagree with what the hon. member (Mr. Northrup) has said as to the importance of the subject. I only differ from him as to the passing a Bill such as the one before us, with the idea of settling this question for ever. I do not think that our passing this Bill would hasten the settlement of the question. There would be doubt as to whether we have the right to pass such a Bill, and there would be disputes, litigation, and I fear bad feeling. I would prefer myself to have the straightforward method adopted of sending the question immediately to the tribunals and having it settled once for all. Unless the courts of Canada and the empire should be against us I do not believe that the people of the province of Ontario will ever submit; and in the name of peace and of all that is good for the whole country I do hope that the best method will be taken to settle it quietly and without embroiling our citizens in such disputes. If I thought for one moment that the referring of this question to the courts as proposed by the leader of the government, was not the best means to settle the question, then, speaking as I do on behalf of the province to which I belong, I would not have great hesitation in expressing myself finally and conclusively as to my opinion. I would not hesitate for a moment to say that I should agree with the gentleman who has introduced the Bill. But I think we should try to get this matter settled by the methods we have of ascertaining what the true meaning of the law is. I would, then, if it should become necessary, stand up with the others for any agitation to put an end to the difficulty that we have discussed here to-night.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of hon. members of the opposition on this Bill. They took great care, in the early stages of this trouble, to avoid knowing anything about it, and they have developed their ignorance in a most remarkable manner until it has become coincident with the most absolute silence. For my part I know that I am too young a member to make any mistake when I apologize most humbly for venturing any remarks in this debate, but I cannot help pointing out that we have two statements before the House and two courses proposed.

The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has given us a concrete proposition embodied in his Bill. I would say let that go, send it to the fountain head so that we may see whether it is ultra or intra vires, but I must say that I have been most profoundly impressed by the statesmanlike and candid utterance of the right hon. the leader of the government. He has laid down the broad general principles which underlie the supremacy of the state. He has shown that the church cannot override the state. To my mind that is broad enough to repel any ecclesiastical decree, enactment, or laws of any description whatever. He has also said, as I understood him, that the civil law alone validates marriage and that no church can be recognized as supreme on that question. What could be more explicit, what more likely to quiet the agitation in this country than this doctrine laid down by the great statesman at the head of this government? There is no uncertain sound about it. Why then should we not fall in with that view and endorse the proposition to send a stated case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for the determination of the rights of the federal authorities, as against those of the provincial authorities. To reject the proposition of the right hon. the leader of the government would be to cast aside the greatest opportunity we have ever had of settling for all time the differences between church and state. Of that I am convinced. It seems to me that never has there arisen such a magnificent opportunity for the settlement of this great question. How can it be settled except either by an infinite multitude of enactments or by a statement of a general and conclusive character which will finally establish the general principle. It cannot be settled in any other way; but in order that we may exhaust all the remedies under our control, I would suggest that the Bill of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) also be sent and submitted to the Privy Council, because you can never tell when lawyers get to work what confusion and uncertainty will result. Therefore, for my part I am prepared to endorse both positions.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER, (East Quebec). The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Burnham) made some remarks upon the attitude of the opposition on this Bill. He should know—at all events I know—that it is never wise for any one to interfere in family quarrels; and that is why we on this side have waited to see what would be the attitude of the government and its supporters on this question. There has been in this matter, it seems to me, a great deal of misconception, as to the effect of what is known as the Ne Temere decree. That decree is not new. It is simply a modification of the Tametsi decree of the council of Trent which has been in force some three hundred years. There has been misconception in this House as well as in the country as regards this ecclesiastical legislation. We are told it was intended to override the law of the land. I take absolute exception to that statement. The Tametsi decree, and later the Ne Temere decree, is simply a rule of conduct to be followed by the members of the Catholic church. It does not pretend to impose its views on those who do not belong to that church. Its object is simply to prevent clandestine marriages. In the province of Quebec to-day, according to the terms of the Tamesti decree as modified by the Ne Temere decree now in force—it was not in force when the decisions were given which were referred to by my hon. friend—if two Catholics marry, they must marry before the parish priest and publicly—not only before the priest but before at least two witnesses. I was surprised this afternoon when I heard the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) refer to an interview given by Father Comeau of St. Mary's Church in Winnipeg. I thought that interview was not correctly reported, and was more than surprised when I heard my hon. friend state that Father Comeau had himself corrected the proofsheets. With all due deference to Father Comeau, I must say, that if he be correctly reported as having said that he would celebrate marriage secretly, that is not, as I understand it, the law of the Church. If there is anything the Church abhors, it is secret marriages; and the very language of the Tametsi and Ne Temere decrees is simply to prevent secret marriages by making sure that all parties married within the Church shall be married publicly.

My right hon. friend the leader of the government said correctly that decisions given in the province of Quebec have been given in cases of marriage between Catholics and Protestants were not based on the distinction whether the marriage was between Catholic and Protestant or between Catholics alone. The Council of Trent, so far as my information goes, was never promulgated in France and therefore never had the force of law, so far as civil effects are concerned, but many of its dispositions were introduced by the kings of France into their legislation.

And all the dispositions of the Council of Trent with regard to clandestine marriages were introduced by the kings of France into the laws of France and passed into the laws of her colonies for

the government of America. In this way they were introduced into the province of Quebec, and they have been in force there for three hundred years. There is nothing new in the Ne Temere decree, as I understand it, except on one point. It provides that a marriage to be valid must be celebrated by the parish priest of the parties, and the idea according to the Ne Temere decree is that parties may be considered as parishioners only after one month's residence within the parish. And, as stated by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), these dispositions are eminently wise. They prevent clandestine marriages; and I am sure we all, whether on this side or on that side of the House, whether Catholic or Protestant—everybody must agree that the prevention of clandestine marriages is most wise. Similar provision is made under the civil law of France to-day. A marriage to be valid must be performed before the mayor of the locality in which the parties reside, and after due publication. Now, there is one thing I would like to make very plain. We have had in this matter, perhaps, too much passionate discussion. Let us endeavour to be free from prejudice, whether we are Protestants or Catholics, and simply look at the question from the point of view of our common Canadian citizenship. There has been an impression that the Ne Temere decree was intended to override the authority of His Majesty the King and the Parliament. As a Catholic I protest against any such interpretation. There is no such intention. The Ne Temere decree does not go beyond setting forth rules binding upon the consciences of Catholics. It is not intended to be a civil law. It is for the civil authorities, if they choose, to give civil effect to its provisions.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). But will the right hon. gentleman say that the effect of the decree is not to affect the rights of the parties to a mixed marriage?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. If a Catholic in the province of Ontario is married according to the provisions of the civil law of the province, even though it be contrary to the provisions of the Ne Temere decree, he is legally married according to the doctrine of the church, his children are legitimate, and his marriage will carry all its effects. Is that plain? But the Catholic who is married contrary to the provisions of the Ne Temere decree may be subjected to the religious consequences according to the laws of his church. In his conscience he is outside his church. But, as I understand it—and I am sure I am right in this—it does not go beyond conscience. In the province of Quebec it has been understood that the civil authorities have given effect to the religious ordinances upon this subject. How far the civil laws of the province of Quebec affect the question is now in controversy before the courts. I, for my part, cannot support the Bill because its provisions seem to me to be absolutely illogical. In my humble judgment, the mover of the Bill (Mr. Lancaster) has not approached the subject in the dispassionate manner in which it should be approached.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) tell the House some thing I said which was not dispassionate?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the hon. gentleman referred sneeringly to the opinion given by Sir Allen Aylesworth, the former Minister of Justice. And two or three times the hon. gentleman stated—and in a tone the object of which was manifest—that this opinion of Sir Allen Aylesworth had been given under the benign influence of the outgoing Prime Minister. That is evidence of what his intention was; and I say that it was not in accordance with the dispassionate character which such a discussion should take. In view of the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) it must be evident to my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) that the opinion of Sir Allen Aylesworth, was, after all, worthy of consideration. The opinion of Sir Allen Aylesworth is endorsed by the government to-night, and though my hon. friend sneered at it, after the position taken to-night by his leader, I should think he would regret the manner in which he has approached this subject.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the right hon. gentleman tell me what the opinion of Sir Allen Aylesworth is? For you cannot tell it from the answer he made to the question. He simply shirked it; and that is what I said, he shirked it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let me read the first section of the Bill, which, it seems to me cannot be endorsed in any way:

> Every ceremony or form of marriage heretofore or hereafter performed by any person authorized to perform any ceremony of marriage by the laws of the place where it is performed, and duly performd according to such laws, shall everywhere within Canada be deemed to be a valid marriage, notwithstanding any differences in the religious faith of the person so married and without regard to the religion of the person performing the ceremony.

Now, a marriage celebrated in a province is valid or is not valid, according to the laws of the province. If it is valid, there is nothing more to say and this Bill does not affect the case. But if it is not valid,

then the supreme authority of this parliament is called in to make it valid. If my hon. friend wishes to amend the constitution, that is another matter; but to say that the law of the province shall be overridden by the law of this parliament, I think, could not lead to the proper government of such a country as Canada. If the province is wrong let us go to the province and try to make it right. But to say that a system of law that has been in operation for 300 years is to be set aside by the intervention of this parliament seems to me a thing not calculated to promote harmony in this country. I think that everybody will agree with me in this. It is stated by one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, the member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) or the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that if we referred this Bill to the Supreme Court and are advised that we have power to pass it, then we must undertake to pass it. But I would very much hesitate to adopt such a course. I think it would be much better that the matter should be left to the courts of the province of Quebec before which the question is now raised. It would be far better to depend upon the decision in the case now before the courts than upon a decision of the Supreme Court in a merely academic case.

At the present moment, the very case which was quoted a moment ago by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is before Mr. Justice Charbonneau, and the judgment is to be delivered at no distant date. It is probable that this case will be referred to all the tribunals of the land, and that we shall have an authoritative decision upon it. I think this is a better way to dispose of the matter than to refer it to the Supreme Court in the merely academic way proposed by my right hon. friend. The amendment of my right hon. friend, it seems to me, and I say it in all seriousness, and his proposal to dispose of this Bill simply by moving the adjournment of the debate, is not at all the proper manner of dealing with the question, and I think on the whole parliament would be disposed to agree with me. Now I have this further to say. It is not the first time that judges have differed upon a matter of great importance. This matter has been before the courts of Quebec for some fifteen years. Unfortunately we have never had an authoritative decision of the Privy Council upon it, or even of the Supreme Court, or, so far as I know, of the Court of Appeals of the province. Judges have decided one way and judges have decided the other way. If the judgment of Mr. Justice Archibald is confirmed, we shall never hear any more of this question; then it will be settled in a manner not to disturb the conscience of anybody. If it be settled otherwise, then will be the time for us to decide what to do. But at the present moment I think that the decision taken by the government simply to adjourn the debate is not a dignified one, nor is it an adequate way of disposing of the question.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice). I do not think there can be any difference of opinion in this House upon two propositions at least, one of them emitted by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) in the very forceful speech with which he has moved the second reading of this Bill, and the other which has just fallen from the lips of the right hon. leader of the opposition. The first one is that this is a measure involving a question of very great importance. I think that requires no elaboration. Anything that touches marriage, that touches what the civilized world looks upon as a sacred thing, the union of one man with one woman for the purpose of procreating a family, which family forms after all the basis of the state, anything, I say, which touches the validity of marriage is a measure of the utmost importance. Nor do I think any one will be inclined to differ with the proposition emitted by the right hon. leader of the opposition, namely, that we should approach this question with all the calmness of which we are masters, and that we should be careful to eliminate from this discussion any expression that might be inspired rather by strength of feeling than by reason, and a careful examination of the facts. It will be with my very best endeavour, at all events, to attain and retain such a state of mind, that I ask this House to listen to some observations which I feel it is proper to make on this occasion. It is just because everything that touches marriage is of supreme importance, and just because by reason of the strength of the convictions, the sincere convictions, of many people who look at questions affecting marriage from different points of view, we are exposed to the danger of advancing arguments based upon views which it is perhaps impossible to conciliate, and which might tend rather to provoke bad feeling than to a rational solution of the question before us, that it is well that before this House undertakes to deal with this matter we should be quite certain that we are right, quite certain that we are starting upon a discussion that will lead to a wise solution of the matter, and not merely to arousing animosity as the possible result of the discussion. It is very essential that we should approash this question with a view of discovering just how far we have power to deal with it, and just how far we have power to enact the measure that has been submitted to us. If we have not that power, our discussion will be useless; and if we have that power, we will exercise it

more effectively after the existence of that power has been established and just as promptly as if we sought to exercise it now, and afterwards submitted the question of our jurisdiction to the judgment of the Privy Council.

The first question that it behooves us to look at is the question how far this House has the power to enact the measure that is proposed. It has been said by several gentlemen who have spoken, and I think it is not a matter of dispute, that this House has power to deal, under the British North America Act, with all matters that concern marriage, excepting the solemnization of marriage. But it is just as clear that the legislatures of the provinces have the exclusive power to deal with everything that concerns the solemnization of marriage. I, therefore, agree with my hon. and distinguished friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup), when he says that the question that is involved in determining the extent of our power is the question of what constitutes the solemnization of marriage as distinguished from marriage itself. This House has power to deal with everything pertaining to marriage except its solemnization, while the provincial legislatures have the exclusive power to deal with everything that does pertain to its solemnization. Now my hon. friend who introduced this Bill did not dispute that proposition, but as I understand him, he sought to establish the proposition that this Bill did not deal with the solemnization of marriage, but that it dealt with the question, in some way, of the capacity of persons to get married.

He claimed that he is respecting absolutely the power of the local legislature to deal with the solemnization of marriage, because by his measure he enacts that:

> Every ceremony or form of marriage heretofore or hereafter performed by any person authorized to perform any ceremony of marriage by the laws of the place where it is performed, and duly performed according to such laws, shall everywhere within Canada be deemed to be a valid marriage.

Now, so far he says that he has left the entire matter of solemnization to be governed by the law of the province, and that the Act is simply to enact that no consideration of difference of religion between the persons to be married or of the religion of the officer who officiates shall affect the validity. In other words, he says that legislatures may—and he respects their right to do so—legislate in regard to the solemnization of marriage, but they shall not be free to say that for one class of persons a certain officer shall be required as a witness of the marriage and for another class of persons another class of officer shall be required as a witness of the marriage. I have difficulty to see how, when he says that, he can claim that he is not interfering with the power of the legislature to deal with the question of the solemnization of marriage. My hon. friend quoted the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, who, according to him, distinguished between the solemnization of marriage and what he called the status of marriage. He cited that opinion as being to the effect that this parliament had power to deal with the status of marriage, but they had not power to deal with the method by which that status was to be created. With that opinion I have not the slightest quarrel. That the solemnization of marriage consists absolutely and entirely of, and includes in its entirety, the sanction the solemnity that the law requires, to be given to marriage which in itself is a contract between the parties, and that the status of marriage thus produced by that solemnity does not come within the purview of the provincial legislature I am not concerned to dispute, and I do not desire to do so.

But the thing that intervenes between that period when people are not as yet married, and that period when they have acquired the status recognized by law of married people is precisely the solemnization of marriage and when the law says that the solemnization of marriage shall be within the exclusive legislative powers of one legislature it seems to me that you cannot undertake to say, as this legislation undertakes to say, that you may, in regard to that solemnization, legislate, provided you legislate that everybody shall be married in the same way, but you shall not be entitled in the enactment of your legislation, which, to my mind, unquestionably deals merely with the solemnization of marriage, to provide, for reasons that may appear sufficient in your judgment, that one functionary shall be a competent witness of certain marriages and another functionary shall be a competent witness of certain other marriages. That is the full extent, as I understand it, of the complaint that is directed against the existing law to-day in the province of Quebec and that is the evil, if I understand the hon. gentleman, that he seeks to remedy by his present measure. He does not avoid dealing in his legislation with the question of solemnization simply by selecting one particular disposition in regard to solemnization and saying that we will not recognize that. That is a provision in regard to the solemnization of marriage. I am assuming now that the distinction does exist in the province of Quebec. I am not called upon perhaps to say whether it does or does not, but what I may have to say upon that question I shall say in a few moments. I am assuming that the law of Quebec enacts that one clergyman is a competent witness of the marriage of persons belonging to his own church and

that such a clergyman's presence is required to give the solemnity that the law recognizes to the marriage of two persons belonging to his church. In so enacting, if it does so enact, it seems to me impossible to say that it is not an enactment concerning the solemnization of marriage and concerning nothing else. I am sorry not to have the opinion of the law officers of the Crown which my hon. friend quoted, but without having their opinion, I may say that it expressly sets forth that while the status of married people may be governed and may, by means of divorce, be dissolved by legislation of this parliament, that status is created precisely by the solemnization of marriage, the thing that is left exclusively to the legislature. The hon. member also cited the opinion of the Hon. Edward Blake, a former Minister of Justice, of this Dominion, and I think you will all agree with me in saying a most distinguished minister of justice, probably one of our greatest statesmen, and for my part I am quite prepared to say our greatest lawyer.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). What is the intention of the government as to the forms of questions to be submitted to the Supreme Court? Will they submitt Bill (No. 3), or frame certain questions?

Mr. DOHERTY. I cannot say that the precise form has been absolutely fixed, but I certainly think I am quite within my authority in saying that care will be taken to so submit the questions as to enable us to get a perfectly explicit answer as to whether this legislation could be passed Whether this Bill would be the best form to submit the question or not is a matter for consideration, but I am sure that the absolute intention is to elicit an answer that would clearly settle this question whether or not we can pass this legislation.

The opinion to which I was first referring of the law officers of the Crown cited by the honourable mover of the Bill dealt with the issue of licenses, and the publication of banns, the preliminaries to the actual solemnization. I can only explain why that particular question should have been put by supposing that those who put it had some doubt whether these preliminaries formed part of the actual solemnization. I do not think that anybody can question that what is prescribed in order that this contract that two people enter into and that is the marriage should have solemnity added to it in the way of the presence of witnesses, a certain number of witnesses forms part of the solemnization, but I can understand that possibly it might have occurred to some one that these preliminaries did not form part of the solemnization. The decision reads:

> It appears to them (the law officers) that the power of legislating upon this subject is conferred upon the provincial legislatures by 30 Victoria, chapter 3, section 92 (B.N.A. Act) under the words 'the solemnization of marriage in the province.' The phrase 'the laws respecting the solemnization of marriages in England' occurs in the preamble of the Marriage Act (4 George IV., chapter 76), an Act, which is very largely concerned with matters relating to banns and licenses.

You will notice that it is not exclusively concerned with banns and licenses, and I state without fear or hesitation, that the principal purport of the Marriage Act was to determine precisely before whom people should be married. The decision continues:

> And this is, therefore, a strong authority to show that the same words used in the British North America Act, 1867, were intended to have the same meaning. 'Marriage and divorce,' which by the 91st section of the same Act are reserved to the parliament of the Dominion, signify, in their opinion, all matters relating to the status of marriage, between what persons and under what circumstances it shall be created and (if at all) destroyed.
>
> There are many reasons of convenience and sense why one law as to the status of marriage should exist throughout the Dominion which have no applicaton as regards the uniformity of the procedure whereby that status is created or evidenced

What are all laws that prescribe before whom marriage must be entered into in order that it should be solemn, should have the solemnity the law requires, but laws regarding the procedure whereby that status is created or evidenced? With all respect to the hon. member, I do not think that if I had been looking for authority to justify the proposition that who shall be a competent witness, or whose presence shall give solemnity to the marriage, forms part of the solemnization of marriage, that I could have found any more to the point than that which he has cited.

May I cite an expression of opinion of the Hon. Mr. Blake, to be found in the first volume of 'Hansard', 1880, at page 301. He says:

> It belongs to the local legislature to decide by what means marriage between those persons between whom marriage may, under the general law, be lawfully contracted, shall be contracted.

By what means it shall be contracted. That is the solemnization of marriage, that is what the law allows the local legislature.

The hon. member cited the legislation with regard to marriage with a deceased wife's sister as supporting his proposition that this House had power to deal with this matter; but one sees at once that the legislation with regard to the deceased wife's sister dealt with who were the per-

sons between whom marriage might lawfully be contracted. That is within the power of this House, that is no part of the solemnization of marriage, and that legislation, therefore, which was enacted, in my humble judgment at all events, and certainly the hon. member who introduced the Bill considers it so, was perfectly within the jurisdiction and power of this parliament, but it by no means follows that because this parliament has power to decide who may be married, to whom, that this parliament has power to decide how they shall be married.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Bill does not say a word about how people shall be married but says that if they are lawfully married, by any ceremony performed in a province, they shall remain married although their religious belief is different. The hon. minister is arguing something that is not before him, he is putting up a man of straw for the fun of knocking him down.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am quite confident it would be easier for me to knock down a man of straw than to knock down the hon. member.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not doubt that.

Mr. DOHERTY. That is a thing I would not attempt. I am endeavouring to speak with all proper respect to my hon. friend. I desire to treat his argument seriously and while I cannot agree with his view I sincerely trust he does not for a moment think I desire to be disrespectful. If there were need for a law to say that two persons of different religions can be married I would not dispute it.

Mr. LANCASTER. What else is there in the Bill? There is nothing in the Bill except the declaration that the fact that they are of different religions shall not invalidate the marriage. What I object to is an hon. gentleman here talking about the means by which marriage may be performed.

Mr. DOHERTY. The Bill says:

And without regard to the religion of the person performing the ceremony.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY. The hon. gentleman says that I have been dealing with the last part of the Bill, without regard to the religion of the person performing the ceremony, because so far he is endeavouring to legislate to say that the fact that persons belong to different religions shall not prevent their getting married, he is legislating to remedy an evil that does not exist. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the hon. member will search the law and the jurisprudence of Quebec and search it in vain, if he is looking for anything that says that persons of different religions cannot be married. I shall leave that to any lawyer in this House or in this country who will take the pains to look into it. I do not mean to say that the hon. member has not taken pains to look into it but I confess that I am at a loss to explain to myself his misapprehension on that question.

I asked the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) if he would be good enough to indicate the cases on which he relied, in which it had been held that because persons were of different religious their marriage was voided, and he cited Laramee and Evans, and Durocher and Degré. These cases are familiar to me as they must be familiar to any man who has had anything to do with the law of the province of Quebec, and speaking from memory I would not hesitate to say that these judgments deal with marriages between two Catholics. I have however before me a very carefully prepared summary of the decisions in all these cases that have been dealt with in Quebec, including these two cases. In the case of Laramee and Evans this is the holding:

Laramée vs. Evans, 1880, Jette, J., 25, L.C.J., 361.

Action to annul a marriage between Roman Catholics under a license and without banns. before a Protestant clergyman. Case referred by the court to the ecclesiastical authority for adjudication by it on the validity of the sacrament, and, upon the production of decree of invalidity the court declared the marriage null as a civil contract.

In Durocher and Degré the finding is:

Durocher vs. Degree, 1901, Court of Review, Mathieu, Curran and Lemieux, J.J., (reversing Lynch J.) 20 S. C. 456. A marriage declared null and void on the ground that the parties, both minors, had to evade the laws of their country, fled to the States and been married there 'en fraude de la loi.' No reference was made by the court to the necessity of any preliminary decree of an ecclesiastical nature.

There is no doubt that Mr. Justice Lemieux, one of the three judges in the Court of Review, who sat in this case, went into a very learned dissertation on the whole question of the marriage laws as affecting the validity of the marriage of Catholics in Quebec, and he expressed an opinion upon a number of questions not necessary for a decision of the case, but I am satisfied that the hon. member will find nothing in that case declaring that the marriage of a Catholic with a Protestant as such was invalid, or in other words, making the validity of the marriage depend upon the parties being of the same religion. As a matter of fact the parties in that case were of the same religion, both being Catholics. These were both minors who had gone to the States to get married in fraud of the law, and the

court pointed out they had gone to avoid the necessity of going before their parish priest to be married, and, also of getting rid of the necessity to get the consent of their parents. I do not question that Mr. Justice Lemieux in that case expressed the opinion that the marriage of two Catholics in Quebec was invalid unless it was performed before their parish priest, or a priest representing him, but there also he was referring to the case of two Catholics. I do not pretend to be omniscient as to the law of the province of Quebec on the subject, but I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that no lawyer, and nobody else will find a judgment of the courts of Quebec declaring a marriage null because one of the parties was a Protestant and the other was a Catholic. Let me say further that there is no law and no jurisprudence in the province of Quebec that ever has held that the marriage of a Protestant and Catholic before a Protestant minister or before an officer civilly authorized, other than their proper priest, was not valid. There is no possible pretension to-day that under the law of the province of Quebec the marriage of a Catholic and a Protestant before a Protestant minister is not a perfectly valid marriage, just as valid as it could be if this Bill were and could be passed by this House and had the force of law. Therefore, so far as this Bill may be intended to remedy an evil resulting from the idea that there is a law in the province of Quebec which says that difference of religion between two persons getting married was a cause of nullity, it provides a remedy where there is no wrong to remedy, it strikes absolutely into the void. That is why I was confining my observations to this Bill, in so far as it purports to say that a marriage shall be valid without regard to the religion of the person performing the ceremony. That of course would affect the law of Quebec in so far as that law may be correctly held to be that the marriage of Catholics in order to be lawfully valid must be witnessed before their parish priest, or some one representing him. As the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) pointed out there is the modification in the Ne Temere decree that the jurisdiction of the priest is made local, and he can marry in his own church those who present themselves, provided there has been a residence of a month prior. But, I am speaking now of the canonical rule as it was before the Ne Temere decree, and that is the only rule that can by any ingenuity be claimed as recognized by the law of the province of Quebec.

Mr. CARROLL. Has the promulgation of the Ne Temere decree in the province of Quebec affected the civil law as it stood before the decree was promulgated in Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY. Not one iota.

Mr. CARROLL. Nor in any other province of Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY. I cannot speak with familiarity of the laws of the other provinces, but I have never heard that it did. However, for whatever professional reputation I may have, I have no hesitation in stating the proposition, that the law of the province of Quebec on marriage is the same to-day as it was before the Ne Temere decree was enacted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Since the Ne Temere decree, would there not be a difference in the judgment of the Ecclesiastical Courts of Qubec?

Mr. DOHERTY. As to the validity of the sacrament I presume there would be. Before the Ecclesiastical Tribunal it would be held, I have no doubt, that the Ne Temere decree applying, the sacrament was not valid. But if the hon. gentleman means to draw the deduction that because the ecclesiastical court might, under the Ne Temere decree, hold that view, the civil courts would be in the slightest degree affected, he has drawn the wrong conclusion.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I understand that the addition made by the Ne Temere decree consisted of two matters. First, that it forbids marriage between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic; and second that it enunciates the doctrine that once a Catholic always a Catholic, and that although a Roman Catholic might have left the church, the church has still jurisdiction over him, so that if he should become a Protestant and be married by a Protestant minister, yet under the Ne Temere decree his marriage would not be valid.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think my hon. friend is in error when he says that the Ne Temere decree prohibits marriage between Catholics and Protestants.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Except by a priest.

Mr. DOHERTY. It is one thing to say that a marriage must be before a priest and another thing to prohibit it. I quite understand that before the Ne Temere decree, the church recognized the validity of the marriage between a Catholic and a nen-Catholic before an officer qualified to solemnize marriage, but that since the Ne Temere decree—dealing always with the spiritual question and from the point of view of the validity of the sacrament—the ecclesiastical authority does not recognize the validity of the sacrament, but that in no manner affects the civil law of the province of Quebec.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it not conceded that article 127 makes the marriage he refers to invalids?

Mr. DOHERTY. I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to the wording of the article which is most careful:

> The other impediments, recognized according to the different religious persuasions as resulting from relationship or affinity or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities.

The Civil Code of Quebec came into force on the first of August, 1866, and it provided that the other impediment should remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different churches. The legislature had then no idea or intention of submitting this law to the various modifications which might be made in the future in the rules of the different churches.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY. It is unfortunate that a sufficiently close scrutiny was not given these provisions of the law before people jumped to conclusions in regard to them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it not the case that because of that very article the judge in the Hebert case decided that Mrs. Hebert was not legally married under the Ne Temere decree?

Mr. DOHERTY. Again I say no.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then I have been misinformed in regard to the report on that case.

Mr. DOHERTY. My hon. friend must be. In the Hebert case the judgment was on a marriage between two Catholics, with regard to which the religious position was absolutely the same before as after the passing of the Ne Temere decree, so that that judgment could not possibly have any bearing on the validity of a marriage between a Catholic and a Protestant before a Protestant minister.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is a case my Bill would apply to.

Mr. DOHERTY. What I am trying to show is that the hon. member's Bill, in so far as it seeks to remedy an evil consisting in this, that a Catholic and a Protestant, because of difference in religion, cannot be married strikes at nothing; and furthermore that in so far as it seeks to remedy a law under which the marriage of a Catholic and a Protestant before a non-Catholic clergyman is null, it is likewise striking a void, because there is no law in the province of Quebec by virtue of which a marriage of a Catholic and a Protestant before a Protestant minister is invalid or can be held to be so.

Mr. DOHERTY.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then my hon. friend would have no hesitation in voting for my Bill on its merits. It is entirely what he wants, apparently.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am not now discussing what I want or what I don't want. I do not think that a matter of this importance should be discussed according to what I do or do not want, but I do think it ought to be determined in accordance with the law of the land. I am not here to argue for anything else.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman recognize that there is an evil at all requiring a remedy. I am trying to find out what evil the Minister of Justice thinks does exist, if any.

Mr. DOHERTY. Whether it be an evil that the law of a province should enact that the most suitable officer to witness the marriage of people of a certain religious belief, is their pastor, I do not think I am called on to discuss on this Bill. But if there be an evil to remedy, that is the evil which this Bill is going to remedy and only that. If we have the power to pass this Bill and if we should pass it, and if the law of the province of Quebec be—and I shall not undertake to determine that it is—that the marriage of two Catholics is not valid unless it be celebrated before a priest according to the Tametsi decree, that is the one change which will be effected by this Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. Has there ever been any decisive interpretation in the courts of the province of Quebec as to the effect of the Ne Temere decree on the marital relations of person in that province, or has it been urged before the courts of that province that the decree has any effect?

Mr. DOHERTY. So far as my knowledge goes there has been no case before the courts on a marriage entered into since the Ne Temere decree was enacted. That decree came into force in 1908, and I am not aware that any case concerning the validity of marriage has arisen since that date. But even if the Hebert case had arisen since that decree was promulgated, it would not have been affected by it, because that was the case of a marriage between two Catholics. I do not know that I need say anything more to show that the only rules recognized by the Quebec Civil Code are those which were in force prior to the 1st of August, 1866.

I think that, though we have no adjudication, there is no ground for serious fear that it will happen that the Ne Temere decree will be held to affect the Quebec law. And it seems to me difficult to believe that there is such a possibility of that as to constitute an evil calling for remedy.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) say—(I ask in order that the matter may be made clear to my own mind)—that there has been no decision of the courts of the province of Quebec in which the provision of the Ne Temere decree was urged as an element in the case?

Mr. DOHERTY. No.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman say that there can be no application in the courts of Quebec of any provisions or results of the Ne Temere decree?

Mr. DOHERTY. That is certainly my unhesitating opinion. And, while I am not afraid to rest that upon the letter of the Code, I may say that I have had occasion—not with a view to this matter particularly—to meet many people who have very considerable knowledge of law of the province of Quebec; and I have never heard one suggest such a possibility. I certainly have never heard it suggested from any ecclesiastical source, that it ever entered their minds that they were re-making the law of Quebec when the Ne Temere decree was issued.

Now, I do not wish to enter upon a discussion of the Ne Temere decree. But, perhaps it may be well to remember that this decree was issued to cover the whole world, with the exception, as I understand it, of Germany. And it may be easy to imagine that the author did not have present to his mind, when he wrote it, the particular law of the province of Quebec. And certainly its author quite realized that a large part of the territory to be affected by it, as a religious regulation, would not recognize it at all. However that may be, I think one can safely say that there is nothing in the law of the province of Quebec that subjects to the necessity of a ceremony in the presence of the Catholic priest a marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic. And, therefore, as I said, the whole scope of this Bill, if it were enacted into law, would be to affect the marriage of two Catholics in the province of Quebec if the law of the province of Quebec is correctly interpreted as meaning that two Catholics must be married before their priest, in accordance with the Tridentine rule, in order to make their marriage legal and civilly valid. Upon that question I do not not think it necessary to pronounce myself. But I want to be perfectly fair and to state the whole situation as it exists. As the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill said, there are contradictory judgments on this subject in the province of Quebec. There are, I think, more judgments than the hon. gentleman mentioned; but I think there is nothing to be gained by adding to the number. But there are decisions concerning section 127 of the Civil Code that the presence of the parish priest is necessary to the validity of a Catholic marriage. On the contrary there are judgments that say that section 127 has to do, purely and simply with what are called 'impediments proper.' The courts are divided, and none of the cases have ever gone to the ultimate tribunal for decision. So, it is possible that it may ultimately be decided that the interpretation put upon article 127 does not properly represent the law of the province of Quebec. However, that may be, the extreme recognition of church rules in the province of Quebec may be said to consist in the requirement of the marriage of two Catholics before the priest. So, the evil to be guarded against is reduced at all events to that. I have no desire to enter into a discussion of the question whether that is really the law of the province of Quebec; nor, indeed, a discussion whether, if it be the law of the province of Quebec, it is a good law or not. I have only adverted to this condition of the law, because it bears upon the question how far it is important that there shall be anything in the nature of haste with regard to this legislation. There, at the outside, is the evil to be remedied, if it be considered an evil.

Now, I know it has been said that there was something particularly invidious about this law, in that it recognized the Catholic priest as having more power than the ministers of other denominations. I want to say only one word in that connection, because it may perhaps be useful in removing misapprehension as to this matter. The law—if it be the law—that two Catholics in the province of Quebec must be married before a Catholic priest, does not proceed at all upon the assumption that it is conferring power upon the priest.

As has been said here to-night, no priest and no minister, and no public officer marries anybody; people marry each other. And even in the church where it is considered a sacrament, there is no doubt made about it, I understand that the ministers of the sacrament, are the people who marry. Now, the original requirements made by the church of the presence of the pastor, was not made in order to make the marriage one whit more religious On the contrary, the decree that makes these requirements is called 'the Decree Tametsi,' because as it begins with the word 'tametsi' meaning 'although.' The effect of the decree is this: 'Although' there can be no possible doubt that consent freely given to marriage constitutes the marriage, and that people who so consent are validly married, and have had a valid sacrament, nevertheless, because that state of affairs requiring no outside ceremonial has created a situation where many married people have been able to go

through the world with their marriages unknown and to contract other marriages in a more public way, and so bring about all the scandals that result, therefore, for the purpose of avoiding clandestinity, for the purpose of making it public, we require that you go before the priest of your parish, the man most likely to know all about you, and that you marry each other in his presence. And further, it requires that there should be two witnesses—and the absence of the witnesses is as serious a defect as the absence of the priest. I only say this to show that these requirements in their origin were not based upon the idea of conferring power upon the priest or upon an ecclesiastical dignitary of any kind.

They were requirements which, in that day and generation, were considered the most effective way of procuring the publicity pointed out by the right hon. leader of the opposition. The countries that refused to be bound by the decrees have actually enacted these very things in their civil law. France, for instance, France, which at that time disputed entirely the authority of the church to regulate marriage adopted substantially these decrees to secure publicity, and we inherited them as embodied in her common law. I will not discuss whether that is the best method to secure publicity; all I want to point out is that this requirement of the law does not confer any power upon any priest or minister of any denomination. But the civil law, if it is correctly interpreted in the sense I have mentioned, has adopted these rules as suitable to the existing situation where there are many different religious beliefs and different methods of procuring publicity. But the civil law dealing with these beliefs accepts the rules as they hitherto prevailed according to different religious beliefs, and if that provision applies to Quebec as regards the validity of the solemnization of marriage, it applies only because the civil law, by that enactment, recognizes these rules as the most effective method, in a population belonging to different beliefs, the majority of whom it is true belong to one particular belief, of securing the publicity of marriage and of preventing clandestine marriages. After all, I think that the prevention of clandestine marriages is of sufficient necessity to justify any legislature to concern itself with the matter. I would like to point out that these articles which are impugned are not the legislation of the province of Quebec, they are not the legislation of the legislature of Quebec they are the legislation of the parliament of Canada, of the old province of Canada, enacted undoubtedly for application in lower Canada. But assuming this interpretation of the article to be correct then that parliament enacted that the best way to guard against clandestinity was to require conformity to the rules enacted in the different religious bodies for that purpose. In doing so they may have been right or they may have been wrong, but surely it was the exercise of a judgment with regard to what was the proper method of the solemnization of marriage. That being so, we get back to where we started, that in so far as this legislation seeks to prevent its being required that the officer who is to act as one of the witnesses, to give solemnity to the marriage, should be a person of the belief of the persons being married, a clergyman in their respective churches, in so far as this legislation seeks to do that, it is seeking to interfere with legislation regarding the solemnization of marriage, in other words, invading a field that belongs exclusively to the province.

While that is my opinion, and I have no hesitation in expressing it, I have respect for the opinions of others; I have respect for the opinion of the hon. gentleman who introduced this measure (Mr. Lancaster), I have respect for the opinions of large numbers of my fellow Canadians who I know entertain a contrary opinion upon this question. Under these circumstances, I think it is only fitting and proper, in view of the difference of opinion existing, that before this measure is brushed aside without consideration for want of power, we should allow the question of the existence of our power to be passed upon by the tribunals of this country, including, of course, the tribunal of His Majesty in His Privy Council. I believe that however strong a man's own conviction may be upon a matter of this importance, the people of this country are entitled to have it determined by the proper tribunal. I cannot agree that the best way is to settle this question first, and find out afterwards whether we have any right to settle it. I think the logical method is first to make sure of our power; first to be sure you are right, then go ahead. Nor can I accept the view that the submission of the question of our power to the courts necessarily implies a decision one way or the other, after that power is determined by this parliament upon the merits of this Bill. When this power is determined, it will then be the duty of this parliament to deal with the question involved in the measure upon its merits, and it will be the duty of each one of us, knowing that we are vested with the power and with the duty of dealing with it, after giving it our calmest, our best, and our most dispassionate consideration, to deal with it in a manner that will be most conducive to the welfare of the people of this country and

preserve the liberty in fullest measure of all classes, subject only to such control as may be necessary to secure the greatest good of the people of Canada.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). Coming from the province of Ontario, I would not be doing my duty, especially in view of the unlucky number of thirteen from that province who sit on this side of the House, if I did not give some expression to the views of the province of Ontario and to my own views upon this question, which previous speakers have said is one of the very greatest importance affecting the people of Canada at the present time. I think the discussion will be beneficial in clearing away a great deal of misconception in regard to this marriage question which existed during the last Dominion campaign. I am a little surprised, after what took place and what was said during that campaign, that no person has risen in his seat and charged the right hon. leader of the opposition with being the author of the Ne Temere decree. In my constituency, and I believe in many constituencies in the province of Ontario—I have only to refer to my hon. friend from Peterboro (Mr. Burnham) in corroboration—if there is one thing perhaps more than another outside the question of reciprocity which accounts for the small number on this side of the House from the province of Ontario, it is the feeling that has been aroused over this marriage question in that province. Not only was the late Prime Minister at that time charged with being the author of this iniquity, but it was said in the county from which I come that he had secretly gone up into that riding and had separated man and wife. There were some unfortunate things arising out of the confusion and uncertainty about this marriage question which I think naturally caused a good deal of feeling. I have known of cases where a man and wife of different religions had got the impression that their marriage was illegal. I know of one case in my own riding where a Roman Catholic woman left her husband, and of course that was all charged up against the late Prime Minister.

There have been other instances of that sort, so it is not to be wondered at perhaps that the ideas of the people of the province of Ontario in this matter have aroused a very considerable degree of interest and discontent. I fear that the attitude taken by the present Prime Minister will not give satisfaction to those people in the province of Ontario who, in very large numbers, withdrew their allegiance from the former premier of this country. We have but to read the reports of what has been said by the clergy of the Protestant Church. They had expressed the greatest confidence that, now they had got rid of this arch traitor to the Protestant Church, the Ne Temere decree would be set aside, there would be no further cause of complaint and hereafter the Protestant standard would be unfurled with nothing whatever to mar it.

It is a serious question and I think that, without passion and without prejudice, notwithstanding what may be preached here and there it is the duty of a member of parliament representing the people of both religions in this country to give it that calm consideration which is necessary if we are going to be a united people. Much abuse has been heaped upon the former Minister of Justice because he dared to give a legal opinion that this was a matter within the jurisdiction of the provinces, that the question of the legality of marriage, the mode of its solemnization was a matter over which the Dominion parliament had no jurisdiction, but that the jurisdiction rested solely with the different provinces. We have now the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Justice agreeing with that opinion.

Mr. LANCASTER. It was never given. The ex-Minister of Justice gave no opinion, he shirked the question when he was asked to give it.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) may be quite right in saying it was not given in this House, but it was given in answer to people who wrote to him. It was published and it was referred to by the right hon. Prime Minister this evening.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Upon what did the former Minister of Justice base his opinion? What was the question submitted to him?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The opinion, as I understood it, was in answer to communications from some reverend gentlemen in Toronto.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What was it about?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It was on the very question that we are discussing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CURRIE. Where is it?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I am afraid if my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) does not know where it is no other person can tell.

Mr. LANCASTER. The ex-Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir Allen Aylesworth) distinctly said in this House that before he would give an opinion he would want to get legal advice. Those are the last words he uttered in this House on the question.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is only another instance of the want of allegiance

of the hon. gentleman to his leader, because he said during this discussion that the former Minister of Justice had given that opinion.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who said?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The Prime Minister, your leader.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman makes the statement that Sir Allen Aylesworth gave an opinion?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Just so.

Mr. LANCASTER. He was asked by members of the opposition to do so, but he declined to give an opinion.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The right hon. Prime Minister, during this discussion, has said that the ex-Minister did give that opinion.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not hear him say anything of the kind.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I may be mistaken, but that is what came to my ears at any rate. Whether or not that is so, I saw it in the public press that he did give a public opinion and he has been much abused for it because it was said that he tried to shirk the responsibility of this burning question by saying that the jurisdiction in such matters rests with the provinces. Notwithstanding the fear of opprobrium I am bound to say that I believe that is the correct solution of this matter. I agree entirely with the hon. Minister of Justice that this question of the validity of marriages is one within the competence of the provincial legislatures. It would seem to me that it is a matter that comes within the definition of the solemnization of marriage. I think that the reason so much difficulty arises is that in the province of Ontario, and perhaps in other provinces, there is an entirely different standpoint to this question from that which exists among the Roman Catholic people in the province of Quebec. I think that can be accounted for by the history of this marriage question. In the Roman Catholic countries in the early centuries this question of marriage was treated as a question of sacrament and no religious ceremony was required by the state or civil authorities. All that was necessary in England up to the time of Lord Hardwick's Act, 26 George II., was for a man and a woman to agree to get married and to consummate it by their own act. That was the end of it as far as the state was concerned.

Mr. CURRIE. Oh no; you are wrong.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I despair of convincing anybody that I am right after that. However, my hon. friend from North Simcoe can correct me if I am wrong, but that is as I understand it, at any rate in England, and I do not think that I am mistaken in regard to it. I understand that until the year 1754, when the first Marriage Act of England was passed, no religious ceremony of any kind was required. Lord Hardwick's Act, which has been amended from time to time, was passed for the sake of publicity, and I think every person agrees that the object of the Ne Temere decree, in so far as it secures publicity and discourages clandestinity, should be commended. I think that every person in the province of Ontario will say that that is commendable, that there should not be clandestine marriages. But, what they say in Ontario is that a marriage is just as public if it is solemnized before a Protestant minister as if it took place in the parish church of the Roman Catholics. That is where they take issue. One says that it is clandestine if it does not take place in the church to which the parties go, and the other says that is is public and not clandestine if it takes place before some officers deputed by the civil authorities for that purpose. It is not only in the province of Quebec that people have been married, their marriage has been illegal, they have borne children and these children have been illegitimate. That has happened in other provinces than the province of Quebec, and the tendency of legislation in Ontario is to legitimize people who form those marriages, so that time after time, even in the province of Ontario, it has been found necessary, where they found that people have been illegally married, to accept the marriage, though illegal, and to pass Acts confirming such marriages for the sake of making them legal.

Mr. EMMERSON. The same is done in New Brunswick.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The same is done in New Brunswick, as my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) says, and I have no doubt in other places. That is the reason that the people of Ontario feel that this is such a shocking thing. Their tendency is not so much to look at the religious ceremony but to look at the intention of the parties and if the people have bona fide gone through some ceremony by which they think they are married, give birth to children and raise a family, then the tendency is, notwithstanding these defects, to go as far as they can for the purpose of legalizing such a marriage. If you look over the records of the courts for the last few years in Ontario you will find a decision where a woman married her deceased husband's brother, which is within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity. That was an illegal marriage, it was absolutely void according to the opinion of the court, but

notwithstanding that there was a remedial clause put in the Ontario Act which provided that notwithstanding any illegality, notwithstanding even the want of a license, notwithstanding the fact that the person who performed the ceremony had no right to perform that ceremony, still if the parties act in good faith, and completed the act of marriage by the act of cohabitation, it is a legal marriage and the children are saved the obloquy and the stigma of its being treated as a meretricious union.

Apparently they did not look at it in that light in the marriages in Quebec.

Mr. PELLETIER. Oh, yes, there is a clause in the Code which says that if two people get married, even although they do not follow the Code, they are married to all intents and purposes as between husband and wife and the children.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). You dissolve the marriage.

Mr. PELLETIER. The civil effects are there.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). But the marriage is gone.

Mr. PELLETIER. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). As I understand if the marriage is not legally performed they refer it to the ecclesiastical courts. They say whether there is any marriage but leave it to the civil courts to say what the rights are?

Mr. PELLETIER. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That does not affect my point. My argument was urging the point that the provinces had the legislation, that this is a matter of solemnization of marriage. What is there in Ontario for instance to prevent the legislature from saying that all marriages shall be performed before an English church clergyman or at certain times. That was the law in England, all people had to be married in a certain church at certain hours. Of course there was no question of conflict of jurisdiction. But once the status is established, I suppose it could be said as was said in respect to the Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill that a Roman Catholic and a Protestant had not the status to get married. I would think we had that jurisdiction, and that conforms with the opinion read here tonight. But once this parliament says what the status is, I do not see what further we can do, then it is remitted to the provinces to say how the people who have a right to be married shall be married. In other words, how their marriage shall be solemnized. There was a time when the Salvation Army could not marry people. If two people went before the Salvation Army and got married that marriage would be illegal and the parties would be in the same position as two Roman Catholics in Quebec going before a Protestant minister. That has been enlarged, now the Quakers may marry, and the Salvation Army and under certain conditions some officers of the Brethren may marry. From time to time where a religious denomination is established, the law is amended to say they may marry. I see no difference between that and what exists in Quebec. They say that certain people may marry because they say that certain people must marry before one official and certain people before another official. It does not seem to me to alter the principle of the matter. It seems to me that the principle is how that marriage is to be solemnized, whether by this person or by that person at one time or another time, it all comes under the head of solemnization of marriage, and is a matter with which the province has to deal.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are we to infer that the provinces have nothing to do with the class of persons who are being married?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The province cannot decide the status. I think the province cannot say who are eligible to be married or who are not eligible to be married, but once that status is established by the Dominion parliament, then the mode of carrying out that marriage, it seems to me, is delegated to the province. That was not the opinion of Sir John Macdonald soon after confederation, in the question already referred to which was submitted to the law officers of the Crown in England. He had given his opinion that a New Brunswick Act which had just been passed about that time was ultra vires, because it provided for licenses and for the marriage ceremony. The opinion of Sir John Macdonald was that it was only a Dominion officer, on account of the authority from the Crown, who had anything whatever to do with marriage. He referred the matter to England and received the decision which has been cited by the hon. member for Lincoln. The Earl of Granville, who, I think, was Secretary of State at the time, reported that they did not agree with that opinion, they said that the solemnization of marriages did come within provincial jurisdiction, the status remaining with the Dominion. That being so, the Minister of Justice and the

past Minister of Justice both sharing the opinion beyond any doubt that the matter of the solemnization of marriages rests with the province, and that the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is ultra vires, it seems to me to be rather disappointing to those who expect something to be done to have it said that now it is to be relegated to the courts to trail along perhaps for years, contrary to the opinion of the Prime Minister himself and of his Minister of Justice. It seems to me that if action is to be deferred until there is some authoritative opinion in those cases now pending in the courts of Quebec on a concrete case where it seems to me the matter ought to come up squarely it will get to the Privy Council very much quicker than we would get a decision by reference of a stated case. I do not think that these stated cases are satisfactory. Where there is a case stated of an abstract position the first tendency of the judges is to shift and shelve it and get rid of it without answering the question. That is what I fear will take place in this case and if action is to be deferred until there is an authoritative decision by the Privy Council, I believe that if the Quebec case could be carried on that would be the most satisfactory way.

Mr. DOHERTY. Is the hon. member aware that in the case he is speaking of the husband has abandoned the case and consequently it is complicated with the question whether the wife can carry it on all alone which might prevent them getting a decision?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I understood that case was on the way for judicial interpre tation.

Mr. DOHERTY. But with the difficulty tacked on to it that the husband has withdrawn his case and of course the difficulty that arose in the first court may arise in the others and prevent you getting a decision on the merits.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It might have that effect but those pressing the case expect to get a decision on the merits.

Mr. DOHERTY. They hope so.

Mr. BORDEN. Another consideration has perhaps been overlooked by my hon. friend. The determination of that case would not in any way define the power of this parliament, it would simply be a determination of the meaning of the Quebec code, not of the powers of this parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It would determine what is the crucial point that is whether or not the decision in Quebec is in accordance with the law of Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, it would determine that of course but I was venturing to remind my hon. friend that it would not in the least determine the relative powers of the province on the one hand and of this parliament on the other hand in respect to the matters which have been debated this afternoon.

Mr. LAMARCHE. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) is aware that the Hebert case to which he has referred, is complicated to a certain extent by an intricate question of fact which renders the decision on the question of law altogether difficult?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I am not aware of that, I am not aware that there is anything in that case which would prevent the cobwebs being brushed away and getting a decision on the merits.

If there is, that case will not give a fair precedent to govern us in the future.

Mr. LAMARCHE. I am giving this information to my hon. friend from what I have learned in my capacity as one of the counsel in the case.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I have read a very long argument by counsel in the newspapers, and it seems to cover the precise question which is agitating the public mind now. However, that is a matter which the Minister of Justice must take the responsibility of. Certainly, a reference of Bill No. (3) would be a most unsatisfactory solution of the question. With all respect to the hon. member for Lincoln I think if we sent that Bill to England, and asked for an opinion on it it would be laughed out of court. As I read that Bill, it asks that even if the marriage is solemnized according to the law of the province, is the marriage valid notwithstanding any ecclesiastical decree. I have never heard it suggested by any one that if the marriage is solemnized according to the law of the province of Quebec, any decree of any ecclesiastical body could interfere with it. If it is solemnized according to the law of Quebec, then it is a legal marriage, of course, and that is the end of it. And, if it is not solemnized according to the law of Quebec, what bearing is this Bill going to have upon it. That raises the question of constitutionality, and involves amending the constitution, and I do not see how that is going to be done by this parliament. It seems to me that what this Bill means —of course it could be amended in committee if it reaches that stage—what it means is that it is a defiance to any ecclesiastical court. I do not know that any person has ever dreamed for a moment that any ecclesiastical authority had anything to do with a legally performed mar-

riage. If the marriage is legally performed that is the end of it, and if the marriage is not legally solemnized that is the end of it also unless the Prime Minister goes further—and that is what the people of Ontario expect him to do—and if there is any doubt about it to have the constitution amended, so that effect can be given to the idea of the hon. member for Lincoln.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) in favour of that?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I am in favour of passing a law that will bring the matter squarely up. I believe it is a matter that ought to be settled, and if the passing of this Bill will have the effect of getting an authoritative decision in favour of it, I am in favour of it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If the courts decide we have no jurisdiction, is the hon. member in favour of amending the constitution to have jurisdiction conferred upon this parliament?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is a matter I would have to give attention to. I would say to my hon. friend as has been said on other occasions, that I am not the person charged with the administration. I am in the minority. I was one of those elected on that ticket. I was blamed on the public platform for supporting a man who was alleged to be guilty of all those things, so that my hon. friend (Mr. Sharpe) will have to make his appeal to those in power.

Mr. BEATTIE. Do you consider the marriage of two Roman Catholics by a Protestant minister illegal?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I think it is illegal if the laws of the legislature having jurisdiction, say so.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Then the matter of belief has something to do with it, and belief is introduced into it.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance). I desire to make some observations upon the subject matter of this Bill, the introduction of which has been the outcome of certain decisions regarding marriage in the province of Quebec, and of the promulgation of what is known as the Ne Temere decree. With regard to the decisions in the province of Quebec, which have been alluded to in this debate, I shall make reference to only two, because they will illustrate the principle that runs through all the decisions which have held that the marriage of two Roman Catholics can only be validly celebrated before a Roman Catholic priest. I shall read the head note in the case of Laramee and Evans, decided in 1880:

LARAMEE VS. EVANS (1880).

1. That in the Roman Catholic Church of which the full, entire and free exercise is recognized by our laws, marriage is a spiritual and religious tie and a sacrament over which the Superior court has no jurisdiction.

2. That our law has not established the civil marriage but that it gives civil effects to religious marriages validly celebrated by curés and ministers regularly according to the rights of their respective churches and authorized to keep registers of baptisms, births, marriages and burials.

3. That the Superior court, where two Roman Catholics have been married by a Protestant minister, has the power to refer to the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese of the parties the decision of the question of the validity or nullity of the spiritual and religious tie of their marriage in order that after his decision shall be reported to the Board it may pronounce upon the civil effects resulting from the validity or nullity of such tie.

4. That according to the jurisprudence of the country the sentence of the Roman Catholic Bishop regularly pronounced and deciding as to the validity or nullity of the spiritual and religious tie of marriage between Roman Catholics, can and ought to be recognized by the Superior court.

In the Hebert case, I understand that in the first decision these points were involved and decided:

1. According to the law of Quebec a Protestant minister cannot marry two Roman Catholics.

2. According to the law of Quebec the validity of a marriage contract between two Roman Catholics must be decided by the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical courts and not by the civil courts.

Consequently the marriage of two Catholics before a Protestant Minister is null. What I wish to call attention to in connection with these decisions—true they are in controversy—which may be regarded as the decisions that would carry most weight if the matter came up for adjudication today, is, that the law applies only to the cases of two Roman Catholics, and not to mixed marriages. In that connection, because it will have a bearing upon my argument later on, I desire to read from a pastoral letter issued by Archbishop Bruchési, of Montreal, and quoted by Judge Archibald in one of these cases:

Amongst the invalidating obstacles to marriage established by the Church, one of the most important is that of clandestinity. . . Because of this impediment, in order that a marriage may be valid between two Catholics in the limits where the Council of Trent has been published, the presence of the proper priest and two witnesses are necessary. Consequently, the marriage of two Catholics before a civil officer or a Protestant minister is null.

He is speaking no doubt from the ecclesiastical standpoint.

By virtue of the constitution of the Sovereign Pontiffs there are countries, and the province of Quebec is of the number, where, in spite of the promulgation of the Council of Trent, we are to consider as valid marriages celebrated clandestinely between two parties, one being Catholic, and the other a baptized non-Catholic. The marriage of a Catholic and a baptized Protestant, or vice versa, celebrated before a Protestant minister, although gravely illicit, and calling down the censures of the Church, is, however, a marriage contracted in a valid manner, even in the eyes of the Church itself. Once consummated, this marriage cannot be broken by any earthly power, death, alone rendering liberty to the party surviving. But to judge if one of the parties is really heretical or to declare when a Catholic denying practically his faith, becomes a heretic, especially in that which concerns the sacrament of marriage, this belongs to the ecclesiastical tribunal alone, and the civil power cannot interfere without passing the limits of its jurisdiction, and without usurping a right which Jesus Christ confided alone to his Church.

Now the point I desire to make in that connection is this, that before the promulgation of the Ne Temere decree, a marriage between a Roman Catholic and a Protestant in the province of Quebec was not regarded by the Roman Catholic church as null and void. As regards marriage between two Roman Catholics in that province it was held by those decisions that the decree of the council of Trent would apply by virtue of legislation to which I shall later refer, and that consequently there might be the impediment of clandestinity.

We know that decisions in the province of Quebec on this matter have been the cause of the agitation which has swept over this country, but the Ne Temere decree has been probably the principal cause. I desire, because the decree has not yet been quoted, to read it:

Issued 2nd August, 1907, by the Sacred Congregation of the Council of Rome by the order and with the authority of the Pope and was intended to apply to the whole Church, beginning with the Feast of the Resurrection in 1908.

It recites the provisions of the Council of Trent requiring the presence of the parish priest and witnesses, that changes are required in the law regulating the form of the celebration of marriage, the desire to introduce modifications and the intention to regulate by the decree the discipline regarding marriage for the future.

After enacting that the marriage must be celebrated by the parish priest, the degree proceeds:

1. The above laws are binding on all persons baptized in the Catholic church and on those who have been converted to it from heresy or schism (even when either the latter or the former have fallen away afterwards from the church) whenever they contract 'sponsalia' or marriage with one another.

2. The same laws are binding also on the same Catholics as above, if they contract 'sponsalia' or marriage with non-Catholics, baptized or unbaptized, even after a dispensation has been obtained from the impediment 'mixtæ religionis' or 'disparitatis cultus,' unless the Holy See decree otherwise for some particular place or region.

From the standpoint of the church or ecclesiastical discipline, I understand that the Ne Temere decree is in force in the province of Quebec, but it is not at all clear that it has been given any support by the civil law of Quebec. In other words that decree is not to-day part of the civil law of that province, and I shall show afterwards that it is no part of the civil law of any other part of the Dominion. It is necessary for us, in order that all points involved may be fully considered, to examine the provisions of the Quebec civil code, because there has been a great deal of misconception with regard to it, and one of the uses of a debate such as this is that the country will probably get a more correct knowledge of the facts in connection with this most important matter.

The Civil Code of Quebec was first given statutory effect on August 1, 1866, by the old province of Canada; and when the British North America Act came into effect at the union, the civil code, which was enacted in 1866, continued in the province of Quebec as if the union had not been made, subject to be repealed or altered by the parliament of Canada or the legislature of that province, according to the authority of parliament or the legislature acting within their respective jurisductions. Article 129 reads:

All priests, rectors, ministers and other officers authorized by law to keep registers of acts of civil cases are competent to solemnize marriage.

If that article stood alone it would be perfectly clear that if two parties, no mater what their religion might be, went before a priest, a rector or other minister authorized by law, he would be competent to solemnize their marriage, but there is the paragraph which follows:

But none of the officers thus authorized can be compelled to solemnize a marriage for which any impediment exists according to the doctrine and belief of his religion and the discipline of the church to which he belongs.

Taking those two clauses together, if they stood alone, I should think it clear that if two parties went before a priest, rector or minister and asked that the ceremony of marriage should be performed between them, it was open to such official, to say I object to celebrate this marriage because

an impediment exists according to the doctrine of my religion; and they might then go to some other rector or priest and have the marriage ceremony performed. But the decree of the council of Trent, to which reference has been made, was introduced into the civil law of the province of Quebec by article 127, because otherwise it could not have any effect in that province. In other words, the ecclesiastical decree could have no weight or effect unless sanctioned by the civil law. Article 127, which has been held to incorporate the decree of the council of Trent in the Quebec civil code, is as follows:

The other impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions as resulting from relationship or affinity or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities.

The right likewise of granting dispensation from such impediment appertains, as heretofore, to those who have hitherto enjoyed it.

I ask the House to observe carefully the words : 'The other impediment recognized according to the different religious persuasions as resulting from relationship or affinity or from other causes remains subject to the rule hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities.' Therefore, it would seem, subject to what I shall say in a moment, that only those rules which were followed prior to August 1, 1866 in the different churches and religious communities, could be held to be incorporated in the civil code which received statutory effect on that day. If that be so, it must follow that, so far as the Quebec civil code is concerned, the Ne Temere decree—which became effective in 1908—did not prescribe any rule that had been hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities.

With regard to what my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) says, and I wish to give full weight to his argument in that respect—I have this to say.

It might be held that these words 'the rules hitherto followed' were the canon rules of the church, and that from time to time these rules might become modified and as modified become part of the statute laws of the province of Quebec. I wish to be fair to my hon. friend. I say that is arguable. I must be frank in the matter: I do not believe that by judicial decision it will be held by that line of reasoning that the Ne Temere decree is incorporated. But I say it is arguable, and it is only fair to say so. Now, among the impediments according to the decisions is the impediment of clandestinity, which is derived from the decree of the Council of Trent. And I shall read that decree, or at least so much of it as affects this argument:

'Those who otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest himself or of another priest acting with the license of the parish priest or of the ordinary and in the presence of two or three witnesses shall attempt to contract matrimony the Holy Synod renders altogether incapable of contracting marriage thus and decrees that contracts of this kind are null and void'.

This decree was not accepted in England. And, to prove that, let me quote authorities. Chief Justice Tindal in Queen vs. Millis, (p. 677) says:

My Lords, I proceed, in the last place, to endeavour to show that the law by which the spiritual courts of the Kingdom have from the earliest time been governed and regulated is not the general canon law of Europe, imported as a body of law into this Kingdom, and governing those courts 'proprio vigore,' but, instead thereof, an ecclesiastical law, of which the general canon law is no doubt the basis, but which has been modified and altered from time to time by the ecclesiastical constitutions of our archbishops and bishops, and by the legislature of the realm, and which has been known from early times by the distinguishing title of the King's Ecclesiastical law.

In the same case Lord Cottenham—p. 875—says:

The civil law, as it has been said was the foundation of the law of marriage in Europe, and that by that law, before the Council of Trent, a contract 'per verba de praesenti' constituted marriage, as it does in Scotland to this day; and that there was no reason to suppose that the marriage law of England was at that time different from the marriage law of other christian countries; but, on the contrary, as the subject of marriage was under the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical courts, and as there was an appeal from those courts at Rome, it was to be assumed that the marriage law of this country and of Rome was the same.

Now it is quite certain that civil and canon law never had, as such, any authority in this country; but, in the language of the Statute of 25 Hen. 8, c. 21,' such laws had effect only so far as the Sovereign and people of this realm had taken them at their free liberty, at their own consent, to be used amongst them; and had bound themselves, by long use and custom to the observance of the same. In illustration of which, Blackstone following the example of Sir Matthew Hale, classes the civil and canon law in use in this country as part of the common or unwritten law. And with respect to the appeal to Rome, Blackstone observes, that the Act of Hen. 8, which subjected those who should appeal to Rome to the penalties of 'a praemunire', only punished that which was illegal before.

Lord Brougham —p.720—says:

The Council of Trent required and for the first time required, the marriage to be in the presence of a priest. But of what priest? Of the parish priest. The Council of Trent

never was received or acknowledged in England; of which we may at once see the proof in this, that there we have no pretence ever set up, nor any contention, that the parish priest's presence is necessary. But if the Council of Trent never was recognized in England, have we not a right to fall back upon the common and universal law of Europe, as our own in this important matter? Now, that decree is itself the most irrefragable proof of this; for it begins by declaring all past marriages valid without any sacerdotal interposition; and consequently pronounces that the requiring a priest's presence is prospective merely, and an alteration of the former law.

And let me say further that the decree was not accepted in France as being in conflict with the tenets of the Gallican church. But, though it was not accepted in France, there were certain ordinances of the French king or kings, which are said to have given it force and effect. And if so, it is strongly arguable, and, I believe, has been decided by some of the courts in Quebec, that it would thus become a part of the French common law of Quebec before the cession. Now, let us assume that at the cession, the decree of the Council of Trent, was, by virtue of such ordinance or ordinances part of the ecclestical law of French Canada. The question then arises whether the English law which was introduced—the common law and so much of the statute law as was applicable—would supersede the French law. As to that, I pass no opinion. Judges have differed with regard to it. All I am suggesting is that the matter is very much complicated and the decisions are therefore very much in doubt; and until you can get an authoritative decision from the Supreme Court or the Privy Council, it would be very difficult indeed to say what is the law in the province of Quebec so far as this article No. 127 of the code is concerned.

Now, there is no doubt that the decree of the Council of Trent is not in effect and cannot be in effect in the other provinces of Canada. I think the statute of Upper Canada may be taken as being a specimen of the laws of the other provinces. The statutes of Upper Canada were consolidated in 1859; and chapter 72, section 1, provided:

> The ministers and clergymen of every church and religious denomination in Upper Canada, duly ordained or appointed according to the rites and ceremonies of the churches or denominations to which they respectively belong, and resident in Upper Canada, may by virtue of such ordination or appointment, and according to the rites and usages of such churches or denominations respectively, solemnize the ceremony of marriage between any two persons not under a legal disqualification to contract such marriage.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

Therefore I think we may quite safely say that it is only in the province of Quebec that the decree of the Council of Trent which I have quoted or the Ne Temere decree can have any civil force and effect whatever.

Now, I take up the question of article 127 of the Code again as to the impediment of clandestinity. That provision of the Code can only be changed by the parliament of Canada or by the legislature of the province of Quebec acting within their respective jurisdiction. If this impediment of clandestinity is an impediment that would be comprehended within the expression 'solemnization of marriage' it can only be removed by the legislature of the province. But if, on the other hand it is an impediment relating to the capacity or status of the parties, it can only be removed by the parliament of Canada.

Now, I want to be fair again to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). As I understand his principal point, for he has many points, it is this: He says the province may have the power to determine the ceremonial under which marriage may be contracted, but he doubts very much the power of a province to say that two Roman Catholics must be married before a priest, or two Protestants must be married before a Protestant minister, or a Protestant and a Roman Catholic must be married either before a Roman Catholic or a Protestant clergyman; in other words, he dwells upon the question of status. The only argument I can see in favour of a possible jurisdiction of the Dominion is on that point. I say the only argument I can see in favour of a possible jurisdiction; because, frankly, I believe that while the words 'solemnization of marriage' are wide enough to include it, and put forward my view with a good deal of hesitation, it is open to my hon. friend to argue that an impediment of that kind virtually, and in substance constitutes a disparity as to religion. That is open to argument, and he has argued it very strongly. Now summarizing the situation, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, the marriage of two Catholics, according to the latest decision, can only take place validly before the parish priest.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that right? I am not saying that is not the case, but I ask my hon. friend, should that be so? Should we permit that to be so as a matter of law any longer?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I want to argue the matter first from the constitutional standpoint, I want first to develop the argument that the marriage of two Catholics in Quebec can only take place validly, according to recent decision, before the parish

priest. There is a doubt as to the validity of the marriage of Catholics contracted otherwise. Now, it is quite possible that if these cases were carried to the Privy Council, it might be held that section 127 would be construed differently from the way it has been construed in the province of Quebec; it is quite possible that it might be held that section 129 alone would apply. But as to that I venture no opinion, because the matter is before the courts. But answering my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke), I do not see how we can in any way pass on that case, because, as it has been pointed out, there are other points involved in that case. Not only that, but one of the parties has withdrawn from the case, and may be the Dominion is not in a position to do anything with regard to it. But even if both parties were still determined to go on, I do not know what status this Dominion would have to interfere.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It is still going on since one of the parties withdrew.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Now, as has been pointed out by the Postmaster General, the code protects the civil rights of the husband, the wife, and the children where the marriage was contracted in good faith; the children are legitimate in the province of Quebec if the marriage was contracted in good faith; notwithstanding the religious impediment, the civil rights of the husband, wife and children are preserved under the provisions of the code. The Ne Temere decree does not apply so far as civil marriage is concerned. With regard to the argument of my hon. friend that rights heretofore referred to in section 127——

Mr. LANCASTER. Not rights but rules, they determine those rights.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). With the rules hitherto followed, it could be argued still that the canon law might be changed from time to time. Neither the Tridentine, nor the Ne Temere decree applies to the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE (South Essex). Has it not been published in the whole of Canada?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think it has, but my hon. friend knows, as I have pointed out, that neither this decree, Ne Temere, nor the decree of the Council of Trent, can have any civil validity in any province unless introduced by statutory enactment. Now, in this case I would like to refer to the decree which exempts Germany from the application of the Ne Temere decree, and I should hope myself that a similar decree will exempt other countries from its operation. However, such a decree has not yet been promulgated. Now, the decree Provida is as follows, and this exempts Germany from the operation of the Ne Temere decree:

Nevertheless, as happens in all human affairs, it has occurred in places, especially in the German empire, that certain grave and inconvenient results were connected with the aforesaid law, due to the lamentable and widespread division in religion and the daily increasing intercourse of Catholics with heretics. Namely, since it was the intention of the fathers of the council that the decree Tametsi would not have binding force until it had been officially promulgated in each parish; since concerning many places it is doubtful whether this promulgation has been made; since it is frequently uncertain the law of the council is likewise obligatory upon non-Catholics dwelling in this or that place; as a result the greatest diversity and dissimilarity of law has arisen in many localities of the German Empire,—wherefore very many and difficult questions have sprung up which have frequently caused perplexity in the minds of judges, a certain irreverance for law among the faithful, and perpetual quarrels and incriminations among non-Catholics.

The decree dated in 1906, declares the validity of mixed marriages contracted without the Tridentine form in Germany, and it may be argued by my hon. friend from Lincoln that it does refer to mixed marriages as contracted without the Tridentine form.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does my hon. friend say that the Ne Temere decree does not apply to the other provinces outside of Quebec?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It applies from the religious standpoint without question, but I say that so far as the civil effects are concerned, it has not been introduced.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there any difference between Quebec and the other provinces with regard to that Ne Temere decree?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think not. The Ne Temere decree has force and effect from the ecclesiastical standpoint in the province of Quebec and the other provinces. I have argued that the Ne Temere decree has not yet been given the force of civil law in the province of Quebec, and it certainly has not been given the force of civil law in any other province of Canada. Now the question arises, under these circumstances, what is the wise course for us to pursue? It must be admitted that it is desirable that we should know the facts before we come to any conclusion. But the public outside are not lawyers, they have a broad way of looking at these matters, and a great number of them believe—I think this will be admitted by Roman Catholics and Protestants—that the Ne Temere decree has the force of law in the province of Quebec, and may have force of

law in the other provinces. But what we have to deal with is public opinion, and I say it is in the highest degree desirable that any doubts with regard to this matter should be cleared up.

My hon. friend from Lincoln commenced his very able speech this afternoon by calling attention to the fact that the most important thing in connection with this particular matter is the question of doubt.

Mr. LANCASTER. And here is the place to settle it.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Doubt as to whether people are married in Quebec or not. I think it is highly desirable, no matter whether the party is a Roman Catholic or Protestant, that there shall be no doubt with regard to the question of marriage.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then pass the Act.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It is important that a man should be capable of knowing, within a reasonable time, whether he is validly married or not.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Ne Temere decree has no effect on marriage in Quebec or any other province of Canada why introduce legislation here to overcome it, or why send a stated case to the Privy Council or to any of our courts?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I will develop that later on. That is not the point involved in this Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln. His Bill is to provide for a uniform marriage law throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. If my hon. friend will pardon me, my Bill does not do that. My Bill says that if a marriage is legally performed without respect to the fact that people of different religion shall have been parties to it, it is valid.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). And the hon. gentleman wants to make that uniform throughout the Dominion.

Mr. LANCASTER. I want to make it uniform that the religion of the parties shall not enter into the question of the validity of the marriage.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Quite so. As I have said the important thing in this is the matter of doubt. Let me argue that point. Supposing we put this law upon the Statute-book; is the doubt resolved? With very great respect to my hon. friend I believe the confusion will grow worse, for this reason: Here, you have the opinion of the previous Minister of Justice, you have the opinion of the present Minister of Justice, you have the opinion of the Prime Minister, you have the opinion of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and if you put that law upon the Statute-book with all these gentlemen and other lawyers, by far the majority of lawyers, I should say in the Dominion of Canada, holding that it is a matter exclusively for the province, do you in any way help to resolve the doubt? I think there is only one answer; you do not help to resolve the doubt. What is the use of leglislation unless it will assist to resolve the doubt? Why translate a Bill into an Act, and put it upon the Statute-book if it does not resolve the doubt, if it does not help out of a difficult situation? As I have said, the people outside are not lawyers, and public opinion will never be satisfied until the highest court in the empire pronounces upon the subject matter of that Bill, and of the other questions which are agitating this country. Therefore, it seems to me that the wisest course possible is the course that has been adopted by the right hon. leader of the government. He says frankly, I believe, that, in his opinion, it is a matter for the provinces to settle for themselves, but there is a doubt about the question of solemnization of marriage, and the Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln is probably ultra vires of this legislation. That is as I understand it. But, there is a doubt. My hon. friend from Lincoln is a good lawyer. He has argued his case well.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid not tonight.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend has put up a pretty good legal argument.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am making it on common-sense, not on law.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Well, my hon. friend is a pretty good lawyer. My hon. friend holds that this Bill is intra vires, and as a lawyer he holds that strongly. There are others who hold that this Bill is intra vires. They say that while the province may make any regulations with respect to the solemnization of marriage they cannot discriminate between people according to their different religious faiths. If he has that opinion and other lawyers have that opinion, how many people outsides have that opinion? There are thousands of people who have that opinion and there are thousands of people who hold that this matter must be brought to an issue and decided by the highest court. In deference to that situation, and in deference to these opinions, with which we may not agree, but which we must respect, and in deference to the views of the people, is it not the duty of this government to endeavour as speedily as possible to have it determined whether the subject matter of this Bill comes within the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament?

Mr. LANCASTER. How would that be retarded by passing the Bill and sending it to the Privy Council? Why would then hundreds and thousands of people not be satisfied if this parliament showed a disposition to do its duty?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That begs the question. The hon. gentleman's Bill might be held valid in part. It is not proper legislation to enact a Bill of that kind subject to be taken to the Privy Council later for a decision as to its validity.

Mr. LANCASTER. It has been done over and over again here.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The hon. gentleman's Bill may be held to be invalid in part or it may be held to be wholly invalid and we want to have an authoritative decision on this matter from the Privy Council. The public want that, and I have seen no valid objection urged against it to-night. Some of my hon. friends have asked the question: Are you going to submit this Bill only? I understood the right hon. leader of the government to say that he will submit this Bill and such other matters as are applicable to this question so as to have a proper decision from the Supreme Court in the Privy Council.

With regard to the B. N. A. Act, section 91 gives the Dominion jurisdiction over marriage and divorce. Section 92 assigns exclusively to the provinces the solemnization of marriage. There is no doubt that sections 91 and 92 give the entire jurisdiction to the Dominion and the provinces, and it is only a question of separation. I have always understood that the Dominion jurisdiction referred to the capacity of the parties.

Mr. LANCASTER. What does my Bill deal with but capacity and status?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The Bill assumes that marriages are validly solemnized according to provincial legislation and then it declares that such marriages, if validly performed, are valid. It seems to me clear that the Dominion jurisdiction has to do with the question of capacity; that is to say the Dominion may say a man shall not marry his deceased wife's sister or that A may not marry B. It might create any incapacity so far as marriage is concerned But the question of form of solemnization is left to the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. As I said before, it is a point to be argued in connection with this matter as to whether the province has the right to say that two Roman Catholics or two Protestants, or two Methodists, or two Presbyterians shall be married before a certain named clergyman or officer. Personally I think the province has jurisdiction, but I put forth my view with a good deal of hesitation, and I say it is arguable on the part of my hon. friend that that is otherwise and that is why I think, notwithstanding the opinion of the Minister of Justice and the previous Minister of Justice and of the right hon. the Prime Minister and others, it is our duty, notwithstanding that burden of opinion is in favour of the legislative jurisdiction of the province, it is our duty in deference to other opinions which we respect and of public opinion outside, to take this matter to the Privy Council in order that we may have the authoritative pronouncement of the highest tribunal in the empire.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). This question is of such importance that no member need apologize for detaining the House while giving an expression of his opinion. I desire to preface my remarks with the statement that I am very strongly and unalterably in favour of the principle advocated by the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). It is unquestionably true that a very undesirable condition of affairs exists in this country upon the question of marriage. That unsatisfactory condition has arisen owing to the uncertainty as to whether marriages performed in one or another form are legal marriages. If there is one subject more than another in which the people of this country are interested, upon which the society of this country is founded, it is that question of marriage and issue and inheritance, for all three are involved in this matter. Agreeing then that there is that state of uncertainty, is it not the opinion of everyone who has given it any consideration that it is most desirable that that condition of uncertainty should be removed? The object of the legislation introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has in view the removal of the doubt that now exists upon this important question. There would appear to be two ways of solving this question, one by the submission of the abstract question to the Privy Council, to determine the extent of jurisdiction of this parliament in regard to this question, the other would be to pass legislation in this House and allow that legislation to prevail until such time as it should be brought in question. I have considered this question from both those points of view, and I have argued myself into the belief that it would be better for this House to pass legislation and allow that legislation to be questioned if anyone saw fit to do it, and to carry that question to the Privy Council for final determination. I have come to this conclusion because if the case is submitted to the Privy Council in its abstract form it goes there without any expression of opinion from members of this House or from

the people of this country. On the other hand, if legislation is passed, and this parliament expresses its opinion on that question, in doing so it expresses the opinion of the people of this country and the question then will go before the Privy Council, if it goes at all, in its strongest possible form. In placing it before the Privy Council in its abstract form, to my mind it goes in its weakest possible form. When that question comes before the Privy Council, if there has been an expression of this parliament upon the question I doubt not but what the Privy Council would feel pressed to give that question much more serious and earnest consideration than if the question went there without an expression of opinion of this parliament. Going there in the abstract form it bears the stamp or seal of this parliament, that parliament is in doubt on the question. Possibly if the House desires legislation of this kind, it would be better to first pass legislation on the question that is submitted than to submit it in an abstract form. While I was not present when the Prime Minister spoke, I gleaned from what was said by the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was quite willing to submit the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) for consideration by the Privy Council. Is it the intention of the right hon. gentleman to submit the Bill to the Privy Council in order to determine the power of this parliament on that question, the Bill just as it is drafted?

Mr. BORDEN. I have already stated that in speaking on the question before. The thing to be submitted to the Privy Council or to the Supreme Court of Canada first and the Privy Council afterwards is the validity of this Bill, that is to say, the question whether it is within the legislative competence of the parliament of Canada. But I also said that I was quite willing and the government had determined to submit any further questions in addition to that which would be necessary to define clearly the power of parliament to legislate in such matters.

Mr. PORTER. This Bill will be submitted? Then in view of the statement of the Prime Minister it seems to me that this matter resolves itself into a question of procedure, the same object is to be obtained one way or the other, and if the Bill is referred to the Privy Council for its determination of the powers of parliament with regard thereto it seems to me that the hon. member for Lincoln will be getting every advantage that he could possibly get by passing the Bill now and having it submitted in that way. I would like the hon. gentleman to say whether he would regard that as meeting his views in regard to the matter.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is the first moment I have understood from the Prime Minister he was willing to submit this Bill. I certainly did not understand him to say so when he moved the adjournment of the debate. I understood him to say, and that is what the trouble has been about for the last hour, that he is going to submit a series of questions. I object to that because I do not propose to have any one draw questions in academic form that will govern the Bill I have here. I have consulted much more eminent lawyers than I am in preparing the Bill, and I am perfectly satisfied it is good legislation as it reads. Of course you can draw up a lot of questions that a court could give answers to which would be confusing and contradictory and it is this Bill I want submitted to the Privy Council as I have drawn it. I stand by my Bill and not by a lot of academic questions.

Mr. PORTER. In view of the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) there is no issue between us. The Prime Minister says he will refer the Bill and the hon. member wants the Bill referred.

Mr. LANCASTER. I don't want it referred. I say that this parliament should attend to this matter, but the majority of the members on both sides, some by their silence and others by their speech, seem to be of the opinion that this Bill must go to the Privy Council, and every Cabinet Minister who has spoken is so much in doubt that he thinks the same thing. It took me seven years to get a law passed through this House saying that masters and mates of vessels should be British subjects, and I would have kept at it for seventy years, if I lived that long, until I got that declaration. I believe some progress will be made if this Bill is referred to the Privy Council and referred just as fast as possible and a declaration obtained. But, I am satisfied with my Bill, I do not want any reference, but the majority of this House appear to want a reference and I am in their hands. I want progress; hurry up your reference and send the Bill to the Privy Council.

Mr. PORTER. I take the same position as the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster). I am not willing to give way in any degree to the view I hold on this question and I am a supporter of this legislation. Although I would have preferred personally to have the Bill pass this House and go to the Privy Council if need be, yet in view of the full consideration which no doubt the Prime Minister and his colleagues have given the matter I am quite

willing to subject my view on this matter to that of the right hon. gentleman. While the hon gentleman (Mr Lancaster) does not desire it, yet he is willing that the Bill should be referred, and I am also willing in view of the circumstances, to have the matter dealt with in that way.

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer). I don't think that I would have interfered in this debate but for what appeared to be a very distinct challenge from my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). He opened by remarking upon the silence of the members from this side of the House and he closed by an appeal to both sides that we should adopt both courses, which seemed to cause some amusement. Well, I understood that one course before the House was to adjourn the debate upon the Bill and the other course was to pass the Bill, and it baffles my poor wit to know how he could follow both courses. Then, I would remark, that the onus of speech upon the Ne Temere question does not rest particularly upon this side of the House. The speaking upon the Ne Temere in the last election was not done by us. It is a remarkable thing, a thing much more remarkable than our silence, that hon. members opposite who do speak upon the question speak very briefly, and be it observed that they are not tumbling over one another's heads to speak at all.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). If I were as fond of popular applause as the Minister of Militia my momentary hesitation to proceed might have been because I was waiting for cheers. We have had in the course of this debate a great many appeals to us to approach the subject in a spirit of calm. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) enjoined upon us the spirit of peace. The Minister of Justice pleaded with us to approach it in a dispassionate mood, but I wonder where the calm and the peace and the dispassionateness were during the last election campaign. The Minister of Finance delivered a speech, the first half of which he delivered very well, when, if I may say so without offence, he was evidently speaking from a carefully prepared brief, but he did not get on quite so well when he came under the cross-examination of the opposing counsel. He said that one of the effects of this debate would be to give a more correct impression to the people upon the subject. It is a wonder to me that the Minister of Finance did not have a desire to convey some of these correct impressions in the province of Ontario before the 21st September. He told us he was of opinion that the Ne Temere decree forsooth has no application to any part of Canada except to the province of Quebec.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Well, I was extremely surprised to hear that because I thought it was very forcibly and very generally applied to the province of Quebec during the last election. I notice that the Minister of Militia takes exception to the words I have attributed to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. member permit me?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I would like to point out before I permit anything that when the Minister of Finance spoke these words which I have carefully taken down the Minister of Militia was upstairs taking his dinner.

With regard to what the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) said, and I wish to give full value to his argument——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I was very particular to ask, if the hon. member will remember—probably he was not cognizant of what was going on—but I asked the Minister of Finance whether he limited the Ne Temere decree to the province of Quebec or any part of the Dominion, and he said that it did not apply to any part of Canada under the civil law.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). That is exactly what I said, and the fact that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) put the question to the Minister of Finance shows, that his impression of what the Minister of Finance said was exactly the same as my own, so that he has proved my case up to the hilt.

I must say that there has been a terrible storm in the teapot in the province of Ontario, if the Minister of Finance is correct in this matter. The Ne Temere decree, he tells us, has no application to the province of Ontario. I wonder that men can be so lost to the sense of dignity and decency as to come in and make statements of that sort when the denunciations of that decree in Ontario during the recent election are so fresh in the minds of every one of us.

Now, I was going to compliment my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) upon the fact that he at least had approached this subject with a degree of courage, but I am not at all sure that that courage has not been evaporating very rapidly within the last few minutes. However he has the credit of having made a speech anyhow, and I am willing to compliment him by saying that he has been struggling very hard with his conscience. While other members beside him seem to have found a ready sedative

for theirs, he was struggling with his, and delivered a very interesting speech.

But I was absolutely disappointed for once in my life, because of what was missing from the speech of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I fully expected that he would have made a solemn declaration in this House that he was not present at the Council of Trent, and that he had nothing whatever to do with the original drafting of the language of the Ne Temere decree. I really think he owed that double denial to some of our Protestant friends in Ontario who, I am perfectly certain, were led to believe that, on both counts of this indictment my right hon. friend was a very guilty party, indeed.

I think, Sir, that there will be profound disappointment in this country on the action of this government on this question. A Presbyterian preacher in this city last night addressed a crowded congregation on the Ne Temere decree, and in his sermon—when I suppose a parson is as solemn as ever he can be at any time—he declared his emphatic confidence that in this session upon which we have entered, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) would evoke from the Prime Minister of Canada a statement which would assure the Protestants of Ontario that we had got a government which settled questions. I am perfectly certain that in this, the worthy divine expressed a sentiment widespread throughout the province of Ontario, and if I wanted confirmation of my view in that respect, I am sure I could get it from my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham).

But it is not only in the pulpit, but in the press that expectations with regard to my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) in this respect have been expressed. I see that the 'Evening Telegram' of Toronto, published in the Mecca of Protestant Conservatism—and we must believe what we see in Tory papers coming from such a source—assured the people of Ontario that on this day we were to learn whether the Rt. Hon. R. L. Borden was the First Minister of a free people, or the puppet of a Theocracy. Well, I am still in the dark on that question. I think there will be great disappointment in the pulpit, and in the press over the experience we have had this last three months. Could they have anticipated this experience, the supporters of our hon. friends opposite would not have raised their expectations so high. On every question of moment the government have no decision to offer but simply inform this parliament that they have put their considering caps on. They have no views about the navy, but are considering what they shall do. Nor have they anything definite to say about the Ne Temere decree, or the Hudson Bay railway. How can the people look for guidance to a government which is continually looking for guidance itself elsewhere. On the question of the navy they are looking for guidance everywhere under the sun. I understand that they intend appealing to the British Admiralty to know what they should do; and on the question of a railway to Hudson bay, they are equally uncertain what to do and are equally groping about in the darkness. I am interested in the tariff question, and on that question neither have they any view, but they are going to create a commission to make their views for them. Why, I appealed to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), upon such a simple matter as putting the tower clock right, and he referred the case to a couple of officials. What guidance can we expect from a government which keeps the tower clock standing for ten days at seven minutes to twelve? If the government have no light in themselves, how can they give any light on public matters?

Evidently after all this outcry, after all the expectations raised in Ontario, the Ne Temere decree is to be referred to the courts and from the courts to the Privy Council. In the meantime, no doubt, there will be another election, and the people of Ontario will be assured that their children are illegitimate, and that my right hon. friend is responsible.

I paid a great deal of attention to my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Clarke, Essex), with regard to what is likely to happen as the result of sending this Ne Temere matter to the Privy Council. There is no better lawyer than my hon. friend in this House, and he said that what will happen will be that the question will be shifted and shelved, and that an indefinite period might pass before we got a decision. If that be correct, I can understand why the government are sending it to the Privy Council.

If they could only shelve and shift this question for twenty years, and if there was a chance of thereby holding power not only for all time, but for a portion of eternity, they would so shift and shelve it. They are giving the cue to the Privy Council as to what they want them to do. They are shifting and shelving it by sending it to the Privy Council. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that that is not what the people of Ontario expected when they voted on almost solid representation in this House for my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden). And he and his friends ought to know that that is not what the people of Ontario expected. I do not see any sign of evaporating courage on the part of my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup); he made a strong, clear and manly statement of his position. And everybody knows that

he voices the expectations and sentiments of the people of Ontario in this matter. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) criticised the leader of the government for want of dignity. I think the people will also criticise him for want of courage in taking the course, upon such a question as this, of simply moving the adjournment of the debate. And now I wish to say just a word more to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), who has greatly shaken my confidence in himself by his later appearance to-day. I want to tell him that the 'Evening Telegram' and the clientéle of that paper have expectations also, and those expectations are expressed in these words:

E. A. Lancaster, M.P., will be guilty of bad patriotism——

That is a frightful charge to bring against a Tory.

——and worse partyism if he allows himself to be bullied or wheedled or coaxed into helping the Borden government to escape an opportunity to face the great question bravely, and settle that question right.

That is the expectation of Ontario as to my hon. friend from Lincoln. I cannot split legal straws with my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster). I just want to say to him that if he proceeds to stand for his Bill—for I understand there are two propositions before the House—if he proceeds to let it be known, without shuffling and humbugging, or anything of that kind, with the courage which I believed he was possessed of and which the 'Evening Telegram' attributes to him, he will not be without the support of at least one member on this side of the House.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, I will give the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) credit for being clever and very witty. But it seems to me his speech has gone far astray from the question before the House. In order to give us a good sample of his wit on the question of the Ne Temere decree, he found it possible to speak of the tower clock and a great many other things which, I think are not issues at the present moment.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). They were illustrations.

Mr. PELLETIER. It seems to me that we have before us to-night something very interesting. We have had a discussion on a very important question, one that has occupied the attention of a great many people for several years, but mostly during the last five or six months. Now what is the position that has been taken, and is evidently being taken, by some hon. members in this House. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) as every one admits, made a very able argument and put his views before the House and the country in a very energetic and eloquent address. And we have had from the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) his views upon the question. And we have had the views of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke). They have both told us that they are absolutely opposed to this Bill. But, though they put forth the view that they are against this Bill, there is as plain as daylight an intention to try to force the House into a position where the Bill would not and could not receive the consideration which it ought to receive if these hon. gentlemen were really earnest in desiring that it should not pass. We are told by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark)—and he is one of the most eloquent members on the other side of the House—that this Ne Temere question is one which was used in the elections in the province of Ontario. Hearing the hon. gentleman make that statement, and hearing the members around him pound their desks, one might be inclined to think that nothing was discussed in the province of Ontario in the recent election but this Ne Temere decree.

Mr. LENNOX. We never heard it.

Mr. PELLETIER. Well, Sir, I was led to understand—of course, I may be wrong—that there were several important questions discussed in the province of Ontario and throughout the Dominion before the 21st of September last. And I understood that the province of Ontario like the other provinces of the Dominion declared that it wanted to maintain British connections and to keep unbroken the British tie. I understood that there was another big question discussed on the hustings in the nine provinces of the confederation and that this question had been settled on the 21st of September last. Now we are told—and told with an object in view—that nothing was discussed but the Ne Temere. Well, since the debate has taken that shape, I wish to tell the House that while my hon. friends complain so much about the fact that here and there there might have been a question about the Ne Temere decree in the province of Ontario, the saintly gentleman who complained here to-night and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who told us that the right hon. the leader of the opposition should have declared that he was not a member of the Council of Trent, let me tell them that in my own province there was something else than reciprocity discussed. And there would not have been on the other side of the House half-a-dozen members elected from the province of Québec had not the

people of that province been told that they must vote for the late government because the Prime Minister was a Catholic and a French Canadian.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Mention the place.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hour is too late to begin that to-night. I should have to name every township, every parish, every hamlet in the province of Quebec.

Mr. DEVLIN. It was not mentioned, to my knowledge, in the county of Wright.

Mr. PELLETIER. From the beginning to the last day of the slection, what were we confronted with? Men came to us and said: You should try and make it clear that the question at issue now is not one between Catholics and Protestants, is not the fact that there are Tories and Orangemen in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Wright says it was not mentioned in his riding. Why, Sir, take the Liberal papers in the province of Quebec, take 'Le Canada' of Montreal, take 'Le Soleil' of Quebec, what have they been living upon during the last 15 years? Crying out in the ears of the people of Quebec, 'Look at Sam Hughes, the Orangeman'; and other members of this House have been held up before the good people of the province of Quebec, and in my own county, as men to be afraid of. We were asked: Is it true that you are going to Ottawa to associate with people who want to destroy the Catholic religion and the French language in this province? My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition knows that himself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I do not.

Mr. PELLETIER. Well, if he does not know that he does not know much. What did we see here to-night? We saw an attempt, an open attempt, by members on the opposite side of the House so to steer this question as to put this government and the Conservative party in a bad position. That can be plainly seen. We could see the disappointment of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), because one of our friends on this side of the House had made a suggestion that the member for Lincoln seemed to be inclined to accept. Did you notice then, Mr. Speaker, the disappointment of the hon. member for Red Deer? Why, Sir, our hon. friends opposite fancied for a few moments that they were back in power. They are going to be disappointed.

Now, I want to make a few remarks which I think I am bound to make. I am not speaking here as a Catholic nor as a member of any religion; I am taking my stand on this question as a Canadian. There seems to be an impression in the different provinces, perhaps our French Liberal papers in Quebec are responsible for it, that an attempt is being made to set race against race and religion against religion. I am bound to say that I regret that this question, in some quarters—fortunately not among the members of this House who realize the great mission that has been confided to them by the electors of this country—has been unwisely discussed. I have seen it stated in some of the newspapers that the Ne Temere decree must be taken up and settled in parliament, because we in the province of Quebec are a priest-ridden people, that a foreign bishop makes laws for us, and because those laws have been read from the pulpits in our province, they therefore become the laws of the province. I want to tell the people of the nine provinces of this Confederation that whilst we may, Catholics and Protestants, adore God in a different manner, that whilst we may go to different churches, we are all British subjects, and we make our own laws in Quebec. There are two lives which every Canadian leads, one is his private life and the other is his public life. His religion belongs to himself, that is a sacred thing. We have seen religious wars, we have seen discussions on religion and people taking up arms about religion. Why? Because people believe that everything in their own religion is all right.

Let everybody believe what he likes, and what he thinks right. We are strong in our religious beliefs, and why? Because we have learned them from our mother's knee, from our mothers, the sweetest effort of God's creation. We have imbibed our religious beliefs with the milk which we have found near their hearts, and that is probably the reason why Protestants and Catholics in this country differ on so many questions. But although we may differ on religious questions there are points on which we can agree. There is one point on which we can all agree, and that is that when a question like the one before the House comes up for discussion and decision, although we may look at it from different points of view, we are glad that the constitution of this country has provided for a higher court, a higher tribunal, in the Privy Council of England, where we can carry this question to the foot of the Throne and have it definitely decided. I am a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian, and I am not going to ask that this question should be decided by a Roman Catholic priest or a Roman Catholic bishop. I am prepared as a British subject to carry this question to the foot of the Throne and lay it before His Majesty, and I do not think there ought to be one man in this House on either side who should object

to the question being settled in that way by the Privy Council. Everybody in this country who is a British subject and who understands his duty will bow with submission to the judgment of the highest court of the empire. A good deal of uncertainty has been created in the public mind by some of the remarks that have fallen from hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who made a speech so eloquent and so forcible —and I beg him to accept my sincere congratulations— has tried to clear the atmosphere of some of the doubts which have surrounded this question, and he has performed a noble and patriotic duty. Some hon. members have criticised his remarks, and have said: Why, this is a strange thing, we are now told that the Ne Temere decree is not in force in any of the nine provinces of Canada. Sir, the Ne Temere decree has no civil effect in this country, and I know whereof I speak. No one of the Roman Catholic hierarchy pretends for a moment that the Ne Temere decree has any civil or legal effect in Canada. The right hon. the leader of the opposition has said so very frankly and very loyally. My hon. friend agrees with what has been said by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MACDONALD. The Minister of Finance agreed with him.

Mr. PELLETIER. Well, it is all right; I am prepared to put it in that way. Let us have this question settled and let us not have any other hon. gentleman sitting behind my right hon. friend come and tell my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that he is wrong when he agrees with the right hon. leader of the opposition. The Ne Temere decree, like the Council of Trent, is a pronouncement made by the Catholic church, just like a pronouncement made by the head of the Anglican church, by the Presbyteries and Synods of the different religious bodies in Canada—even by the Orangemen. They pass laws and, if I am not mistaken, they tell me that it is forbidden in the Orange order for an Orangeman to marry a Catholic girl. If the Orange order says that, if the Presbyterian church says that, and if the Methodist church says that, are you surprised that the pope is of a different opinion? Let us have some give and take about this. Let us give to all religious beliefs the right to say as they are all saying, that they may make certain rules from the point of view of their own church that do not bind people who do not belong to that church. Such rules do not bind so far as the civil law of any country is concerned. That seems to me as clear as it is possible for any man to make it. I have here a quotation from the 'Tablet,' the organ of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster and an authority on Catholicism. What do I find on this question of the Ne Temere decree?

The decree speaks only of canonical nullity or validity of marriages; that is the nullity or validity in the judgement of the Catholic Church and in the sight of God. The Catholic Church, though she does not acknowledge that the state has any right to determine what marriages shall be null or valid, has no power to change the civil law of marriage.

That is an authoritative statement.

Therefore, nowithstanding the recent decree, if two persons of any religion whatever, against whose marrying there is no legal impediment (that is no civil impediment according to the law of England), marry each other in England according to the requirement of the English law, their marriage is (and such marriage will continue to be) in law, valid and binding, whether a priest or other minister of religion be present or not.

This is the universal opinion of all the Catholics of this country. The Roman Catholic church does not pretend to impose its views on different religious beliefs or different religions. It is preposterous to say that, and I hope and trust that before long, if there are any people in this country who still believe that to be the case, they will come to a better knowledge and understanding of the whole position. I have read with some interest a question which was put in the British House of Commons on this very subject last summer when things were at fever heat. The question was put to the government and I have here the answer which the government gave.

An hon. MEMBER. Who asked the question?

Mr. PELLETIER. I do not know who asked the question. I thought that was not very important if I had the answer.

Mr. Birrell (a minister of the British government) said 'The law knows nothing of papal marriage legislation. We believe that under it, our Catholic fellow men are not so free as we to marry and divorce and marry again. Our courts will continue to administer our own law, and all who apply for its benefits shall have them. It has lost none of its efficiency since August 2, 1907.

That is the answer that was given. I read the other day a statement in a paper over which appeared these headings:

MARRIAGE IS VALID .

Famous Case in which Papal Decree was Invoked.

In this case the judge declared that the Ne Temere decree did not apply in Ireland.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Why go to the Privy Council after arguing for five or ten minutes like the hon. gentleman has, that the Pope and the whole hierarchy of the church have declared that this Ne Temere decree does not interfere with our civil rights?

Mr. PELLETIER. My hon. friend is a very brilliant lawyer in Montreal but he is absolutely astray with regard to the question he has put. The question that is going to be referred to the Privy Council is not whether the Ne Temere decree is of civil effect, but whether a certain Bill proposed by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is constitutional or within the powers of this parliament.

Mr. PROULX. If my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) thinks that it is only a canonical decree and has no effect in civil law, why pass an Act such as the hon. member for Lincoln proposes?

Mr. PELLETIER. I am showing that there is some misapprehension of opinion between eminent lawyers like my hon. friend from Lincoln on the one side and some hon. gentlemen on the other, and so many doubts have arisen that this Bill has been proposed. It is evident that there is doubt since some lawyers are of one opinion and others of another opinion. So we shall refer the question to the Privy Council and have it threshed out. I suppose my hon. friend will understand and appreciate my answer. I think it is our bounden duty at the present moment not only to thresh out this question and to try to have the decision of the Privy Council, but to try and remove all causes of possible friction between different classes of citizens in this Canada of ours.

If some Canadians belonging to certain religious beliefs think that another religion or some other Canadians entertaining or having some other religious beliefs are encroaching on their rights, the sooner we dispel this idea the better for the future of this country and of confederation. I was surprised when I saw that and I asked myself: What kind of a lawyer have they in Ireland who has gone before the Courts of Justice there and pretended that the Ne Temere decree could be a bugbear. It seems to me that is some trick—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That was not the question. You speak of the case of Usher and Usher.

Mr. PELLETIER. A landlord called Usher.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The case was before the court, the validity of the marriage was attacked because the requirements of the Ne Temere decree had not been observed, in that only one witness was present, instead of two.

Mr. PELLETIER. The marriage had not taken place according to the requirements of the Catholic religion. We hear a great deal about the protection of women. I believe in protecting the women, and I believe the children of this country should have a standing. But what do we see in this case? We see a gentleman, a landlord named Usher, a Galway landlord who went over and wanted to be married at 11 o'clock in the evening to a housemaid; apparently he could not wait. There was one child issue of the marriage, and when that landlord, who had thought fit to put his landlordism at the feet of his housemaid, after some months thought he would throw her into the street as an outcast, wanted to have the marriage dissolved, it was not dissolved, and it serves him right.

I would not like anybody in this country or in this House to believe that the Ne Temere decree would have any such effect as this landlord desired. As I said, I am not authorized to speak for any religion here, but I think we are all Christians, we are Protestants, Presbyterians, Methodists, Catholics, but we are all Christians, and there is one thing on which we shall agree: that is that before the Christian era women did not occupy the high position which they have occupied since the beginning of the Christian era. Since that glorious time, all Christians have paid to women the respect taught to us by the one common Lord and Saviour whom we all adore, although in different ways and in different churches. I do not want anybody to believe that the Roman Catholic religion wants to make outcasts of poor women and to make illegitimate the children of those whose marriage has been declared null. There is, as has been declared by the Minister of Finance, an article in our Civil Code which says that even when marriages are declared null they produce all their civil effects as between husband and wife and as far as children are concerned. The Catholic church does not want to dissolve marriages.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). What is the effect of the dissolution under the law?

Mr. PELLETIER. The effect is the marriage though annulled produces all its civil effects. The chidren are legitimate and the husband still bound to support his wife. I think all Christian religions are on the same footing, we are all opposed to clandestine marriages. We try and put as

many obstacles in the way of clandestine marriages as possible.

Two Catholics who go to a Protestant minister, if they think they ought to go are at liberty to do so. and we respect their opinion. But why do they go there? Very often in order to make a clandestine marriage. If they do not marry before their priest they have some reason for that, and we have found, I have seen many cases of young girls who were married in this way, the clergyman who performed the marriage ceremony had the marriage license all right, he was within his rights, he was doing his duty, but sometimes marriage licenses are obtained by improper means. The result is that we see in the papers very often that the father of a boy or a girl goes after the young groom or bride as quickly as possible to bring him or her back home. It is in order to avoid things like that that these decrees have been issued by the Catholic religion. The object is good, it is very good, and it is one which members of all religions have always upheld, that marriage should be public and celebrated openly so as to prevent any possible mistake and, as much as possible, bigamy.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I do not think my hon. friend understood my question. I understood him to say that notwithstanding the dissolution of a marriage it does not affect the legitimacy of the children or their rights of property. I asked what, under these decisions, was the effect of dissolving the marriage.

Mr. PELLETIER. Nor civil effect. The religious is dissolved, but the legal mutual obligations remain. This is as far as two Catholics are concerned. As has been shown in one stated case to-night, it has never been pretended and is not now, that mixed marriages, that is a marriage between a Roman Catholic and a Protestant, are invalid, they are perfectly valid and legal and are considered as such by the Roman Catholic church itself.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Both civil and sacramental?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes, both civil and sacramental. The mixed marriage is ill-advised, it should not take place, but it is legal. The question is only as to a marriage between two Catholics before a non-Catholic clergyman. These are considered null by the Catholic church. Let me now quote the text of Article 163 of our civil code. It will show that we are a civilized people in Quebec.

A marriage although declared null, produces civil effects, as well with regard to the husband and wife as with regard to the children, if contracted in good faith.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Take the Hébert case, where both husband and wife are Roman Catholics, and are married by a Protestant clergyman. Assuming that the court will decide that marriage is invalid, and that the final court of appeal decides that, will the children be regarded as legitimate?

Mr. PELLETIER. Certainly.

Mr. SINCLAIR. And will the wife have all her civil rights notwithstanding that decision?

Mr. PELLETIER. Certainly.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the husband still be compelled to support her?

Mr. PELLETIER. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). If the Ne Temere does not affect the civil law of any province in Canada, does not affect marriages of Protestants or mixed marriages, where is the need of this Bill? Why vex our souls and give us all this trouble.

Mr. PELLETIER. That question has been put to me once already since I rose. I have answered it and I do not propose to answer it again. I shall ask my hon. friend to read it from 'Hansard' to-morrow.

I wish to refer briefly to the question of mixed marriages. As the Minister of Finance has stated mixed marriages are valid both under the civil and the religious law. The Catholic church says they are ill advised and should not be entered into, and the Westminster Confession of Faith say the same thing, so that that great religious body, the Presbyterian church, and the Catholic church agree on that point. I wish to relate an historical fact which should be known throughout the length and breadth of this country and which will conclusively prove the point I wish to make. The Council of Trent which sat in the 17th century, declared that both mixed marriages and marriages between two Catholics would be null if they were not contracted in the presence of the parish priest. Neither this nor any other part of the Trent decree became part of the law of France, ipso facto. Henry III, Henry IV, Louis XIII, Louis XIV published ordinances from time to time incorporating, not the whole of the Trent decree, but some parts of it, in the law of France as it stood when this country became part of the British Empire. One year after that period, in 1764, there was published in Canada what is known as the Benedictine decree issued by Pope Benedict XIV on November 4, 1741. It was extended to Canada by Clement XIII in 1764, one year after the Treaty of Paris. The effect of that decree of Pope Benedict was to exempt Canada from the operation of the Trent decree, as far as mixed marriages were concerned. That is important to bear in mind, so that our Protestant friends may know that there is no pretension on the part of anybody that mixed marriages are at all affected, because the Pope himself has declared that they should not and this issue is therefore settled both from the civil

and religious point of view. This is the condition of affairs which existed before the 2nd of April, 1908. The Ne Temere Decree now forbids from a Catholic religious point of view only mixed marriages before a non-Catholic clergyman, but this is a matter which affects only Catholics and their conscience. It has not civil effect, and does not affect those who are non-Catholics. As 'The Tablet' puts it, the Catholic church has no power to change the civil law of marriage. The impediments to marriage which were in force on the first of August, 1866, continue to exist, but those created after do not come under article 125 of our Civil Code, which speaks only of impediments hitherto existing. Let me point out that that important historical document the Westminster Confession of Faith contains practically the same prohibition against mixed marriages as is contained in the Ne Temere decree. It says:

Chap. XXIV., article III.—'It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent; yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. And, therefore, such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, Papists or other idolators.

The first part of this article says exactly what the Catholic church says, namely: that mixed marriages are lawful but ill-advised. Replace in that sentence the words 'Papists and other idolators,' by the words 'and non-Catholics,' and you have the whole thing. Then this Presbyterian document says:

The practical result of such marriages is either a domestic life embittered in the way described above, or the growth of an indifference, commendable in the eyes of such as Mr. Lecky, but in the view of all evangelical spirits, most deplorable. Observation may convince any one of the truth of the words of Thomas Adams: 'One religion matching with another not seldom breeds an atheist, one of no religion at all.'

I am not going to call this a Protestant Ne Temere decree, but it is the faith which the Presbyterians believe, and we Catholics simply believe the same thing. In conclusion I wish to draw the attention of the House to a few facts which I consider important. I think it was my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) who said that one of the fathers of confederation held that parliament had power to pass such legislation as that now before us. The Conference at Quebec in 1863 and 1864 discussed the various articles which later became the British North America Act, and the fathers of confederation delegated Mr. Langevin, afterwards Sir Hector Langevin, to speak for them on this very question. And he used this language:

Well, amongst these right are all the civil laws of Lower Canada, and among these latter those which relate to marriage; now it was of the highest importance that it should be so under the proposed system, and therefore the members from Lower Canada at the conference, took great care to obtain the reservation to the local government of this important right, and in consenting to allow the word 'marriage' after the word 'divorce,' the delegates have not proposed to take away with one hand from the local legislature what they had reserved to it by the other. So that the word 'marriage' placed where it is among the powers of the central parliament, has not the extended signification which was sought to be given to it by the honourable member. With the view of being more explicit, I now propose to read how the word marriage is proposed to be understood.

When Sir Hector Langevin spoke he had the manuscript in his hand, prepared with the approval of all his colleagues, men like Sir John Macdonald, the Hon. George Brown, Mr. D'Arcy McGee, Mr. Galt, Mr. Chapais; all the great men who sat around the board where the confederation plan was discussed, and he said:

The word marriage has been placed in the draft of the proposed constitution to invest the federal parliament with the right of declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the confederacy, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rights of the religious creeds to which the contracting parties may belong.

After this declaration was made, one of the great men of that day, Sir A. A. Dorion, rose from his seat and said there was nothing but the word of Mr. Langevin to guarantee to us that the laws of Lower Canada were not going to be affected and he used these words:

I can well understand what is meant by the regulation of the law of divorce; but what is meant by the regulation of the marriage question? Is the general government to be at liberty to set aside all that we have been in the habit of doing in Lower Canada in this respect? Will the general government have the power to determine the degree of relationship and the age beyond which persons may marry, as well as the consent which will be required to make the marriage valid? If so, it will have the power to upset one of the most important portions of our civil code and one affecting more than any other all classes of society.

Then Sir Hector Langevin repeated his declaration. He told Sir Antoine Dorion that the declaration had been carefully prepared beforehand, and was going to be the law. Now what do we find, and this is something which every Canadian should know. The articles of confederation, as adopted in 1864, did not contain the words 'the solemnization of marriage' which are, we now find, in the British North America Act. The words 'marriage and divorce' were in those articles, but the words of section 92 were not to be found in them. After the remarks made by Sir Antoine Dorion, and after Sir Hector Langevin's rejoinder, when those gentlemen went to London they caused those words to be in-

serted in the British North America Act. I am giving arguments in order that the public may understand both sides of the question. We have been given the opinion of Mr. Blake. What did Mr. Blake tell us in 1880?

> We cannot provide as to banns dispensations or licenses, preliminary to the solemnization of marriage. The right to legislate on this subject lies with the local legislature.

My right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, will admit that this argument goes very far to show that there are very strong opinions on both sides, and that is the object I had in making these quotations. They show that there was much doubt in the minds of certain people—not in mine—and that is why this matter should be referred to the Privy Council. So far as I am concerned I have not the least doubt that this Bill cannot be dealt with by this parliament. It is ultra vires and it is a matter which ought to be dealt with by the provincial legislatures.

The Hon. David Mills, who was Minister of Justice in the right hon. gentleman's government, said:

> The form in which marriages are to be solemnized is beyond our authority and therefore it is a question which we ought not to deal with.

The late Sir John Macdonald said the same thing. Mr. Justice Girouard, who proposed the bill to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister, expressed a different opinion. But he said that in view of the opinion expressed by Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Blake and Mr. Mills, he yielded to their better judgment and consented to strike from the Bill the dispensation clause which was in it when it was presented to the House.

This discussion will have an important effect. In the first place it will remove a great many doubts and misapprehensions which have heretofore existed. It will prevent religious discussions which are always to be regretted, because they always leave some bitterness behind. In my opinion, the government has done wisely in endeavouring to have the opinion of the highest court in the land before allowing the enacting of any statute. When we have that opinion we shall know whether the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), is right, and I do not see any reason in the meantime why we should not go on and work together as Canadians, Protestants and Catholics combined, for the benefit of this country. That is our bounden duty. And when the majority of this House has removed this question, temporarily at least, from discussion, I hope that the newspapers will follow suit, and that everybody will be content to wait until we have a decision from the Privy Council, and know where we stand.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). The importance of this Bill is the only apology I have to make for venturing to address the House at this late hour. In common with most gentlemen on both sides, I always listen with interest to the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). He is a distinct addition to the party with which he is connected—eloquent, ingenious and an adept at flag waving and restoring the spirits of those surrounding him when they are feeling a little depressed. But I am sorry that he did not make the speech he has just given us a little earlier in the evening when the clouds were hovering around and before the sweet voice and the fine Italian hand of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) had exerted their influence. Had he done so, I do not know whether his remarks would have been received with that enthusiasm which has greeted them. When he indulged in his reference to the province of Quebec in the last election and told us there was no question of a navy or anything else, nothing but the personality of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government—

Mr. PELLETIER. I did not say that.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend spoke with such vehemence that he led us to believe nothing else was said, that nothing was said about boring holes in the British flag, and that the only subject broached was the personality of the right hon. the First Minister.

My hon. friend complained about this Ne Temere decree having been introduced as an issue in our politics. He has not been long in this House. It is unfortunate for him and his aspirations for Canadian patriotism, that he was not here during the last session of parliament, because if he had been, and were moved by the same aspirations as those to which he has given utterance to-night, he would have been behind the man who was Minister of Justice in the late government. Who are those who raised the question about the Ne Temere decree or the marriage laws?

They were certainly not members of the Liberal party, but I recollect occasions on which hon. gentlemen opposite got up and wanted to know from the late Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) and the late government just what they were going to do about this Ne Temere decree. Not long ago I had the privilege of attending a curlers' banquet in Halifax and heard a distinguished member of the Presby-

terian church tell us, as a proof of the great qualities of the race to which we belong, that although there was no Scotchman or Presbyterian in the cabinet, no Presbyterian had said anything about it.

But at last we have found a champion in the person of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). Not only did he undertake to speak for the doctors of the church with which he is connected, but he also told us what the Presbyterians thought about this matter. I do not know, after such a speech, but that we could rely on him in future to look after all our rights in this matter whatever they may be. But when I find him following the lead of his leader (Mr. Borden) of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), and the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds)—all of whom follow the lead of our Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) and our leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in their views upon this question—it may be that his high aspirations will be rewarded, and that he will go not so very far wrong upon this question? Who were the men who introduced this question into the politics of this country? Last session when the previous government was in power, man after man on the Conservative side wanted to know what the government intended to do about this question. The gentleman to whose seat in this House the Minister of Finance succeeded and who was translated to another sphere, again and again, in pathetic tones which every one who sat in the last parliament knew so well, lamented the terrible fate hanging over this people as a result of this nefarious decree which the late government, he complained, would not do a single thing to stop. Was the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) disturbed upon the question. The hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) who introduced this Bill seems to have altogether forgotten his comrade the Minister of Militia——

Mr. LANCASTER. I mentioned him this afternoon. I never forget him; he is an old friend.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We march shoulder to shoulder.

Mr. MACDONALD. If they are shoulder to shoulder, they are now beating a retreat and behind a leader who has taken the very opposite view from that with which they started out. Let us see where the Minister of Militia was on this question in the last parliament. My hon. friend from Lincoln seemed to forget him——

Mr. LANCASTER. I quoted him.

Mr. MACDONALD. Did the hon. gentleman qucte the whole thing? Here is the answer given by Sir Allen Aylesworth to the question put by the present Minister of Militia:

3. Under the British North America Act the subject of marriage and divorce is one in regard to which parliament may legislate but everything to the solemnization of marriage in the provinces is within the exclusive powers of the provincial legislature.

As to be remaining questions, other than question No. 7. Legislation of the character indicated in the questions would appear to refer wholly to the persons by whom, or the form of the ceremony by which, marriages in any province could be validly solemnized, and in that view such legislation would seem not competent for the parliament of Canada to enact.

Now, let us see what was the query of the Minister of Militia. Take this for a sample question—and I commend it to my Presbyterian friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier); it shows what his colleague the Minister of Militia was worrying about. Here is what the present Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) asked:

6. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to declare valid a marriage solemnized in Quebec or in any province of Canada between two persons of the Roman Catholic faith, providing the officiating clergyman be a Protestant, and for the removal of doubt to make the law retroactive?

7. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to permit any ecclesiastical dogma or rule to override the laws of the people of Canada?

8. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to restore to legitimacy every woman who supposed her marriage legally consummated and also the children born of such marriage?

9. Will the government enact legislation compelling alimony to the woman where the man has left her under the ecclesiastical dogma of any church?

And Sir Allen Aylesworth, then Minister of Justice, declared that the dealing with these matters did not rest within the purview of the Dominion parliament but with the provincial legislature.

Mr LANCASTER. No. he did not. He evaded the question, he never answered it distinctly.

Mr. MACDONALD. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster), if the rules of the House will permit him, will rise and declare that he does not agree with the opinion of his leader (Mr. Borden) or that of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty).

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) will permit me, that is not the point on which I contradicted him. I say again that Sir Allen Aylesworth never said distinctly that there was jurisdiction in the provincial legislature. He evaded that point on every occasion.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) in introducing the Bill, made an argument, which from his own standpoint was very effective. But he admitted frankly that he was a prejudiced Tory. And, as such he had to get a crack at somebody on this side, and particularly at Sir Allen Aylesworth. This is what was the latter said in answer to the question of the present Minister of Militia:

> Legislation of the character indicated in the questions would appear to refer wholly to the persons by whom, or the form of the ceremony by which, marriages in any province could be validly solemnized, and in that view such legislation would seem not competent for the parliament of Canada to enact.

Is not that clear?

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not wish to embarrass the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald), but I would point out to him that when counsel says in answer to a question, 'It appears to me that a certain view is expressed and on the basis of that view my opinion is so and so,' that is not a positive opinion. Sir Allen Aylesworth knew what he was being asked but he took care to evade the question.

Mr. MACDONALD. In the statement of the hon. gentleman's leader to-night, that hon. gentleman said categorically that he agreed with the opinion of Sir Allen Aylesworth. And the Finance Minister who went into this historically and most elaborately, and with an apparent assiduity and interest upon which he is to be complimented, declared that he followed the same views. The followers of the late government, following their Minister of Justice declared that this question was not within the purview of this parliament and that they did not propose to legislate upon it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Which question?

Mr. MACDONALD. The question which my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) submitted.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But that is not the question brought before the House by the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster).

Mr. MACDONALD. It is practically the same. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia was not present for a great part of the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) or he would have known that he discussed the question which the hon. gentleman asked and which I have already quoted. If his Bill means anything, it means dealing with the situation which the present Minister of Militia attempted to call to the attention of Sir Allen Aylesworth as Minister of Justice. And what was the position at the close of the last parliament? The Liberals stood by the opinion of the Liberal Minister of Justice and we went to the country on that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You went to the country on reciprocity.

Mr. MACDONALD. On that and on our whole record.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A bad record.

Mr. MACDONALD. One thing is sure, and that is that the Minister of Militia is not worrying about this question as he did last session. He is nicely seated in the Department of Militia and 'does not care whether school keeps or not.' But my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is evidently vexed in regard to this question. It was evident that he felt the question ought to be dealt with. Any one who reads the press of Ontario or follows the utterances of its pulpit, knows that as a result of the representations made, this question attracts a great deal of attention and that as a result of those representations there is a demand that this parliament shall act. But in view of all the facts it is evident that the former Minister of Justice was not far wrong in his opinion. On the 30th of November a question was put in which these questions by the present Minister of Militia were quoted and the following was asked:—

> Does the government agree with the opinion expressed by Sir Allen Aylesworth? If not, what are the reasons?

In reply to the third question the leader of the government said, 'The matter has not been under consideration.' Apparently the leader of the government had no opinion on this question on November 30. The soul of my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) in that same debate was vexed about the disregard of this question by the late government.

His leader on November 30 had no opinion on this question. The member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) follows a leader, who told us that on November 30th he had no opinion on the question at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. My Bill was in the hands of the clerk before the House met, on the 15th of November.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then the member for Lincoln had an opinion on this question when his leader had not?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, and was not afraid to declare it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the opinion of the member for Pictou?

Mr. MACDONALD. I have the same opinion on the legal question as Sir Allen Aylesworth. Let us trace the history of this government on this question. The Postmaster General was complaining about this question being inter-

jected into the politics of the country, while the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) complained that nobody on the Liberal side was saying anything. The member for Lincoln introduced his Bill, and the leader of the government, after thinking it over, finds that Sir Allen Aylesworth was right. The Minister of Justice has thought about it, and he finds that Sir Allen Aylesworth was right. The Minister of Finance finds he was right, and the Postmaster General finds he was right. And yet these doughty gentlemen have been telling their friends that they were going to be bold on this question, and act in a decisive manner. They have failed to do anything, they are trying to evade responsibility by referring the question to the courts. Why, Sir, the leader of the government knows that the most unsatisfactory decisions that have ever come from the Privy Council have been made upon academic questions submitted in the form this one will be. The Privy Council has given us decision after decision which is most difficult of interpretation and application. Who can tell us what is the relative power of this federal government and the relative powers of the provincial legislatures in regard to the question of temperance, for instance? Take the decision of the Privy Council in regard to fisheries and the rights on foreshores. Every lawyer who has studied those questions knows that the relative powers of the provincial and federal governments are as difficult as ever of interpretation. The Toronto 'Telegram said on Saturday night that the hon. member for Lincoln would not be deterred by any specious arguments, but he was going to stand by his guns, and it called upon the leader of the government to stand up and go straight ahead. How dissapointed those gentlemen will be when they find out how this government evaded the question, sending it to the courts where it will take two or three years to decide, and then we will have a decision which no one will be able to understand. We have no positive declaration from the leader of the government that he will introduce a Bill if the Privy Council should declare that the federal government have jurisdiction. We would like to know just where the government stands with regard to that situation. The member for Lincoln complained that the leader of the government had not even stated in his first speech that he was prepared to submit the Bill he had introduced for the consideration of the courts. The leader of the government says that he did say so, but the member for Lincoln declared he was not satisfied with simply submitting a copy of the Bill, but he wanted to have a Bill passed into legislation in order that it might go in that form before the Privy Council.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. LANCASTER. I never said anything of the kind. I wanted the Bill itself to go to the Privy Council, and not an academic question. I made that clear twice.

Mr. MACDONALD. I accept my hon. friend's statement, but let the unrevised 'Hansard' be read to-morrow. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter), who made a very diplomatic speech, apparently by arrangement, declared that he had argued himself into the position that it was absolutely necessary in order to have a proper decision, that a Bill passed by this House should be sent home for the opinion of the Privy Council. The sudden collapse of that gentleman when his leader intimated that he was going to accept the Bill of the member for Lincoln without any deliberation by the House upon its details, was an interesting spectacle. Both he and the member for Lincoln ignominiously retreated. They have disobeyed the injunctions of the Toronto 'Telegram' and the pulpits of Ontario, and have capitulated to the evasive policy of the leader of the government. For myself, I am absolutely opposed to the settlement of a question of such importance by submitting an academic question to the courts. My experience as a member of the bar for twenty years has convinced me that the submission of academic questions to the Supreme Court and the Privy Council has not given satisfactory results, but have resulted in decisions which are most difficult in their application. Let there be no misunderstanding; the leader of the government and his whole following have retreated, and taken cover behind Sir Allen Aylesworth. They had not the pluck he had shown to stand by their opinions. Then the Minister of the Interior, with a fine Italian hand, performed some magic feats of which the House does not know the details, but perhaps they will be disclosed in due time. which has caused a change to come over some hon. gentlemen opposite who were very valiant earlier in the day. Mr. Speaker, we oppose this proposition upon the grounds that the government have once more evaded their plain duty, and have determined to do nothing in order to avoid responsibility.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). I am impressed with the conviction that this is one of the most important questions that has come before this parliament for many a day. There is no doubt that it is a question primarily to be decided by men of legal training.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate so far, and I know I cannot add anything to what has been said from the constitutional and legal standpoints. I shall, therefore, not attempt to.

I wish to state most emphatically that the impression which the great political comedian from Red Deer, endeavoured to convey to the House this evening that the Ne Temere decree was the only subject for discussion in the province of Ontario in the last election is absolutely incorrect. In the county that I have the honour to re present, the question was never mentioned on any platform, nor was it mentioned by me in my canvass to one single individual. It is very true that there was a certain amount of doubt in the minds of the people of Ontario in regard to this very question, and there are many reasons why they should doubt hon. gentlemen opposite, but the doubt was not in regard to this question alone. The people of Ontario doubted the honesty of hon. gentlemen opposite, and we have only to look over the record of their government to see that that doubt was justified. They had a right to doubt them on this question, and they have reason to recall the position taken by the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with regard to the Manitoba school question in 1896, and to contrast it with the position which the right hon. gentlemen took at the formation of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. There were strong reasons why the people of Ontario should doubt the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues on the other side of the House. I could go to a considerable length as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), did a while ago, I could go on for fifteen or twenty minutes and, like him, add nothing to the debate on this question. Every person in this House knew before the hon. gentleman had spoken at all precisely what his concluding sentence would be. Every person was aware of the position he would take. On a question which is of such importance as this, which has been looked into and studied so carefully by many hon. gentlemen, it seems that the only position left for a person who is not a lawyer, and, therefore, not competent to discuss it from the legal standpoint, is simply to express his opinion in regard to the principle involved, and that is all I rose to do. I want to place on record that in my opinion the principle involved in this Bill that there should be a uniform marriage law throughout the Dominion of Canada is one which is in the interest of the people, and one with which I agree. That is my reason for rising, and I shall not detain the House any further than to say that I felt I could best indicate my approval of the principle involved by expressing my approval of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster).

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Borden).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Achim,	McKay,
Aikins,	McLean (Queen's P.E.I.),
Alguire,	Merner,
Ames,	Middlebro,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Monk,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Morphy,
Arthurs,	Nantel,
Baker,	Nicholson,
Ball,	Nickle,
Barker,	Northrup,
Barnard,	Paquet,
Barrette,	Paul,
Beattie,	Pelletier,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Porter,
Borden,	Reid (Grenville),
Bowman,	Rhodes,
Boyce,	Robidoux,
Brabazon,	Roche,
Bradbury,	Rogers,
Burnham,	Schaffner,
Burrell,	Sexsmith,
Carrick,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Chabot,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Clark (Bruce),	Shepherd,
Clements,	Smith,
Cochrane,	Smyth,
Cockshutt,	Staples,
Coderre,	Stevens,
Crocket,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Crothers,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Currie,	Sutherland,
Doherty,	Taylor,
Fisher,	Thoburn,
Foster (King's, N.S.),	Thompson (Yukon),
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Thornton,
Gauthier (Gaspé),	Tremain,
Girard,	Wallace,
Goodeve,	Webster,
Hartt,	White (Leeds),
Hazen,	White (Renfrew),
Hepburn,	Wilcox and
Hughes (Victoria),	Wilson
Jameson,	(Wentworth).—87.
Lamarche,	
Lennox,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Béland,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Blain,	Lemieux,
Boivin,	Loggie,
Boyer,	Lovell,
Brown,	Macdonald,
Buchanan,	Maclean (York, O.),
Bureau,	MacNutt,
Cardin,	McCraney,
Carroll,	McCrea,
Cash,	McKenzie,
Chisholm (Antigonish)	McMillan,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Marcile (Bagot),
Clark (Red Deer),	Martin (Montreal,
Clarke (Essex),	Ste. Mary's),
Delisle,	Molloy,
Devlin,	Murphy,
Douglas,	Oliver,
Edwards,	Papineau,
Emmerson,	Proulx,
Fortier,	Richards,
Gauvreau,	Robb,
Guthrie,	Ross,
Hughes (King's,	Seguin,

P.E.I.), Sinclair,
Kay, Thomson.
Kidd, (Qu'Appelle),
Knowles, Tobin,
Kyte, Turriff,
Lafortune, Verville,
Lancaster, Warnock,
Lapointe White (Victoria,
(Kamouraska), Alta) and
Lapointe (Montreal, Wilson (Laval).—61.
St. James),

Amendment (Mr. Borden) agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. HENDERSON. A few moments before the division was called I had agreed to pair with the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). As I had done so I remained in the Chamber. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has not voted.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am paired with the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. McCurdy). Otherwise I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. Bills, except the Grain Bill, then Supply, beginning with Public Works.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) will bring up the question of the duty collected on lumber, which was brought up some time ago.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.02 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 23, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VACANCY IN SOUTH RENFREW.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister if the writ for South Renfrew has been issued?

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). Not yet.

ELECTION EXPENSES IN TEMISCOUATA.

Mr. GAUVREAU. I wished to ask a question of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), who unfortunately is not now in his seat. I would, therefore, ask the Prime Minister if he will be good enough to take note of a complaint that has come to me that the expenses for the election in Temiscouata have not yet been paid to the deputy returning officer. I would like to know why.

Mr. BORDEN. In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I am not able to give the information which the hon. gentleman has asked. But I shall direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the question, and request him to give the information at the earliest possible moment.

THE TOWER CLOCK.

Mr. MONK. I would like to say for the information of the House that I have finally been able to reach the man who has charge of the parliamentary clock. He is suffering from a severe cold. According to his report, the clock has stopped in consequence of the peculiar climate which we are now experiencing and which occurs almost every year. Dampness has formed on the movements, particularly the outside hands of the clock, and they become so charged with frost that it is impossible to remove it without danger to the clock itself and to the building. It is necessary, therefore, to wait until a thaw releases the machinery.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. I may say to my right hon. friend that the clock stopped on Friday night last while the House had under consideration the estimates for Public Works. I do not know whether there was any relation between the stoppage of the clock and the consideration of those estimates. As we are going to resume the consideration of those estimates, perhaps hon. members will bear in mind the coincidence that brought about the stoppage of the clock.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Mr LEMIEUX. If I am in order, may I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any decision has been made as regards the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal? I saw the other day a question on the Order Paper put by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), to which no answer was given, that I am aware of. But since then, on Saturday evening or Friday evening, a political meeting was held in Montreal where a resolution was adopted praying for the dismissal of the said Harbour Commissioners. Yesterday a meeting of the Board of Trade took place in Mont-

real, and a resolution was passed unanimously endorsing the stand taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and praying for the retention of those Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman of the rule which prohibits discussing a question on the order paper before it is reached. The notice of that question is still on the order paper.

CAR SHORTAGE IN THE WEST.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the government to the very serious car shortage which exists in the southern part of the province of Alberta. The attention of the government has been drawn to the car shortage in other parts of western Canada during this session, but I think this is the first time a shortage of this kind has been felt in the province of Alberta, from which I come.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member intend to start a discussion, or does he simply require to ask a question? To discuss the question would be out of order at this stage.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity when the House is moved into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will take the matter up on going into Supply.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. HAZEN. moved the third reading of Bill (No. 31) to amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act 1899.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Since we had this Bill before us, I have again read the observations of my hon. friend the minister in charge of the Bill when moving the second reading, and when we were in Committee of the Whole. The only reason I could find why my hon. friend has taken the course to abolish the present Harbour Commission of Quebec and to substitute a new one, is that the same thing was done in Montreal a few years ago. I cannot find that any other reason was given. If I correctly apprehended the cheer that was given by the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), the reason was a political one, that it was done in Montreal, therefore it should be done in Quebec. The Harbour Commission in Montreal has certainly done excellent service, and nothing but praise can be said of it. But my hon. friend knows that the conditions are not at all parallel in Quebec and in Montreal. In Montreal the chief reason why the former Harbour Commission was suppressed and the present one appointed, was that it was found that on account of the magnitude of the works which were going on at that time in the harbour of Montreal, and must go on for several years to come, the old commission was found not to afford a satisfactory mode of carrying on those works. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are spending millions of dollars every year, out of the revenues of the harbour, for the improvement of the harbour. No such conditions at all exist in Quebec. I wish it were otherwise, I wish we could do as much for the harbour of Quebec, and that the commissioners in Quebec had as much money to dispose of as the Montreal Harbour Commissioners. Unfortunately such is not the position today, though I hope that in the near future this may come. Therefore, I do not see why the Quebec Commission should be treated in the same way as the former commission in Montreal.

There is one thing as to which my hon. friend has been absolutely silent; that is to say, what is to be the remuneration of the harbour commissioners. The harbour commissioners of Montreal are pretty largely and generously rewarded, although their remuneration is not too much, as I think the money has been earned, but are we to understand that the harbour commissioners of Quebec are going to be remunerated upon the same scale as the harbour commissioners in Montreal, or has this matter been taken into consideration at all? I do not propose to oppose the Bill. Since the government has made up its mind there will be no use in prolonging the discussion, but I would like to know what is the intention of my hon. friend upon this point.

Mr. HAZEN. In reply to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I have very little more to add to what I said to the House when the second reading of this Bill was being considered. It is thought desirable, in the first place, by the Quebec Board of Trade, a body which, I am informed, represents very largely indeed the business interests and the best business thought of Quebec, that it would be in the interest of that port and of the country generally if a smaller commission than the one which now exists, were provided for by legislation and I fancy that, to some extent, the members of the board were influenced in the direction of this idea by the fact that the harbour commission of Montreal, consisting of three members, has proved so much more satisfactory than the larger body whose place it took. Since the discussion occurred in the House several weeks ago the matter was reported in the newspapers and there was every opportunity for any

one who wishes to oppose this Bill, or who was not in favour of its provisions, to make his representations known. Not a single representation against it, however, has been made to me by any one in the city of Quebec; on the contrary, representations have been made to me not only by people living in the city of Quebec, who are in touch with the business life of the city, but by people living on the other shore of the River St. Lawrence, approving of the change, and expressing the belief that more effective work will be done by a smaller commission. It is true, as has been pointed out by my right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, that the conditions in Quebec are somewhat different from those in Montreal. In Montreal there is an enormous expansion of the trade of that port going on every year, and it is quite evident that for a great many years to come there will have to be very large expenditures at that port if facilities for handling the traffic are going to keep pace with the traffic that will undoubtedly go there during the season of open navigation. It is also certain that with the development of the country, and with the building of new lines of railway, some of which are in course of construction, there will be a large development of business also at Quebec, that it will not all be confined to the port of Montreal, but that the ancient capital of Canada will receive its share, and will attain to that position of commercial importance, and supremacy which it is so desirable it should occupy. It is felt, in anticipation of that business, that it is desirable that the harbour board should be reorganized and an organization affected that will be able to deal effectively with the traffic as the harbour board of Montreal are dealing with the traffic at that port.

With regard to what my right hon. friend said on the subject of remuneration, I might say that it would seem to me that it would not be justifiable to pay the harbour commissioners of Quebec, at the present time, any such sum as has been paid to the harbour commissioners of Montreal, because the business to be done in Montreal is so much greater in volume, and importance, and demands a greater proportion of the time of the commission. What the Governor in Council will endeavour to do, I presume, will be to fix a sum that will be a fair remuneration for the position, having regard to the responsibility and the amount of work that is involved on the part of the commissioners. These things will all be considered before the remuneration is fixed.

Mr. PELLETIER. Mr. Speaker, I may perhaps be allowed to say a few words in answer to the remarks made by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My right hon. friend seemed to find fault because the government is reducing from nine to three the number of the members of the Board of Harbour Commissioners in Quebec, and one of the reasons which was given is that there is much less work to do in Quebec than in Montreal. It seems to me that if there is much less work to do in Quebec than in Montreal there is no reason why we should have nine men to do less work in Quebec than three in Montreal. I am sure that will appeal to my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Far from it. Everybody's business is nobody's business.

Mr. PELLETIER. In so far as that goes, I think what my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) has just said is a complete justification of the move which has resulted in the Bill now before the House. My right hon. friend seems to think that there is very little to do in Quebec. Well, I hope there will be much doing in Quebec. I think that Quebec is one of the national ports of this country and that it should be taken care of in a proper way. I think that, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has just said, with the completion of certain railways, if this country is going to ship its grain and have its export trade going through Canadian ports, as every true Canadian should wish and desire, the time has come to equip our national harbours and to see that we should have, as members of the different harbour boards all over the Dominion a body of men who will feel that it is their duty to try and take up this question and accomplish the good results which are expected from them. I fully hope and expect that before long the port of Quebec will be taken care of as it should be, and I hope and trust that my right hon. friend will be one of the first to help us in that matter, and to see that the equipment of the port is properly handled and taken care of. At this point I think we should have, intead of nine men attending to their own business, going once in a while to attend a meeting of the harbour board and getting $5 or $10 for being present, three men who would make it their business to attend to the matters of the port and not go to the meetings only occasionally. That is the great difficulty which we have had to contend with in the past. I can understand that it is with some reluctance that my right hon. friend sees this harbour board going. He has kept it there in spite of numerous requests which came to him when he was Prime Minister of this country. He received request after request demand after demand. He never considered that it was his duty to accede to these

demands, but they were so unanimous that we thought we should recognize them and give the people there what they want. The other day, when this Bill was up for its second reading, my right hon. friend told us that we knew that the Quebec Board of Trade had passed a unanimous resolution year after year, but that the board of trade at Levis had not passed any such resolution. I did not like to contradict my right hon. friend on this point, because I had not the facts before me, but now I am in a position to tell him that he has been misinformed on this question and that this very morning my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself received a deputation composed of the mayor of Levis and the president of the board of trade, who, by the way, is one of my right hon. friend's most faithful supporters and party friends, and they told us that they also had requested the government to make this change. Mr. Auger told us, as president of the board of trade, that this change was welcomed not only in Quebec but in Lévis. We are doing what the population demand, we are complying with the demand of trade at that port, and I do not see why we should be blamed for it. What harm is there? What have these nine men done? My right hon. friend will admit that they have not done much. They are full of vigor but they have their own business to attend to and they have not accomplished much for the port of Quebec.

I am not blaming them; they were worthy citizens; they meant well; but they did not consider it an important part of their duty as citizens. Now, we propose to make it their special duty to attend to the business of the port, and I hope and trust that before long the capital of the province of Quebec will take its place as a national port, and we want three good men who will look after it as such in the interest of the whole of Canada. That is the stand we have taken, and I think that in a couple of years, if not before, my right hon. friend will admit that we have done a good thing.

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

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 66), respecting the Public Archives.—Mr. Borden.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

Bill (No. 75), to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act (Mr. Doherty) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—attendance for part of session,

Mr. DOHERTY. The only modification effected in the existing law is by the insertion of the word 'sitting' in the twelfth line of the section before the word 'day'. The evil sought to be remedied by the insertion of that word is that under the law as it now stands a gentleman who is appointed to the Senate or elected to this House during a session finds himself subjected to a deduction from his indemnity, of $15, not only for each sitting day that he is absent during the period in which he is a member, but for every day that elapses during the session, before his appointment and in the same way a gentleman who ceases to be a member of either House during the session finds himself subjected to a deduction of $15 for every day that elapses after he so ceases, whether the House sits upon that day or not.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—SHORTAGE OF CARS IN THE WEST.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I would like to bring up the matter of the car shortage in the province of Alberta, and to ask the government to take some action immediately to assist the farmers in that section of the country to get relief from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the only railway at the present time in that part of the country, and the only railway against which complaint is made. I would like to quote from the Lethbridge 'Daily Herald' of Friday last, which enumerates the conditions at several points in southern Alberta, in order to impress upon the government the very serious nature of this car shortage. The conditions this year in southern Alberta, as in the rest of western Canada, were unusual. The harvesting was very late, and then the snow came, so that the threshing was delayed, and the farmers have been able to get their grain threshed only during periods of fine weather, which have not been very frequent during the last three or four months. But now, when the farmers have great quantities of grain for shipment, it is impossible for them to get the cars from the railway company, and they are unable to get any money, or sell their grain. The situation is very serious, as the following statements show:

Place.	Cars on order.	Condition of Elevators.	Estimated Crop, Bush.	Amount shipped.	Car Supply during last Month.
Granum.....	400	Filled up.....	1,000,000	250,000	2 or 3 cars in last 2 weeks.
Claresholm..	250	Filled up.....	1,750,000	350,000	Practically none—no Market.
Warner.....	50	Full not crowded...	600,000	Less than half....	Getting a few.
Barons.....	480	Filled up	1,000,000	250,000	4 or 5 in two weeks.
Carmangay.	100	Filled up	1,500,000	Almost 1,000,000	Not a car for last month.
Taber	300	All full..... ...	1,000,000	300,000	What cars are unloaded.
Cardston....	Few.	Plenty of room.....	1,250,000	Probably half.....	Getting all they want.
Sterling	100	Almost full..... ..	1,000,000	About one-third...	3 or 4 a week.
Magrath....	75	Filled up.....	1,000,000	Less than one-third	Practically none.
Coaldale....	25	Filled up.....	500,000	Over half.....	One once in a while.

I think that that is a very serious charge to be made against any railway, particularly in western Canada, namely, that they were unable to supply sufficient cars. These figures have been gathered by the secretary of the Associated Board of Trade of Southern Alberta from Boards of Trade in these respective points, so that they are practically official figures from commercial organizations. Those places on the line of the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company, running south from Lethbridge, and owned and operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are in a better position than the other points mentioned. I would like to quote also the statement made by Mr. J. A. Cummings, president of the Granum Board of Trade, in his report to the Associated Boards of Trade of Southern Alberta, in which he says:

J. A. Cumming, president of Granum Board of Trade, says that grain could hardly be given away there. Four hundred cars on order; less than half the crop marketed; outlook serious. At the last general meeting of the board of trade a resolution was unanimously passed, protesting against existing conditions of the car supply, and the resolution forwarded to the district superintendent of the Canadian Pacific railway at Calgary, asking for relief.

I would like to point out in this connection that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company must have realized, from the commencement of the present season, that there was sure to be a great demand for cars in western Canada, especially in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, at an unusual time, because there was a delay in the harvesting of the crop and in the threshing of the grain and consequently the farmers would have to be shipping grain at periods of the year at which they were not accustomed to ship to such an extent. The company has been negligent of the people of western Canada especially of southern Alberta, which relies wholly on the Canadian Pacific railway for its transportation service. I would therefore urge on the government to use every effort to relieve the situation and to urge on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they put forth every effort to relieve the needs of the farmers of southern Alberta.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Medicine Hat has drawn attention certainly to a very important phase of a very difficult question, namely, the condition of things in the northwest, but I am bound to say that he has done it with great fairness, and no fault could be found at all as to either the manner or the matter of the presentation he has made. He was fair enough to state what is known by all, that the present year has been a very exceptional one. The lateness of the harvest, the coal difficulty, the weather and other things less important have all combined, with the large output of grain, to make the situation more difficult than in other years. I have no disposition at all to call in question the figures which my hon. friend has read. I assume them to be correct. Of course, the newspaper, I suppose, was occupied in emphasizing the difficulty, but in the department we get some letters of a brighter character from points where the blockade has been broken and where cars have been fairly well supplied, and where conditions are much better and are rapidly ameliorating. It is, however, true that, owing to all these things which have been mentioned, there has been a serious condition of congestion in the whole of the Northwest, especially west of the province of Manitoba. I think the railways have done all they could under the circumstances. I am led to think so, not only from representations which have been made by the railways themselves, but from representations from perfectly unbiased sources as a result of examinations which have been made.

I want to read just a few figures which I happen to have in my desk. If I had known that my hon. friend was going to bring up this matter, I could have given him fuller information; but these figures will at least show another side of the case. The number of cars inspected in the western inspection division up to the end of December in 1901-2 was 30,458. Leaving several years out of account, we find that in the same period in 1906-7 the number was 34,855; in 1907-8, 35,827; in 1908-9, 59,816; in 1909-10, 69,748; in 1910-11, 59,124; in 1911-12, 83,001. Thus in a season, which was

practically one month shorter than the preceding one, the number of cars inspected was very satisfactory, namely, 83,000 as compared with 59,000 during the entire season of last year.

When we come to the number of cars hauled by the different railways, the figures are also interesting. By the Canadian Pacific railway in 1908-9, 36,512; in 1909-10, 41,987; in 1910-11, 35,036; in 1911-12, 44,857; —in a period of time shorter than in the preceding year.

The figures for the other railways run in about the same proportion. They all seem to have moved more cars of grain during the period alluded to in 1911-12 than in any preceding year. The total of cars moved, as I have stated, was 83,001, an increase over 1910-11 of 23,877. That shows that comparatively the railways have been much more active, and have moved more grain during the three months or less ending on 31st December last, than during the longer period of nearly four months in preceding years. However, even that has not enabled them to take away the farmers' crop or ease the interior elevators to any very large extent. The general word that comes from the west is that the elevators are nearly up to their capacity so far as storage is concerned. Some of them are full, most of them are very nearly full, and this is true of the elevators clear down to Fort William and Port Arthur, where the storage capacity of nearly 32,000,000 bushels is now almost filled up.

Another fact to be considered this year is that owing to the increased number of grades, each of which must be stored separately, large elevators are prevented from storing as many bushels of grain as they could in former years.

As to means of relief, something has been done. I took it upon myself to ask the representatives of the three great railways to meet here in Ottawa three weeks or a month ago when this matter became very urgent, and as a result of their conferences, application has been made to the Interstate Commerce Commission in the United States for leave to file grain rates from the northwest down to Minneapolis and Duluth, and so ease the pressure in the congested districts by taking the grain away from more western areas down towards the south.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Divert it to the south?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Down toward the south, they could not take it towards the north yet as the Hudson Bay railway is not yet completed and so we were deprived of that northern exit, and had to seek a southern exit. The Interstate Commerce Commission did not seem to see the necessity for waiving their 30 days' notice, but they have been brought to see the necessity and the notice has been waived. To-day the Canadian Pacific railway is taking grain out by the southern route as rapidly as it can find cars and, what is still greater gain, it is utilizing foreign cars for that purpose. Other railways are doing the same.

One condition of special hardship this year seems to arise from the fact that a great quantity of the grain to which my hon. friend alluded which has been late threshed, or which is even now being threshed from time to time, being mixed with snow and ice and, therefore, being damp, must be treated in hospital elevators or must be dried in elevators before the warm weather sets in or, as I am informed, it is liable to become a total loss. That is the kind of grain which is being taken out now for treatment in the elevators in Minneapolis and Duluth. I may say, too, that the railways lowered their rate for wheat, making the rate to Duluth or Minneapolis the same as to Fort William and Port Arthur. In all these ways, therefore, everything has been done that could have been done to relieve the congestion, but still there is a vast quantity of grain in the northwest and the whole moral of the story is that further avenues of outlet or further storage facilities or both will have to be provided. Farmers in the east are used from old time to the necessity for providing storage for their grains and the produce of their farms. The grain growers in the northwest never have been in the habit of doing that, their desire being to transfer the grain as rapidly as possible from the field when it is threshed to the car or elevator and rid themselves of any further handling of it. So it results in the northwest grain traffic much as in the city of Toronto or Montreal when everybody wants to get home at 6 o'clock, and the cars are too crowded to hold them. Everybody wants to harvest his grain within two or three months, and a great deal of it within 3 or 4 weeks, and it is very difficult to provide the grain carriers necessary to do that.

I do not think that I can give my hon. friend any further information than this. There is a duty somewhere, and I hope we will all be able to find out what share belongs to us in carrying out the duty, there is a duty somewhere to provide for the ever-increasing crops of the northwest which are seeking an outlet now mainly towards the east, but which, by and by, to a large and increasing degree will, I think, seek an outlet towards the west. When the Hudson Bay railway is in operation and carrying facilities in connection with it are provided, that will be an additional outlet. Meanwhile, as I have said, there is suffering and there is trouble.

Another thing of which the railways complain, and any business man looking at it from a business standpoint sees the difficulty, is that the railways are not free in distributing their own cars. Owing to a certain condition of things legislation was had in this country some five or six years ago which took away from the railways their full liberty of distribution of cars. Now that distribution, as the House well knows, is conditioned by the terms of the Act, and it becomes bothersome and cumbersome and extremely uneconomical at times. I think some relief will have to be found with reference to the matter of car distribution. The Grain Bill of which notice has been given, and which will be before the House actively after the first of next week, will take up a number of these matters, and we will be able to discuss them at that time.

NOVA SCOTIA APPLES.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I beg to call attention to a matter reported in the public press in regard to one of the large industries of Nova Scotia. I refer to the growing of apples and fruit. Within the last week the fruit growers association held a meeting at Wolfville, Nova Scotia, and I see in a newspaper published in Nova Scotia the startling headline:

WESTERN APPLE MARKET LOST TO NOVA SCOTIA.

W. W. Moore tells Fruit Growers that the Apples sent to the Canadian West were Dishonestly Packed—Government will be asked to place Duty on American Fruit.

The apple growing industry is certainly one of the great industries of the province of Nova Scotia; and it has not by any means been developed to its capacity. It is too bad that a black eye should be given to it by reason of bad packing or improper handling of the fruit. Let me read a part of the discussion that took place:

Tuesday's evening session was devoted to 'The Commercial End of the Apple Business,' and the first speaker was W. W. Moore, of Ottawa, who took for his subject, 'Transportation and Markets.'

His figures were very interesting, and surprised many in the audience, when he stated that up to January 12, the total export from the province to British, foreign and home markets, amounted to 1,420,657 barrels. The only year previous which came anywhere near this record was in 1909-10, when the mark reached was 711,000 barrels. Speaking of each market individually, Mr. Moore said that this year Nova Scotia apples had won a high place and were now recognized as something to be reckoned with. The German market, practically unknown before, might, in time, become very important, and he explained the climatic situations, tariff, &c., and further said that apples sent to that market must be packed in boxes and be extra fine in quality and appearance.

The western market came in for a fair share of attention. He regretted that the opportunity of establishing a market there was not only badly hurt but practically gone, and, in fact, it might be said that the business had received a black eye,—due to the fact that the apples sent west were dishonestly packed. It will take many years to eliminate this impression. Our apples are not as well packed as in Ontario, and not as carefully graded. The barrel used here is not as attractive as the one used in Ontario, and many figures were quoted to substantiate this. Box packing is highly recommended, especially for Gravensteins. They were too fine apples for barrels, as they could not be packed tight enough to stand a long journey. The barrel he considered the best package for the majority of apples, but for the finest apples he considered the box the best.

That discussion took place on the 27th inst. On the following day, certain resolutions were passed which I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell):

First—'Whereas, the system of inspecting apples in the province of Nova Scotia which has been in practice for the past few years, mainly at the port of shipment is not entirely satisfactory, inasmuch as it is only possible to inspect a very small percentage of the apples at the ship and then many shipments are made through other channels, where they escape inspection;

'And whereas under the present Fruit Marks Act, the inspectors are not authorized to inspect open packages;

'Therefore, resolved, that the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers Association now in session respectfully request the Dominion government to have made such changes in the Fruit Marks Act as well as provide for a more thorough system of inspection at the packing houses, ports of shipment and elsewhere, including open packages, when or where advisable—and also to issue certificate of inspection when circumstances and conditions warrant doing so.'

This resolution, regarding the proposed change in fruit inspection, was carried unanimously. The second resolution was:

'Whereas, the Dominion Act regulating the size of apple barrels is not being complied with in the fruit districts of the province;

'And, whereas it is important that all barrels containing apples should be fully up to the standard required by the Act;

'Therefore, be it resolved that the department to which it may belong be requested to add to the duties of apple inspector, the inspection of the barrel as well in which the apples are packed;

'And also that the Act be so amended so that it will require all coopers who manufacture barrels in which apples are packed and offered for sale to brand their name and address on the side of each barrel made by them, ,and also making such manufacturer of barrels subject to a fine of twenty-five cents

for each barrel so made by them not complying with the Act.'

Now, as a Nova Scotian and deeply interested in the development of the fruit growing of that province, I bring the matter as promptly as possible to the notice of the government so that steps may be taken to prevent even the owners of the fruit themselves from behaving in such a careless manner as to do injustice to this magnificent export trade of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture). My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has outlined a rather comprehensive scheme, but one which, I assure him, the government and especially the Department of Agriculture, will take into careful consideration. I am somewhat familiar with the conditions that prevail in this province, sufficiently so to be aware of the rapid strides that the fruit growing industry has taken in Nova Scotia. And I congratulate my Nova Scotian friend upon the magnificent crop they produced last season, the larger portion of which goes to swell the export trade of Great Britain. Some points raised by the reports to which my hon. friend has referred may not be suitable for discussion at this moment, being of a more or less technical nature. But, in passing, I might say that the operation of the Fruits Mark Act has certainly done an immense deal of good to the fruit growing industry of the Dominion, not only in Nova Scotia but elsewhere; and. so far as I am concerned, I am only too glad to render the most sympathetic assistance I can to make that Act still more beneficial to the interest of the fruit growers. While not going into a full discussion of the question at this time, I may inform my hon. friend that I have arranged for the holding, within the next three weeks, of a conference of the fruit growers from the whole Dominion. At the conference there will be delegates from each of the fruit growing districts and from every province, and in addition there will be our chief inspectors and representatives from the agricultural departments of all the provinces of the Dominion. Further than that, I have issued an invitation to all the heads of our experimental stations throughout Canada to attend this conference in order, not only that they may have the benefit of the discussions that may take place there, but also that they may, in their turn, contribute practical advice on the matters under discussion. I am sure that the results of that conference will be of immense benefit, not only to the government in outlining what may be necessary in the way of legislation, but also to the fruit growers themselves. For we must recognize that fruit growing has attained the dimensions which entitle it to be regarded as a natural industry of great importance. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) will understand that, pending the holding of that conference, it would be unwise to attempt to deal with any of the questions he has raised; for at that time we shall have all the light upon this subject that can possibly be thrown by those concerned in it. I shall be only too delighted to listen on that occasion and to do anything I can to carry out, in reason, the requests of the fruit growers themselves.

MONTREAL ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION AT NANCY.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville). I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a matter of importance. We have in Montreal an association of young men which has won not only prizes and medals but fame as well in Europe.

That association won the international tournament which was held in the city of Rome, Italy, and won all the prizes there. Last year they were challenged again by the international tournament which was held at Nancy, France. They presented a petition to the government, through the good offices of the acting mayor of Montreal, Alderman Dandurand. That gentleman came to Ottawa and presented a petition to your humble servant, the object of which was to obtain some aid towards paying the expenses of the trip. I think the association is composed of about twenty athletes. I thought it would be a good advertisement for Canada to help these young men to maintain their reputation abroad. I, therefore, brought the matter before my colleagues in council. This was a few days before the dissolution of parliament, during the adjournment which took place after the departure of the then Prime Minister for England to attend the King's Coronation and the Imperial Conference. I think my hon. friend will find the matter on record in his department; at least, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, if he were present, would say that I am right in stating that council looked favourably upon the request which was made by the citizens of Montreal and by the athletic association. I was authorized by council to inform the association that a sum of $3,000 would be put in the estimates if the association went to Nancy. I may say, entre parenthèse, that these young men did go to Nancy, and won all the first prizes and high honours in the tournament, and came back once more covered with glory. I am quite sure their presence at that tournament was a good advertisement of our country and of our sports. Acting on

the assurance of council I sent to acting Mayor Dandurand of Montreal, a translation of which I will read:

Ottawa, 9th June, 1911.

My dear Mr. Dandurand,—I have handed your petition (the petition of the athletes) to my colleagues in council last week, and here is what I am authorized to lay before you. The council will put in the supplementary estimates a sum of $3,000 as a special aid on the occasion of the trip of the athletes to Nancy, France. Naturally, this is subject to the control of parliament which votes the budget. But according to my judgment there is no risk taken, as I think the amount will be voted by the House.

Accept, my dear Dandurand, the assurance of my highest consideration.

Your devoted servant,
RODOLPHE LEMIEUX.

They obtained the money from the bank. The council decided to have the money put in the supplementary esimates. As I said a moment ago, our athletes went to Nancy. They were assisted, not only by this promise of the government, but by the citizens of Montreal generally, and they won fame at Nancy. I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the promise made by council that that amount would be placed in the estimates. I took great care to inform the athletes that this promise was subject to the vote of parliament, and I could only say that the matter would be brought up before the House. Unfortunately, a change of administration took place.

But I suppose both sides of the House are well pleased with our Canadian athletes, and will recognize that they have done nobly for Canada, and will agree that the new government should implement the promise which was made in good faith by the late administration.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I may say that the matter had not yet been brought to our attention; but I should have much pleasure in putting the sum in the estimates.

THE DUTY ON LUMBER.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). Before you leave the Chair, in accordance with the notice given by the leader of the opposition last night, I wish to ask for a few minutes time to discuss the duty on lumber as it affects the people of the northwest, that is, the class of lumber that a short time ago came in free of duty. I will move the following motion:

That the Minister of Customs, in collecting a duty of 25 per cent on sawed planks, boards, joists, scantlings, studding and other lumber of wood dressed on one side when the edges thereof are neither jointed, nor tongued nor grooved, is violating the Customs Act, and unduly and illegally imposing a heavy tax on the people.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of very great importance to the people of the three prairie provinces. First of all, I will point out the disadvantages under which the new settler labours when he goes into that prairie country, and wishes to put up a building. If he goes to any other part of Canada he can probably get the umber on his farm with which to put up the necessary building in which he can live comfortably. But when he takes up a homestead on the prairie, he is unable to do that, there is no timber, in many cases, within a hundred miles of him, and he has to depend absolutely on the lumber that he may be able to purchase. Some of that lumber is cut in the provinces of the west, but the great bulk of it is brought in either from western Ontario, or from British Columbia, or from the United States. The late government, realizing the position that the farmer was in, and that when he first went out on the land he was not in a position to put up fancy houses, or spend much money in buying lumber, in order to enable him to build more cheaply, they put rough lumber on the free list, and also lumber that was dressed on one side. I may point out that under the late administration the settler was able to build his house, his stable and his barn, with lumber of those classes that did not pay any duty. I may say that for an ordinary building, an ordinary shanty, or an ordinary house even, with lumber that is dressed on one side the farmer is able to put up a good and comfortable house, and that is the lumber that came in free of duty. As soon as the present government came into power, the customs regulations governing the importation of this class of lumber have been changed. At the present time, the settlers who formerly got lumber free of duty now have to pay a duty, not of $1.25 or $2 a thousand, but a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem.

When you take ordinary lumber, boards, dressed on one side, or scantlings, beams and joists, dressed on one side, you have a class of lumber that will cost from $12 to $16 a thousand and the duty on that lumber at 25 per cent will be $3 or $4 per thousand. When you add to that the retailer's profit on the cost of his lumber, you are forcing the settler to pay $4 and $5 per thousand feet more for his lumber than he had to pay a couple or three months ago before this change was made in the interpretation of the Customs Act. Let me read to the House the clause of the Customs Act which deals with this particular item. Item 503 is as follows:

Planks, boards, clapboards, laths, plain pickets, and other timber or lumber of wood, not further manufactured than sawn or split, whether creosoted, vulcanized or treated by any other preserving process or not.

Those were free and still remain free.

504. Planks, boards and other lumber of wood, sawn, split or cut, and dressed on one side only, but not further manufactured.

Those came in free and are still on the free list. This is the item under which I am making the complaint.

505. Sawn boards, planks and deals, planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, 25 per cent.

In the past lumber has been coming in dressed on one side and on one edge; that is to say, one side planed and the other edge sawn with a fine saw and the Department of Customs have allowed that to come in free. But owing to the late ruling of the Customs department that lumber now comes in at a duty of 25 per cent. In the preparation of this lumber the American saw mill men who have been selling their product in Canada follow exactly the same practice as that which is followed by the lumbermen in eastern Ontario and British Columbia. They dress that lumber on one side and on one edge. It is dressed on one edge for the purpose of making it more saleable. It is more exact, more true, but it is done in the mills in Ontario and British Columbia and in Pacific coast states mainly for the purpose of reducing the weight of the lumber. It is a very common thing, in my part of the country at all events, to see an invoice for a carload of lumber. An American or a British Columbia sawmill man sells his lumber at a stated price delivered at a certain station. The retail lumber merchant who buys that lumber pays the freight on it and then remits the balance of the invoice to the sawmill man. I have seen dozens of invoices where the amount got by the railway for the freight was a very considerable percentage higher than the amount got by the sawmill men who took the logs out, sawed the lumber, dressed it, loaded it on cars and shipped it. Therefore, you see that it is necessary for the lumberman, in order to make his lumber more saleable and to save the freight, to dress his lumber on one side and also on one edge. That same class of lumber is coming in from the United States and has been coming in free of duty. A board, joist or scantling that was dressed on one side by the planer and sawn with a fine saw on the other, irrespective of whether it had been planed first and then resawed, came in free and the settlers of the prairies of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta got the advantage of that free lumber. They got that lumber at from $2 to $4 a thousand less than they are getting it for to-day. That is a hardship to the settler of the onrthwest for the simple reason that lumber is one of the most absolute necessities to him. Lumber is just as necessary to the man on the prairie as are bread, meat and clothing. He cannot live on the prairie in a tent during the winter months; he has to have a house. That house has to be made with lumber, coming either from the north of the prairie provinces, from western Ontario, from British Columbia, or from the United States. The United States sawmill men have in the past been sending that lumber in and the settler of the prairies has been getting the advantage of free trade in rough lumber to that extent. This was the class of lumber that suited him, it was the class of lumber that he wanted, it was the class of lumber that he could afford to buy. Now, under the present administration, that same settler has to pay $3, or $4 or $5 more a thousand feet for the same lumber when he goes to buy it from the lumber merchant.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the price of lumber gone up to the consumer since this law has been in force?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, it has.

Mr. STAPLES. What evidence has the hon. gentleman to that effect?

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend, when I am through, he can give any information to the House that he pleases. Not long ago I was talking to a lumber merchant and he told me that the price had to go up because the lumber was costing them more since they had put on the duty.

Mr. STAPLES. I am quite as anxious as the hon. member for the settler of the west and I want to know if the price of lumber has gone up to the consumer. If it has then there is a grievance for which I would be very anxious to get a remedy. Give me one instance.

Mr. TURRIFF. You cannot add $2, $3, $4 or $5 to the cost of a thousand feet of lumber to the merchant without that additional cost being paid by the man who buys and uses the lumber. How are you going to get away from it?

Mr. STAPLES. I understood that the lumbermen of British Columbia guaranteed that the price would not go up and I want to know if they have put the price up. If they have I want to get after them.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend says that the British Columbia lumbermen undertook that the price would not go up. My hon. friend was not quite sincere in making that remark.

Mr. STAPLES. I was quite sincere.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well then let me tell my hon. friend that what the lumbermen

said was that if the duty was put on lumber they would not put their price up until next spring.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask what evidence the hon. gentleman has to that effect? I want to get at the facts.

Mr. TURRIFF. It was reported in the Winnipeg 'Telegram', a paper which I do not always consider reliable. There is no use of anybody arguing that, when you add $4 a thousand to the cost of lumber you are not going to add to the cost of that lumber to the man who has to buy and use it. It is all right to talk about the British Columbia lumberman not putting the price up.

Are the British Columbia lumbermen, the men who formed the combine that made all the trouble a few years ago, a likely class of men to do that sort of thing? The lumbermen of British Columbia, western Ontario and the prairie provinces formed a combine and no man in the western provinces was allowed to go into the lumber business in any town without the consent and authority of this lumber combine. Why? Because they would not allow him to buy a carload of lumber. Not a man in the combine would sell a carload to any retail lumber merchant who was not approved of by the combine, and who was not a member of the Retail Lumbermens' Combine. The result was that the British Columbia lumbermen, the Ontario lumbermen, the lumbermen in the prairie provinces were all able to put up the prices. But that was not the whole of the evil. The retail men, knowing that nobody else could buy lumber and go into this town and sell in opposition to them, decided whether there should be one or two or three lumbermen in each market who should be allowed to handle timber, and knowing that they had no competition they were enabled to enhance the price very largely with the result that the consumer was compelled to pay very large prices for his lumber. That, Mr. Speaker, was one of the principle causes that led the retail lumbermen, and farmers who wanted to buy 2, 3 or 4 carloads of lumber, to open negotiations and open trade relations with American sawmill men living in the Pacific coast states. The result has been that for years back there has been a large amount of lumber coming in from the United States. Rough lumber comes in free and also lumber dressed on one side and dressed by a fine saw on one edge. The moment the new Minister of Customs came into power, the moment these hon. gentlemen who were going to do so much for the western settler assumed office, practically one of the first things they do is to put a duty on that lumber and compel the settler in the west to pay a higher price for the lumber, to compel the merchant to pay a higher price and to make him pay duty on the lumber, which until a few months ago came in free.

Mr. STEVENS. The hon. gentleman is giving the impression that this applies to all lumber. Will he say to what particular class of lumber his remarks regarding the raise in price applies?

Mr. TURRIFF. I read the item in the Customs Act covering the class of lumber with which I am now dealing, item 505. Under the late administration lumber that was dressed on one side and jointed or not planed, but fine-sawed, on one edge, came in free. The customs authorities dealt with the lumber just as they found it when it came to the line for admission. They did not take up the question whether that lumber had been planed on the edge and then resawed they looked at the lumber and if it was rough lumber on three sides and planed on one side, that lumber came in free.

But my hon. friends opposite at the request of the lumber combines of British Columbia and Ontario who came down here two or three months ago and had interviews with my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) and, I suppose with other ministers of the government, agreed to collect duty on that lumber which had been coming in free to the great advantage of the farmer of the west. Here is the regulation passed by the Customs Board:

> In connection with the request for a decision as to the rate of duty payable on imported lumber for which free entry is claimed under tariff item 503 or 504, the Board of Customs declared: 'That sawn planks, boards, joists, scantlings, studding and other lumber of wood, dressed on one side when also dressed wholly or partially on one edge, is dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, under the general tariff, on importation into Canada.'

You will notice that the Act says that if the lumber is dressed on one side and dressed on one edge it is dutiable but this Customs Board under the present administration, knowing, I presume, what the government wanted, took an absolutely different view from what they had taken before, with the result that they now say the lumber is dutiable if it is partly dressed on the edge while the Act itself says that it must be jointed on the edge, so that the regulation is curtailing the item in the Customs Act with the result, as I have said, that the settler now has to pay duty on lumber that he previously got free.

Mr. CURRIE. Is any lumber coming in free now, is any class of lumber allowed to come in free?

Mr. TURRIFF. I read two sections of the Act dealing with lumber that is free, and I shall read now to show that a certain class

of lumber is still coming in free. Of that I make no complaint whatever.

Planks, boards and other lumber of wood, sawn, split or cut, and dressed on one side only, but not further manufactured.

That lumber was free and it is still free under the Customs Act, and under the regulations of the minister. That item has not been changed.

Mr. CURRIE. Is there any quantity of lumber coming in under that schedule?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, there is lumber coming in under that item.

Mr. CURRIE. Then there is no great hardship.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not discussing that item at all, I am discussing item 505 in the Customs Tariff, 1907, and showing that the lumber that a few months ago came in free is now, under the ruling of the Customs Board, compelled to pay duty because the Customs Board has made a ruling that if it is partly jointed on one edge it becomes dutiable and before that the Act itself says it has to be jointed lumber in order to make it dutiable.

The Customs Department has laid down the rule that if a piece of lumber comes in planed on one side and on one edge, and a saw is then run over it so as not to leave any marks of the planer on it, that lumber will come in free; but if a plank came in showing nine or ten feet of the saw and one foot of the marks of the planer, the Minister of Customs would say that it was dutiable. The small part showing the mark of the planer made it dutiable, but the 90 per cent of it that did not show the mark of the planer would not make it free, as it was before. The thing resolves itself into this, that under the former interpretation of the Act the settler was getting lumber free of duty, whereas at the present time he has to pay duty, and the lumberman is able to get for his lumber $3 or $4 a thousand more than he did before. Take the case of a man who is building a barn. There are hundreds of farmers in my constituency who have built barns costing from $3,000 to $5,000. The lumber bill would be from $1,500 to $3,000. A great deal of that lumber will still come in free under the items I have quoted, but a great deal of it, under the recent ruling of the Department of Customs, will have to pay duty; and if in order to avoid the duty the sawmills do not plane or dress this lumber on the edge in any way, they have to pay extra freight; so that the settler is obliged to pay extra, either in duty or freight, to the amount of from $100 to $300 on the cost of a barn. That is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. It is particularly unsatisfactory this year, because the farmer of the west is unable to get a market for his wheat. Was it not bad enough for the western farmer to have been done out of the market for his grain which was dangling right before his eyes across the boundary, where he could have got a much better price for it? But one of the first acts of the Prime Minister, in dealing with the fiscal question, is to change the regulations of the Customs Department by which this same settler is forced to pay from $2 to $4 a thousand more for certain classes of lumber than he did before. That is the condition of affairs that exists in the west to-day, and that is the condition that I protest against on behalf of the farmers of my constituency. We have heard a great deal from the lumbermen in the past about treating the United States with regard to lumber as they treated us. Under the ruling of the Minister of Customs, our tariff on lumber is much higher than the American tariff, if you include free lumber. During the late campaign one of the great cries we heard in the west was that under reciprocity we were going to give the natural resources of Canada away, that the Americans would come over and take our lumber across to the United States. That argument was put forward very strongly by the lumber interests of British Columbia; yet to-day we find these same lumber interests taking the very opposite stand and complaining that instead of our lumber going into the United States there are from 75 to 100 carloads from the United States every day coming into the four western provinces. Now, if it was a bad thing for our lumber to go into the United States, surely it would be a good thing to let that lumber from the United States come into Canada so that our own supply would last the longer. These same men now take the opposite course and say that this lumber should not be allowed to come in free. I am not very much surprised at my hon. friend the Minister of Customs taking that course; I did not expect very much else. I would have been surprised if three months ago any one had told me that the right hon. the Prime Minister would have taken that course, because of what he told the farmers when he made a tour of the west he was going to do for them. If he had told them that his first official act would have been to make them pay duty on lumber that was then coming in free, his candidates would not have received as many votes as they did. But I am not surprised, because now that he is in power he has refused to make good almost every position he took when on this side of the House. To a certain extent lumber is coming into Ontario from the United States, and according to a letter from one of the lumbermen of British Columbia brought down in the return, it is

also going into the western provinces to the amount of from 75 to 100 carloads per day. Just think what that means in extra cost to the farmer at a time when he is in a very poor condition to meet that extra cost, when he was looking forward for better things, when he was promised better things by my right hon. friend if he came into power, instead of which the first thing that takes place is that he is made to pay duty on lumber that was free before.

I have not gone into the legal aspects of the Act, or the legal interpretation of that item. But the fact remains that the lumber formerly came in free, and now has to pay a duty and I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) could have that regulation changed, and let that lumber again come in freee. Is it not absurd that because a particular piece of lumber shows on an inch of it the mark of a planer, and the balance the mark of a saw, it has to pay duty, while a piece that does not show the mark of a planer comes in free? That conclusion is most illogical, and most unfair to the settlers of the northwest, and I do not think myself that it is in accord with the terms of the Act.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the hon. gentleman know that lumber can be prepared on one side entirely by the planer and still come in free?

Mr. TURRIFF. As I understand it, all the mills when they saw the lumber put the green wood through the planer for the purpose of trueing it up some, but mainly to make it lighter and thus save freight. That lumber is planed on one side, and in some cases put through a planer that planes on one side and edges at the same time, and attached to that machine is a saw that follows the planer in order to give it a sawn edge instead of planed edge. But if one inch should be missed and show a planer mark, that lumber has to pay duty. Previously it came in free. This just shows the tendency of this government. It is ever ready to turn the farmers down and protect the combines. That is the result this government is bringing about whether they intend it or not. That may not be their intention, but actions speak louder than words. The first thing they did with the tariff, on obtaining office, was to make the settler pay a duty on lumber which previously he got duty free.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has made what he considers a very strong plea on behalf of the farmers of our prairie provinces. If all the statements he has made were in strict accord with the facts, I must say there would be some ground for his complaint against the ruling of the Minister of Customs in this lumber matter. But I have been very much amazed that any hon. gentleman who has been sent here to make the laws of this country, should dare stand up in his place and deliberately advocate that any of these laws should be evaded and broken.

Mr. TURRIFF. I did not say that.

Mr. GOODEVE. The hon. member from Assiniboia read a clause in the Customs Act and openly stated that by fraudulent subterfuge heretofore, certain lumber, which is dutiable under the Act, was admitted free, and he urges that that fraudulent violation of the Act should be allowed to continue. And that is the position taken by other hon. members opposite when they have to deal with this question of the duty on lumber. The Act itself is very clear. There are two sections which are particularly involved in this matter, namely, section 504 and section 505 of the Customs Act of Canada. Section 504 provides:

> Planks, boards and other lumber of wood, sawn, split or cut, and dressed on one side only, but not further manufactured, free.

And section 505 says:

> Sawn boards, planks and deals planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, 25 per cent.

It is under the latter clause that the larger portion of lumber is going into the prairie provinces, and that came in under the ruling of the late government, free of duty. In his anxiety to make his argument clear, the hon. gentleman has himself shown that the very purpose of the lumberman of the United States treating their lumber the way they do, is to fraudulently enter it into the Dominion free of duty. Only a moment ago he said that after the lumberman of the United States had passed their lumber through their planers and dressed it on one side, they had a special machine prepared whereby they would rough the edge in order that they might fraudulently escape the customs duty. That is the hon. gentleman's own statement, yet he defends that action of the American lumbermen, and actually takes the Minister of Customs to task because that hon. minister undertook very properly to enforce the laws of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I interrupt? My hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) has asserted that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said that the lumber was rough dressed fraudulently. My hon. friend did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. GOODEVE. What I have said is this, that the action of the American lumbermen in having a fine saw follow the planing, or the dressing on one side was for the purpose of evading the Act. Since the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has himself admitted that that was

done, he must be cognizant that it was done fraudulently, and for the purpose of evading the customs law of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the hon. gentleman's opinion, but it is not that of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). If the hon. member for Kootenay will ask his friend the Minister of Customs, the minister will tell him that if that lumber comes in with a saw following the planer and not leaving the mark of the planer, it will come in free.

Mr. GOODEVE. The Minister of Customs will not tell me that. What he will tell me is what the hon. member for Assiniboia has repeated three or four times. Is there a schoolboy in the city of Ottawa who does not understand that that roughing of which the hon. gentleman has spoken, was of itself proof of intent of fraudulent entry? But, in passing the lumber through, here and there, when it is cut very true, the little saw with which they intend to rough the entire edge sometimes misses, leaving the clear evidence of the fraudulent intent to enter lumber free that should be dutiable. And yet the hon. gentleman would undertake to twist and turn that and to attack the Minister of Customs for performing the duty he is sworn to perform.

Now, the declaration of the Board of Customs is made independently of the Minister of Customs. This was an independent board of Commissioners appointed by the government to deal with any question in dispute. And their decision was along the lines I have just indicated, and what was the hon. gentleman's own interpretation of the words of the Board's decision? And let us see whether my interpretation is more in accord with the facts and with common-sense and with justice than the interpretation given by the hon. member. Here is the declaration of the Board:

> In connection with the request for a decision as to the rate of duty payable on imported lumber for which free entry is claimed under tariff items 503 or 504, the Board of Customs declared: 'that sawn planks, boards, jointing, scantlings, studding and other lumber of wood, dressed on one side, when also dressed wholly or partially on one edge, is dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, under the general tariff, on importations into Canada.'

And the hon. gentleman said that because the Board had said 'dressed on one side, when also dressed wholly or partially on one side,' they were assuming to turn the law. What they did was to call the attention of the officials appointed to enforce this Act, to the fact that if the lumber was only partially dressed on one side because of the re-sawing to which the hon. member has referred, therefore they were to collect the duty. And I think that every hon. member who is inclined to look at this question fairly will realize that the interpretation placed on the Act by the Customs Board was in accordance with justice and with the true intent of the parliament of Canada.

Now, having looked at that side of the question, I would like for a moment or two to deal with this so-called hardship of the prairie farmers of the west. And in dealing with questions of this nature in this House we must deal with them in a broad way, as they affect the whole of the people of Canada. The hon. member said that the Conservative party in the recent elections said the policy of their opponents would have the effect of giving away the natural resources of Canada to the American people; and, as proof that the Conservatives have changed their position, he proceeded to say that from seventy-five to a hundred carloads of lumber a day were coming in from the United States into the Canadian prairie market. The hon. gentleman has stated correctly the position we took in the recent election campaign. We said our own home market was of more value to our people than to the people of the United States, or than their market was to us. And the hon. gentleman has just now proved it. He himself has said that we are sending little or no lumber into the United States, but that they are sending lumber into our west at the rate of from seventy-five to a hundred carloads a day.

Mr. TURRIFF. I did not say that we were sending little or no lumber into the United States. I did not mention anything about it.

Mr. GOODEVE. Why, that was the hon. gentleman's whole argument. Now, we take the same stand to day that we took before the people in the election campaign. We contended that it was our duty as Canadians to preserve the natural resources of this country for our own people. Does the hon. gentleman realize that, to follow out the principle he has laid down would tend not to the conservation of our great timber resources, but to their utter and complete destruction? It would be in effect a repetition of the policy which has tended to the destruction of the large timber areas of the United States. Owing to the unfair competition that has been forced upon the lumbermen of British Columbia, they have been compelled to bring to market only that portion of the timber which they could cheaply and quickly take from their reserves, selecting only their best qualities that could be most easily surely handled and manufactured at a profit, with the result that a large portion of the timber area of that province is left to destruction by the wind and by forest fires. This is

the exact opposite of the position that is being taken by all civilized people to-day. In the province of British Columbia, as in Ontario and Quebec, and in all our timbered areas, the whole object must be the conservation of our natural wealth. We may exhaust our mineral wealth, because mineral once taken from the ground is gone for ever; but by the careful conservation of our timbered areas—just as with the golden grain on behalf of the growers of which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), claims to speak—our resources can be made to last from generation to generation, growing in value as an asset of the Dominion from year to year. That is the position we on this side took in regard to this question. Why is it, let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite, there is at this very time a large importation of lumber from the United States into this country? Is it not due to the hard times and depressed trade of the nation to the south of us? Owing to the decreased demand for the rougher and lower grades of lumber, they cannot easily get rid of those grades. The largely increased use of steel and concrete in buildings, in the large centres has displaced the rougher grades of lumber, and the demand is for the interior finish lumber, and for the higher grades. For flooring and number one, they are getting very high prices. In some cases they get as high as $60 and even $70 per thousand for flooring lumber.

The result of that is that the lower grades of lumber are left over from season to season, and piled up and accumulate in the yards of those companies in the United States. There comes a depression like the one at this particular time, they have to make large overdrafts on the bank, and finding it necessary to realize on these assets their bankers say to them, you must reduce your overdraft; and the very first thing they do in order to reduce it is to try and find a market for the accumulated surplus of the lower grades of lumber that are piled up in their yards. Immediately they come to our Canadian western market, which in fairness and justice belongs to the lumbermen of Canada, and they flood that market, not with fair priced lumber, but with lumber frequently sold at less than the cost to manufacture.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Asking for information, why would not the dumping clause apply to prevent that?

Mr. GOODEVE. My hon. friend has asked a question that I was just going to deal with. In every case where that has happened in regard to other lines of manufacture, what has occurred? Immediately, with the consent of the whole people of Canada, the government put into force what is known as the dumping clause, and charge a special duty, making them pay the duty on the real value of the article as it sold in their home market. Yet in the case of lumber, instead of asking for that advantage that they are justly and fairly entitled to under the same conditions, the lumbermen of the west have never asked for the enforcement of the dumping clause. My hon. friend has asked a pertinent question, and I think our lumbermen are fairly entitled to it under these circumstances.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They would have to ask for it

Mr. GOODEVE. No doubt the officials of the company would have to ask the government to apply it, but it has never been applied in the case of lumber, the lumbermen of British Columbia have never asked for it. But while it is a fact which is known to every lumberman throughout the country, that the American companies at the present time, for the reasons I have stated, are selling lumber at less than the cost to manufacture, yet I want to say that the consumer of that lumber in the prairie provinces does not reap one five cents benefit from that lower price; and why? That is a very pertinent side of the question. Naturally, my hon. friend opposite argued that if the jobber in lumber purchased his lumber at a bargain price the consumer also would get part of that bargain price, and, therefore, would reap a benefit. The hon. gentleman waxed eloquent when he said it would make a difference of $5 or $6 per thousand, and that would amount to a large sum of money. I find in the speech made by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), dealing with this question, that he said it would mean a saving of $12,000,000 to the farmers of the prairie provinces. That statement is on a par with the statement and the arguments that have been advanced this afternoon. As a matter of fact, out of the total importation of 300,000,000 feet of lumber, there would, under any circumstances, only be about one-third of it dutiable, and if you put the duty at 25 per cent ad valorem, which would make it about $2 per thousand, which is the outside price, the total amount saved would only have been about $200,000 instead of $12,000,000. But I want to show you that they will not reap a benefit of $200,000, or even $2. And why? Because if a merchant to-day, going into the ordinary market for some unusual reason, is able to pick up a certain special article at a price which he knows to be absolutely less than the cost of that article, he does not immediately proceed to give away that profit to his consumer; he would be foolish to do it, because he

knows that it is only under these special conditions that he buys it, he will eventually have to pay a fair price for it, and, therefore, he continues to sell it at the ordinary advance on the regular fair market price for those goods. Now I say, without fear of contradiction, the question asked by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) and that my hon. friend could not answer, was very pertinent; I venture to say that no man on that side of the House can demonstrate or prove that because they are selling lumber at less than cost in the United States, the consumer in the prairie provinces is receiving one dollar benefit per thousand on that lumber, not a dollar. We find, Sir, that there is a direct loss. Let me show you another side of this question before I leave that point. I have made the statement that I do not think there is a man in this House who can demonstrate that the purchase of that lumber at less than cost from the American producers, has reduced the price a single dollar to the consumers in the prairie provinces. But now I take the other side, I will admit for the sake of argument, that the buying of that lumber at less than cost to the manufacturer would reduce the price to the consumer, and I think I can demonstrate that even under those conditions it would mean an actual loss, not only to the farmer of the Northwest, but an actual loss to the people of the whole Dominion. I will try to make myself clear. If a man sells his lumber at less than cost price—I am speaking of the American millmen—directly to the consumer in the markets of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the farmer buying his 2,000, 3,000 or 5,000 feet of lumber for his fencing, his shed or his barn; let us say for the sake of argument, that he saves $4 a thousand on 5,000 feet, that would mean $20, and that money goes to the manufacturer of the United States. The result is that the millman of the province of British Columbia, not having that market, the money having gone out of the country, is compelled to close down his lumber camp in the woods, as he has already done, to close down his mill in the milling centres, and the loss falls directly on the farmer of the prairie provinces. Why? If he has saved $20 on that lumber, he has lost a home market of 1,000 to 2,000 men who consume his wheat, his butter, his eggs, his flour, his clothing, and all that goes to make up the great Canadian home market. So the actual loss to the farmer is greater than the trivial gain he has made. I think no man can gainsay that. That is the whole theory of interprovincial trade. Now what does that amount to? Last year in the province of British Columbia we bought $14,500,000 worth of those agricultural products I have referred to from the farmers of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, $14,500,000 worth we purchased from them, and helped them with our home market close to the farmers by reason of the development of our own industries. I have heard hon. gentlemen on that side of the House tell me that the best market for oats that we have to-day is the market of British Columbia. We purchase their oats, we purchase their hay, we purchase their mess pork and bacon, and then, coming further east, we purchase the goods of the Ontario canneries which are to-day going into that province to feed the lumber camps in those great lumbering districts. That is the theory of the interprovincial trade, and that is the theory of the Liberal-Conservative party. We want to build up a great home market in this country, we want to develop our great cities. Let me tell you, Sir, that I am not like those men who think that the only virtue in that mighty west is that it enables you to exact from the ground its fertility and richness, and leave it a barren waste and wilderness. I believe we have a great heritage, I believe we will make that great western country of ours one of the manufacturing centres of the world; by manufacturing, I mean manufacturing for the farmer. Let him, as he will, manufacture his grain into beef, into pork, into poultry, and he enriches the soil, he enriches himself, he enriches the country. That is our whole theory. So it is with our lumber industry. We say we are justly entitled to a fair amount of protection.

I want to say for myself that I would have no hesitancy to stand on the floor of this House and say altogether that clause which says that lumber planed on one side shall be admitted free should be eliminated from the tariff. I would have hesitancy in saying that that would be to the advantage of the people of the whole of Canada including those of the prairie provinces. Why are you asking for your Hudson Bay road? Why are you asking that you may get closer to the market for the goods that you raise? There is no market in the world equal to the market that stands at your door and the only way in which that market can be built up is by means of interprovincial trade. After the speech of the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) I received some telegrams and a number of letters but as the matter had passed I did not think it advisable at that particular time to bring them up. I would like to read one telegram that I received because it bears on the other question that has been raised by the hon. mem-

ber for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). There is within the sound of my voice a gentleman who is in a position to make good his claim. He has made this offer, and he repeats it to-day, that he will pay the expenses of an investigation into the question of a lumber combine in the west. If it has been shown that in any particular there is a combine in regard to prices the entire expenses of an investigation will be borne by him and he is in a position to make good.

Mr. KNOWLES. Who will pay them if it falls through.

Mr. GOODEVE. I say that if you can prove or show that there is the slightest combination in prices, or to raise prices, all the expenses of the investigation will be paid by these parties; but, if, as I am sure it will be found, there is no combination, certainly, the government will pay for it. We have asked and urged that an investigation into this question be made and we are prepared as members representing the province of British Columbia to ask now on the floor of this House that such an investigation be made in order that the assertions which are being made in the public press and by members of this House can be shown to be absolutely untrue. Here is the telegram:

A. S. Goodeve, M.P., Ottawa.

Western press despatches state that the member for Moosejaw charges in the House that a lumber combine exists in British Columbia and that the manufacturers have closed down their mills for the purpose of advancing prices. Mountain manufacturers emphatically deny existence of combine or anything approaching one and strongly object to such unwarranted allegations unsupported by evidence of proof. We would welcome full investigation by an independent commission which would establish beyond question the absolute freedom of competition in the wholesale market for British Columbia lumber, as well as the fact that the wholesale price is too low to return to the manufacturer adequate profits on his product. Mountain mills have been closed down and logging operations largely suspended because of the impossibility of British Columbia manufacturers meeting the slaughter prices of American manufacturers whose demoralized home market caused by over production has induced their dumping lumber into Canada at prices below the cost of production. Nearly four thousand men are out of work in the interior of British Columbia owing to reduced logging operations and the loss of trade is being daily lamented by grain dealers, cattle dealers and farmers of Alberta. The British Columbia industry furnishes a most important section of the market for the produce of Alberta and for the purpose of a political argument it is unfair to ignore the strong interprovincial interests. American shippers have evaded Canadian customs regulations in the past and British Columbia manufacturers want a square deal in the future.

That is exactly our position; all we ask, all we urge is a square deal. We say that you are checking this enterprise. We are willing to pay our share of protection because we believe it is in the interest of the Dominion as a whole. We pay duty on our machinery and on everything that goes into the manufacture of our lumber; therefore, we say, we believe that we should receive a fair protection, particularly when it does not mean an increase in the cost but, from our standpoint, means an increase in the home market of other interests. I would like to show however how it is really affecting our province and I have here the very latest statistics dealing with lumber coming into Canada. The statement is as follows:

IMPORTATIONS, NOVEMBER, 1911.

PLANKS, BOARDS, &C., DRESSED ONE SIDE ONLY.

—	Imported during November, 1911.	Imported during November, 1910.	Imported Apr. 1, 1911, to Nov. 30, 1911.	Imported Apr. 1, 1910, to Nov. 30, 1910.
	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.
Ontario	5,373,000	9,617,000	67,787,000	42,551,000
Manitoba	6,651,000	1,253,000	54,812,000	39,241,000
Saskatchewan	871,000	422,000	9,117,000	5,260,000
Alberta	1,697,000	257,000	20,528,000	4,693,000
British Columbia	12,151,009	3,623,000	91,628,000	32,573,000
Total	26,143,000	15,172,000	243,872,000	124,318,000

DUTIABLE.

SAWED BOARDS—PLANED.

—	Imported during November, 1911.	Imported during November, 1910.	Imported Apr. 1, 1911, to Nov. 30, 1911.	Imported Apr. 1. 1910, to Nov. 30, 1910.
	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.
Ontario	941,000	452,000	4,559,000	3,597,000
Manitoba	909,000	307,000	8,537,000	2,677,000
Saskatchewan	282 000	107,000	1,520,000	425,000
Alberta	43,000	56,000	389,000	385,000
British Columbia	2,348,000	259,000	21,235,000	4,155,000
Total	4,523,000	1,181,000	36,240,000	11,239,000

The figures absolutely bear out my argument that this is purely a question of depression on the other side and the forcing on the market at any price in order to get rid of the surplus product. This has always been recognized by protectionist countries as being unfair and Germany, France, the United States and Canada herself have very properly taken steps to prevent it.

Mr. TURRIFF. If it is a wrong to British Columbia that lumber should be imported from the United States why did the people of British Columbia import 12,000,000 feet last November?

Mr. GOODEVE. I am amazed that an hon. gentleman, who has reached the status of being elected a member of this House should ask the childish question: Is it wrong to import lumber into British Columbia?

Mr. TURRIFF. Answer it.

Mr. GOODEVE. Answer it, certainly.

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. gentleman is too amazed to answer that.

Mr. GOODEVE. I certainly am amazed that any man would make the assertion that any gentleman on this side of the House, or any man who has reached the age of discretion, would say that it was wrong to trade with another country. I have heard that argument in back counties but never on the floor of parliament.

Mr. TURRIFF. You are arguing against it.

Mr. GOODEVE. Not arguing against it. If the hon. gentleman has not understood my argument better than that I can only say that I pity him. He has my sincere sympathy. We, on this side of the House, have stood for the expansion of our trade, but we have also stood for the protection of our industries in order that we might expand that trade. This statement, then, is conclusive evidence of the conditions as we have them at the present time and, under these conditions, we are not asking that the dumping clause be placed against the importation of lumber, but merely asking that the clause already on the statute-book, interpreted by the hon. gentleman himself, should be enforced fairly, justly and legally. That is all that we in the province thus far have asked from this government and I for one say that I commend the wisdom and force of character that in spite of opposition, enabled the hon. Minister of Customs to see that the law was fairly and justly enforced.

Mr. L. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add a great deal to what has been said by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Some of our friends on the other side of the House, however, taunt the people of western Canada with the fact that they have sent no farmers to represent them in this House. I have been farming in Saskatchewan for the last 30 years, and, therefore, I presume they will be glad to find there is at least one who has come from that part of Canada who is a farmer.

This question should be discussed under two heads. The first is whether or not, notwithstanding all that has been said, the lumber in question is dutiable. The two tariff items, 504 and 505, have been read repeatedly, but I shall take the liberty of reading them again. 504 describes lumber that is free. It reads:

> Planks, boards, and other lumber of wood, sawn, split or cut, and dressed on one side only, but not further manufactured, free.

Item 505 reads:

> Sawn boards, planks and deals, planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, general tariff, 25 per cent duty, ad valorem.

This duty will, of course, apply in the case of American lumber. I expected the hon. member from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) to argue the point whether or not the lumber mentioned should come within the definition of item 505. I am sorry he has not done so. If the lumber referred to in this discussion does not come under the item 505, it must come under the item 504. Nothing has been submitted to show us that it does not come under 505, and under 505 the lumber must be:

Dressed on one or both sides when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved.

There is nothing to show that the lumber in question has been jointed or tongued and grooved on the edge. If it is not it cannot possibly come under the item, and must have been intended to come under the other item.

I have been told of an argument that will be advanced here, and I presume the reason my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), has not advanced it is that he has so little confidence in it, that is that the meaning of the word 'jointed' is planed or smoothed off on one side. You will agree that we must construe a statute according to the ordinary use of the words used therein. Then by the word 'jointed,' can you say you mean planed? No man, who has any respect for his assertion, can say so. We are told, on the other hand, that it is not the ordinary meaning, but that it is some customary meaning that will carry weight here. I have never heard the argument that some meaning that is applied to a word in some particular custom or trade is the meaning you must give it in an Act of parliament. I do not think that argument can be advanced with any show of reason. I have said we must construe these words according to their ordinary meaning.

Another rule I have copied from a legal decision:

What the legislature intended to be done or not to be done can only be legitimately ascertained from what it has chosen to enact either by express words or by reasonable and necessary implication.

If that is so what construction are we to place on this word?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman argue that the interpretation is illegal? I understand that my hon. friend is a lawyer.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). What interpretation?

Mr. MEIGHEN. That placed on it by the Department of Customs?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). The department never told us they placed that construction on it.

Mr. THOMSON.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The Board of Customs has given a ruling as to what the clause means. Does the hon. member argue that ruling is invalid for illegality?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I am not sure I understand what the hon. gentleman means. If he means to ask me whether or not a ruling that the word 'jointed' there means 'planed' is correct, then I say that the ruling is wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then why do not his friends, the American lumbermen, apply to the courts for redress, instead of applying to this House?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I presume the American lumbermen can apply to the courts for redress if they want to, I am not counsel for the American lumbermen any more than my hon. friend; I am here representing the constituency of Qu'Appelle. My hon. friend cannot shelve me off my line of argument that way and it is not fair of him to attempt it.

As to the construction placed upon it by the department, I am going to show that the words used by the department show plainly that they do not claim the word 'jointed' means 'planed.' I shall read you the declaration of the Board of Customs in connection with this matter:

In connection with the request for a decision as to the rate of duty payable on imported lumber for which free entry is claimed under tariff items 503 or 504, the Board of Customs declared: 'That sawn planks, boards, joists, scantlings, studding and other lumber of wood, dressed on one side, when also dressed wholly or partially on one edge, is dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, under the general tariff, on importations into Canada.'

So they use the word 'dressed,' they do not say 'jointed,' the department do not claim it is jointed. I do not know who will claim it later on, some of the things we hear claimed might lead us to expect anything. I am trying to show that the lumber in question is not dutiable according to the Customs Act and I think I am right. There has been no attempt to show that the word 'planed' means the same as 'jointed' or is intended to mean the same. If the word 'jointed' is intended to mean 'planed,' why have we not got something about jointed lumber? We have jointed lumber as well as planed and tongued and grooved, why is not jointed lumber referred to? Would ship lath, or something of that kind come in free?

If the construction placed on this word 'jointed' is that it must cover planed lumber, then I submit that ship lap must come in free. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken tells us that there was no increase in price. I wonder what the British Columbia lumbermen came here for. Was it on a pleasure jaunt? I do not think so.

I think they came because they wanted to increase the price of their lumber. That is the only reason they came. I presume they have plenty to do at home, and their expenses amounted to something. They came so as to increase their profits. As the hon. member for Assiniboia has said, the effect of an increase of duty is to increase the price, we know that is the universal effect. Now, we are told that the British Columbia lumbermen, and the other lumbermen, are such good, honest men that they will not take advantage of this regulation, and will not increase the price. But there is another class of men, called jobbers, who are going to buy lumber from the United States at a ruinously low rate, we are told, but are going to charge us just the same as before. Why is a jobber going to take illegitimate profits while a lumberman is not? I presume they are made of the same sort of clay. We have no more reason to trust the lumber manufacturer than the jobber. Moreover we have not the same reason to trust him in this particular instance, because the jobbers are scattered all over the country, and are not in a position to combine. We are told that there is no combine among the lumbermen. I think it was once proved that there was a combine among them, and I think, if we get at the bottom of the matter we shall find that there is a combine yet. I grant that there is not the same evidence of a combine. I know that in the town where I live people have been prevented from dealing in lumber, because the lumbermen would not allow more than a certain number of dealers in the town, because the effect would be to reduce prices. I admit that they have dropped that evidence of a combine, but I do not admit that they have dropped the combine; the combine is still there, though the evidence is not so clear as it was before. We are told that people who buy job lots at a low price do not sell them at a low price. Is there any man in this House who does not know the contrary? Is there any man here who has not often seen merchants and others buy job lots and sell them at a much decreased price? The usual thing is that when a man buys anything at a job lot price he sells it at a lower price than the ordinary price. We are told that this is a violation of the dumping clause. If that is the case, why do not our friends opposite take action under it? They are not so green as to neglect an opportunity of that kind. If there is any violation of the provisions of the dumping clause, why does not the Minister of Customs take action under it instead of making this change in the tariff regulations? I do not admit for one moment that there is any reasonable argument in favour of the proposition that lumber is dutiable. But suppose it is. The minister will probably tell us that he was obliged to put on the duty to protect the lumbermen because the Act compelled him to do so. Well, there is another remedy which he can easily provide if the Act compels him to collect 25 per cent duty, and if he believes the farmers have a right as well as the lumbermen, the remedy is to change the Act so that the lumber in question will be allowed to come in free the same as in the past. That is an easy remedy, and on behalf of my fellow farmers of Saskatchewan I would ask him to apply it. It will be only fair and just, if he believes he is obliged to collect the duty as it is at present. I do not think I have anything further to say on the question. It is quite clear that the lumber in question is not dutiable, and even if it were, it is hardly fair that these exorbitant duties should be collected. If it is dutiable, the Act is plainly a mistaken Act. The fact of the matter as it stands now is this, that the Department of Customs, as administered by the late Minister of Customs, permitted the farmers of the western provinces, and the farmers of other provinces to bring lumber into this country free of duty. I do not want to make any distinction between the farmers of the west and the farmers of the east.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Do I understand the hon. member to say that the late Minister of Customs allowed lumber imported into the west, planed on two sides, to be entered free of duty?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I cannot tell just what lumber paid duty, not being a lumberman. I bought my lumber from a lumberman, but I never asked him what lumber paid duty, and what did not. I presume, however, that if lumber was planed on both sides it would pay duty. I was saying that under the administration of the late Minister of Customs we received that particular kind of lumber free of duty, whereas under the administration of the present minister we have to pay duty on it. All this fine play with interpretations may do for lawyers, but the effect on the farmer is that he has to take out of his pocket good money, and pay duty that he had not to pay before, and there must be some reason for it.

If we admit there is any question—and that is the best construction that can be put on the wording by hon. gentlemen opposite—if we admit there is any question as to the meaning of the word, we can understand well why the ex-Minister of Customs in the late government favoured the farmer and the consumer. If it was a matter of favour we can understand how a man's symathies will have some effect on his opinion, no matter how honest he may be; and I can understand well why the ex-Minister of Customs should have been more favourable to the consumer than the manufacturer, and why the sympathy of the present minister (Mr. Reid) goes out entirely to the protected manufacturer and pays no attention to the farmer who pays the duty.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments of my hon. friend who has just spoken. I may say that this matter is one which is being used by hon. gentlemen opposite for the purpose of making an unfair attack on the present government. There is no intention on their part to protect or help in any way the farmers of the northwest. Their object is simply to harass the present administration. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that the party responsible for the interpretation—the correct interpretation—put upon that clause in the tariff is an official in the Customs department who was appointed by the late administration. That official was perfectly correct in his action. In his capacity of inspector, he discovered that lumber, which was rightly dutiable under the Customs Act and the regulations, was coming in free. Hon. members opposite have been begging the question throughout the whole of the debate, both to-day and a month ago when the subject came up before. My hon. friend who preceded me, laboured hard for the last half hour to show that the actual interpretation of the clause in question is not the correct one. But every one who knows anything about the lumber business will agree that the interpretation by the commission is perfectly accurate. Every one in the lumber trade will know that in the construction of houses, joists, scantling, boards as they come from the saw at the mill, are frequently wider at one end than the other. The mill run is invariably untrue as far as dimensions are concerned. Consequently, before that lumber can be used for construction purposes, these edges which are untrue must be trued up by the process of manufacture. Now, by the customs tariff, which was not the creation of this government, the manufacturers are protected to the extent of 25 per cent duty advalorem; and under the clause I have referred to, the lumber in question is distinctly manufactured. On no occasion has the present government sought to place a duty on rough lumber. They have no idea of changing the tariff schedules which were in operation a number of years under the late administration, but what they have done is this: On representations made by their own officer, they faced the question fairly, and put in force the true interpretation of the tariff. But the late government, on the contrary, fearing the farmers of the northwest, connived with the American mill owners, and allowed their own statutes to be evaded. Such conduct, I submit, was unworthy of any government.

My hon. friend asked why the lumbermen from British Columbia came down here, and he gave an elaborate disquisition on the plum of profit which they were expecting. They came, he said, for the express purpose of increasing profits on their lumber, whereas, as a matter of fact, what they came for was to stop a fraudulent practice which had been discovered by an officer of the late government. Not only was lumber brought in free in disregard of this clause in the statute, but the Americans were shipping in lumber billed rough, whereas in the heart of these cars was stowed away secretly considerable quantities of planed and dressed lumber. It was this grievance which the lumbermen of British Columbia came down to have redressed, and this government faced the question fairly. The lumbermen did not ask for any change in the tariff, but simply that they should be protected according to the statute law of the country. Surely every businessman has the right to demand that the law be administered as it stands on the statutes. That is not asking any favours. The farmers of the northwest and the lumbermen of British Columbia have equally the right to insist that our laws should be administered as they are enacted.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS. When the House rose I had pointed out what constituted jointing, according as that term is used in the Tariff schedule. I am sure hon members will have observed that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) in endeavouring to discuss this question of what constituted lumber in the manufactured state described by the term 'jointed', made a gross failure of the effort, and also that the attempt of the last speaker and taht of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) would lead the House to believe that the present administration was seeking to take undue advantage of the farmers of the northwest. Let me call attettion to the wording of the resolution.

That the Minister of Customs, in collecting a duty of 25 per cent on sawn planks, boards, joists, scantling, studding and other lumber of wood dressed on one side when the edges thereof are neither jointed nor tongued nor grooved, is violating the Customs Act and unduly and illegally imposing a heavy tax on the people.

Now, the wording of that resolution is on a par with the ambiguous language used by the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) in discussing the question. All through that discussion a distinct and deliberate effort was made to becloud the real issue. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) stated that the lumbermen of British Columbia, and, I

presume, the lumbermen of Ontario, were anxious to deal with this question on its merits and that they welcomed and asked for fair criticism of their position. But no man or body of men can deal with such ambiguous language as is contained in this resolution. As a matter of fact the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and other hon. members on that side know that the Department of Customs is not collecting 25 per cent duty 'on lumber of wood dressed on one side when the edges thereof are neither jointed nor tongued nor grooved.' That is simply a subterfuge. All these ambiguous terms are used simply to get the House to commit itself to a vote condemning the government for something they are not doing. Let me call the attention of the House to the exact terms of the Act.

This law has been in force for years and it was favoured by the late government which hon. members opposite so long supported:

> Sawn boards, planks and deals, planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued or grooved.

Now, I contend it is not right, it is not honourable,—if I am permitted the use of that term—to place before the House a resolution of this kind taking advantage of the fact that many members are not familiar with all the technical terms of the lumber business. On the contrary, it is for these hon. members who have a grievance to clarify the atmosphere and lay these matters before the House as they are. Here is the point at issue: The lumber merchants of the northwest for years were bringing in lumber contrary to law. Not one hon. member who has spoken on the other side has dared to offer any explanation for that action. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle, I think it was, said that the ex-Minister of Customs had favoured the farmer in this matter, in other words that the minister who had this particular branch of the administration in his control had winked at the statute and given to the farmer of the northwest an advantage—at least he told them he gave them an advantage, but I will show in a minute that that advantage did not exist. And why did he do it? Simply to quiet them in their demands for the fulfilment of promises given them in years gone by by the leader of the late government. Another point is that during the past two weeks hon. members on the other side have been charging the administration with not fulfilling their promises. The House has been in session about thirty-five days altogether, and hon. gentlemen opposite expect, with their rambling attacks upon the administration, occupying much time of this House, to cause the people to believe that the administration has failed in the fulfilment of its promises; as if in thirty-five days a government could carry out every plank in the platform on which it went to the electors. The assumption of such a position is a sheer absurdity. As to this lumber question, I read in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' the other day that the farmers of Alberta had had a convention and that they were going to send a delegation to lay before the leader of the government certain matters which are of vital interest to them; and in that convention, while they referred to the duty on agricultural implements and to many other matters there was not the slightest reference to the lumber question. Yet hon. members opposite would have the House believe that the whole northwest is suffering intensely because of the correct interpretation of this clause and the proper enforcement of this statute. Such a contention can have only one object in view, especially when taken in connection with the wording of this resolution, and that is, as I have said, to harass and hamper the operations of the government; and that,I hold, is not to the credit of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

It has been stated that a lumber combine exists. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle, while admitting that there was no possible evidence of a combine, said he was sure that a combine existed. Now, if such a combine does exist, it must have grown under the care and nurture of the administration of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who now leads the opposition. Ever since this session opened there have been repeated charges throughout the country that a combine existed. Is there an hon. member on that side who has the temerity to state that these combines have come into existence since the accession to power of the present administration? Any man with even a grain of common-sense knows that it takes some time to develop a combine. Again, the word 'combine' has been used very loosely. A combine, as I understand it, is a combination of a number of individual concerns under one control with the idea of eliminating competition. I do not think any hon. member opposite would question the accuracy of that definition. There are three lumber associations in the west, just as there are associations in every other trade and profession in the country. There is the wholesalers' association, the retailers' association, the grocers' and hardware and druggists' associations—even undertakers' associations. And the lawyers and the doctors

have their associations as well. These associations are for the purpose of promoting the best interests of the trades or professions concerned. The three lumber associations in the west are the Pacific Coast Lumber Association, the Kootenay Lumbermen's Association and the Northern Alberta Spruce Lumbermen's Association. These three associations are independent of and in keen competition with one another. Nobody can gainsay these facts. Therefore, I do not think that hon. members opposite can substantiate their contention that a combine exists. In the next place, the late government under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if I remember correctly, held an investigation into the alleged combine on the Pacific coast, and nothing was done to deal with that combine.

If that combine existed, which I deny, if that contention is true which is made so earnestly by hon. gentlemen opposite, then I say the late government was not true to its duty as administrators of the country's affairs in allowing that combine to exist through all these later years, because the association I have spoken of has been in existence for a great many years. Now I want to go further, and say that not only is there competition between these various associations and large companies who are operating in the western parts of Canada, in Alberta and British Columbia, but there is another association which is entirely distinct from the millmen and manufacturers, namely, the Retailers' Association in the Northwest. This retailers' association is simply an association of the retail lumber merchants of the prairie provinces. I know nothing whatever of their organization or of their operations, other than what any citizen may know from general report. But the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) stated to-day that when the combine, as he called it,—and which, by the way, they have not proved to exist —when the combine existed they controlled the retail market in the Northwest, and because of this fact the retailers broke away from the lumbermen of the west and formed an organization of their own. This is the explanation made by the hon. gentleman, who will correct me if I am not right—they formed an association for importing American lumber for the purpose of giving relief to the persecuted farmers of the Northwest. Am I correct?

Mr. TURRIFF. No, I did not say that at all.

Mr. STEVENS. Well, the hon. member may not have used those exact words, but that was the impression he gave.

Mr. TURRIFF. If that was the impression the hon. gentleman took from my words, he must have misunderstood me, because I had no such idea in my mind. 'Hansard' will show what I said.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, 'Hansard' will show, but unfortunately we haven't it here. In any case, what I say is that there is a retail association in the northwest which was organized for the purpose of protecting their own interests as retail lumbermen. But the contention is, whether the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) made it or not, that these retailers' associations were formed in self defence to protect themselves against the western millmen, and they proceeded to import American lumber. Now what is the result? Prior to the formation of this retailers' association, the price of lumber in the Northwest was cheaper than it is at the present time, since the association has been in operation; in other words, with the change in the system of distribution of the lumber direct from the millmen of the west by the retail organization as it now exists, the farmers of the Northwest have to pay more for their lumber to-day. That fact I think will not be questioned by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now I want to ask, if this combine which is talked about so glibly by hon. gentlemen exist to-day what has the late government ever done, or what has any single member who is now so agitated over this question ever done, to remedy that condition, to bring this combine to task, and break it up? Nothing whatever. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) threw down a challenge when he said that he was prepared, on his responsibility as a member of this House, to offer, on behalf of the lumbermen of the west, to pay the expenses of a full investigation into the combine, if such exists, and if that combine is found to exist they will stand the cost.

Now, I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite and every western member here, that so far as I am concerned, if it can be demonstrated that there is a combine in existence in the west, whether in lumber or in any other article, a combine in restraint of trade, I shall take my stand in the House independently, and irrespective of the stand of any other member, against such a combination. I am prepared, and I am sure I am uttering the sentiments of a great many other members of this House, to say that if you can demonstrate there is such a thing in existence as a combination in restraint of trade, I am prepared to deal with it by legislation in this parliament. Had hon. gentlemen opposite been serious in their charges regarding combinations of various kinds, they would long ago have in-

troduced legislation to deal with them. Combinations, as I said a moment ago, do not grow up in a day; they are, as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said the other day, the direct evolution of the modern industrial system. Furthermore, a combination that is an evolution of the modern industrial system is not injurious to trade, provided it is properly controlled by the administration of the country. But if these combines have grown up and I admit that some of them are in existence in the northwest, if they have reached a state of maturity, if they have become strongly entrenched in the community, it is owing to the nurture afforded them by the late administration and is not a result of the present government's policy. These combinations have been bequeathed by the late government, and this government is under the necessity of dealing with them. Instead of meeting the conditions as they developed, instead of meeting step by step the growth of trade and the advance in industrialism, the late government have allowed matters to drift until they have bequeathed to the present government, in this and other respects, problems which it will take a great deal of time, energy and thought to solve.

Now, Sir, I want to refer briefly to the question of reciprocity to which reference has been made. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that in the last election campaign the lumber interests of the west were strongly opposed to reciprocity. Well, I want to advise hon. members that in the riding which I represent, the city of Vancouver and surrounding district, where there are some of the largest mills in the world, and where there are centred the largest lumber interests on this continent, there were a number of lumbermen who favoured reciprocity because it was going to advantage them individually, as it would enable them to ship their red cedar lumber over to the United States where there was no competition. But we cannot base legislation on the interests of a certain number of persons, we have to take into consideration the interests of the country as a whole, not of this section or that section. As a matter of fact, at the present time there is a great deal of lumber being shipped into Vancouver. The Transcontinental railway, which was a child of the late administration, is buying practically all their lumber from the mills in Bellingham and Seattle. I think they gave one order for ten million feet of timber to be delivered in Vancouver. Hon. gentlemen will say: How does it come that the British Columbia mills cannot compete on their own ground with the American mills? Well, the proposition is exceedingly simple. For a number of years the American mills as a matter of economy have been sawing night and day, keeping up large stocks of lumber expecting that the time would come when there would be an extra demand for their lumber and they will be able to get rid of it. As we all know at the present time, and for over a year past, the American lumber market has been in a stagnant condition. As soon as the political agitation came on two years ago, the railways shut down all their extensions, except those that were absolutely necessary. The consequence is that there is a very poor demand for lumber on the other side. In addition to that, the banking system in the United States is such that no one bank can carry a large lumber concern for a year or two, and the result is that through financial stringency they have been forced to place on the market these large accumulated stocks. I want to tell the farmers of the northwest this, that while at the present time they are receiving certain benefits from the American lumber, that will only last for a short time. It is a temporary and a transitory relief, something that will last just so long as they cannot get rid of their lumber. There is no body of men who are so willing to put up the price and corner the market as are the manipulators of various lines of business on the other side of the line. I think I am perfectly safe in making that statement.

So it is claimed that the condition of the trade on the other side of the line is a blessing in disguise to the farmer of the northwest. As a result of that stagnation there is no business, and they are forced to throw their hoarded up stocks on the market and get rid of them chiefly in order to protect themselves from going into liquidation. These are the actual conditions, which can be verified by an examination of the facts. That being so, and I do not think any hon. member would question the accuracy of the statement, it is exceedingly ill-advised that the citizens, or farmers if you like, of the northwest should use this as a lever to force the lumbermen of the Pacific coast into exactly the same commercial condition as that which exists south of the line. We are prepared on the Pacific coast to meet any fair competition, we are anxious to, but we are not prepared to meet the overloaded stocks thrown on the market in competition with lumber or anything else that we may make. I do not think that any hon. member would seriously advocate such a policy. Yet, as a matter of fact, that is exactly what is being supported by hon. members opposite.

I desire to draw your attention to another point. When we were met with the condition that our natural resources were jeopardized by the passing of that reciprocity treaty, we feared, and rightly so, I think, that our large areas of pulp wood would be placed at the mercy of the pulp interests of the United States. As a matter of fact that is exactly what would have resulted if reciprocity had passed. Instead

of having, as we have at the present time, six or seven large pulp mills in British Columbia, these places would have been shut up, and the pulp wood would have been shipped to the American side, and there manufactured. As far as I am concerned, as a member and supporter of the Liberal-Conservative party, our policy is the development of our own industries in our own country and the utilization of our own resources. If there is a question of something that we cannot manufacture here I am willing to consider at any time the reduction of the tariff, but when it is a question of whether we are going to be the purveyors of raw material to the manufacturers south of the line or whether we are going to manufacture these raw materials in our own country, I stand unhesitatingly on the policy that our own raw materials should be manufactured at home. Furthermore, I contend that these large areas of pulpwood, whether in British Columbia, Quebec, New Brunswick, or any other part of the Dominion, are the just and fair right and heritage of the manufacturer of Canada. What I do agree with is that when we give certain privileges to companies or organizations in regard to these resources they should be properly safeguarded. There should be legislation which would prevent the organization of combines in restraint of trade. I most heartily agree with that proposition, and I hope that before this administration is in power for any great length of time, this great problem will be approached and dealt with. It can only be dealt with satisfactorily if we take it up properly and upon a scientific basis. When hon. members opposite charge this government with shelving these various questions, I say that such a charge is absolutely without foundation in fact. They are endeavouring to meet those problems which have been bequeathed to them as a result of the maladministration of the late government, and to deal with them on their merits as they come before them.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has impugned the motives with which my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has brought forth this amendment which he has placed in your hands. He seems to think that it is nothing more or less than a political game for the purpose of appealing to the rural vote of the prairie provinces, and he seems to question whether it has any practical end in view. If my hon. friend had been in the House during the last parliament he would have recalled the fact that those who are his own political friends, when they sat on this side of the House, were most ingenious in the creation and production before this House of motions, which, on the face of them, were nothing more or less than propositions for the purpose of catching votes. They were brought forth upon matters upon which the party was not united, they were brought forth to ends and purposes which, the party, since they have come into power, have not shown themselves devoted to. My hon. friend might also have been impressed with this thought that during the last parliament we had five, six or seven members from British Columbia who supported the Conservative party and there was not one of them who during those three years would arise and demand what they now conceive it is necessary and right that we should have had, namely a more strict interpretation of this clause which we are discussing this evening. To their mind to-day there is no doubt as to how this clause should be interpreted. Now it is as clear as the chimney on the housetop. There are men who were very zealous last parliament in performing their duties as the representative voices of their different districts, but during all those three years there was not one of these men, even including the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) who raised the question of the true, as they say, interpretation of this clause that we are speaking of to-day. It is another remarkable fact that our good friends the manufacturers never brought before the late government the view that they have now brought down. They waited until after dissolution, they waited until the late government was going before the people, and there was possibly an equal chance as to how the elections would go, but, so long as the late government was entrenched in power, and when there was no thought of the other party coming into power they were glad to let sleeping dogs lie. My hon. friend from Vancouver expresses great surprise and regret upon finding that the persons whom he has joined as fellow members of parliament and whom he is compelled to associate with, have been here year after year, and have never done a thing to break up this combine. He speaks, thinking he speaks correctly, but he speaks very far from correctly in the face of the sessional records. He speaks without knowing whereof he speaks. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) will bear me out that members from the prairies on both sides of the House did what they could in the parliament before last to investigate and expose this very combine that the hon. member for Vancouver so vigorously declares does not exist, and never did exist. The hon. member for Souris, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), the hon. member for Kings and Albert, N. B., (Mr. Fowler), and other hon. members on that side of the House, who were in the parliament before last, were members of a committee that went fully into this matter of the combine, a committee that took evidence,

and I have under my hand the evidence as it is printed in the sessional records. I shall read a word or two of it just to see whether we found a combine on that occasion or not, and just to see whether the hon. member for Vancouver may not find his heart a little lighter when he sees his environment not composed of men so careless about their duty, and so indifferent to the question as he says they were. We have the following finding of that committee, a finding which was unanimously adopted in a House composed of Liberals and Conservatives. This finding is signed by three gentlemen, one of them a prominent Liberal at that time, now deceased, the Hon. Thomas Greenway, who, to a certain extent, represented the consumers of the prairies, the other the hon. member for Lincoln, who, to a large extent, represented the opposition, and the other Mr. William Sloane, then representative from Comox-Atlin, whose heart was on the same side of this matter as is that of my hon. friend from Vancouver.

Their signatures will be found on page xxvii of the 'Journals of the House of Commons,' vol. 42, 1906-7. I shall read this much for the benefit of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens):

> Your committee also find that more recently the manufacturers formed associations known as 'the British Columbia Lumber and Shingle Manufacturers Association,' and 'The Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association,' which, in the opinion of the committee, amount to a combination, and co-operated with the said retail associations.

The finding of that committee was made the finding of the House of Commons of that day. My hon. friend says nothing was done. This parliament is not potent to do anything towards prosecuting combines, as the Minister of Labour has told us time and time again, but the Liberal government of Alberta, the citizens of which province were more intimately associated with this matter at that time than any others, taking that evidence as their brief, prosecuted these men, they were found guilty and penalized according to the Criminal Code enacted by this parliament. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), should retract this statement with regard to the indifference and indolence of those who have been in this House longer than he has been.

A combination did exist. I shall not read much of the evidence which was wrung from the men who gave it, the men who, according to the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), come with their hands up and say 'We court an investigation, we are anxious for it.' Bless their hearts, and they are ready to bear the expense of the investigation if a combination is proved. They came before that committee, and Conservative and Liberal alike who were members of that committee will bear me out that they were misleading and endeavoured to mislead the committee in every way they could without committing perjury. We had to wring the evidence from them; they evaded the question so that every answer required a dozen questions to elicit it where one should have done. It was almost impossible to get any information out of them. I shall read a word or two of the evidence before that committee. At page 191, of the same sessional record to which I have referred, there is a sworn minute from the record book of the British Columbia Mountain Lumber Association, wherein they set the prices for the sale of lumber by all men belonging to that association:

> The meeting sat as a committee on the whole and took up the price list item by item, with the result that the following changes were made up on majority votes, the advances being named below over the No. 10 list:
>
> | | | | | |
> |---|---|---|---|---|
> | 4-inch | boards | advance | $0 50 | per M. |
> | 6 | " | " | 1 50 | " |
> | 8 | " | " | 0 50 | " |
> | 10 | " | " | 0 50 | " |
> | 12 | " | " | 0 50 | " |
> | Resawn boards | | advance.. | 1 00 | " |
> | Dimension | " | " .. | 0 50 | " |
>
> throughout.
>
> Ten other classes of timber were advanced by the following amounts:
>
> $1, 50c., 50c., $1, $1, $1, $2, $1, $2, $5.

Those are the advances they put in cold blood in their minute book and which no member of that association was permitted, on peril of expulsion, which meant the ruination of his business, to violate. One poor fellow named Krapfel wanted to sell certain lumber for a bit less than the rest. At page 186 of the evidence it appears that Mr. Krapfel asked permission for the North Star Lumber Company to sell a certain stock of rough lumber piled at Cranbrook, 1,500,000 feet, for the same price as surface lumber. He explained the reason for his request and after submitting to a vote, permission was granted. Does my hon. friend think there is no combine there to keep up prices? He defined the combine as a combination of men formed to keep up prices. We find that these men set out these facts in cold blood on the record of their minute-book. We find that before Mr. Krapfel could sell he had to ask permission and give his reasons and when a vote was taken he was permitted to sell this rough lumber at the same price as surface lumber.

For my own part I am against protection from start to finish, but doubly so when we come to such unworthy combinations, to such parasites upon society as these combines are.

The proceedings of this committee lasted for a great while. It was attended by lum-

bermen who came in their defence, and by others who came to give evidence as to the working out of the combination. One gentleman, a retailer, Mr. Thomas Wilkinson, a well known man from Regina, gave evidence. He wanted to buy lumber from these lumbermen and they would not sell. The copies of the letters are here from the lumber people in British Columbia saying they could not sell to him because he had not a certificate of membership in the retail association. The Harrison River Mills and Trading Company wrote after he tried to get admission and could not:

I am very sorry to hear that you have failed in getting membership. No doubt it will come in due time. You will likely be able to get some lumber outside the association, but I fancy most of the mills belong to it. However, I only wish you the best kind of success in your new venture, and hope the day is not far distant when we will be able to sell you lumber. We would be only too glad to do it now if we could.

A free country? The manager of a great milling company writes that he would be glad to sell if he could but the combine will not allow it. The consumers on the prairie in the last resort feel the wring of that combine and the pressure of it on their shoulders.

I have another extract to read. I am sorry the Minister of Militia is not here because gentlemen will remember that in the last session of the parliament before last he made a few remarks on a motion to go into Supply on behalf of lumber, desiring that it should be protected. He called attention to the need of protection for the lumbermen and made out as good a case as he could with a view to bringing the matter before the people in as favourable a light as possible. I want to read the words I had the honour of using myself, on that occasion. I took the stand there which I take now with regard to protection, and I have taken it since and propose taking it so long as I am a member of this House. I said, at page 9513 of the 5th volume of the 'Hansard' of 1907-8:

One reason why we are always afraid of the men engaged in lumbering is that there is such danger that they will become combinsters, and I deliberately state that protection is the mother of trusts and combines. Tariffs breed trusts, and if there is one thing in which there should be no trust, that thing is lumber. For my part, I am against protection from start to finish, protection is to me an abomination. I support the Liberal party because of the two parties it is the one that favours the lower duties. But if a strong party decidedly devoted to free trade were to arise, I would be a supporter of that party, regarding its tariff policy, in this House, as representing my constituents, I believe I serve them best by supporting the party that goes furthest in granting a low tariff.

Mr. KNOWLES.

That is the stand I took then, and I take it now, and I repeat that I am sorry to see protection in any form, but especially sorry to see the favour of protection granted to people who so little deserve it as these heartless institutions, the lumber manufacturers' combine in British Columbia.

My hon. friend the Minister of Customs had an excellent chance of showing which way he is going to turn his footsteps when this matter came before him. It is not often that you can get at the combines. Their workings are essentially hidden. Conspiracy to be conspiracy must be in darkened places. You cannot have conspiracy out of doors. It is only in unexpected moments, when they reveal and expose themselves, that you have an opportunity of dealing to these illegitimate combinations the deathblow which they so well deserve. My hon. friend had his opportunity at that time, but did he take advantage of it? Let me tell him how the late government interpreted that clause—the brief way in which they disposed of it. I read from a letter in the return which has been brought down, signed by the Commissioner of Customs under date of the 17th of August, 1911. That was after the dissolution of parliament. This letter was addressed to the North Pacific Lumber Company, and it says:

I am to state that the rating of lumber for customs purposes is determined according to its condition when imported. That is the point. The rating is settled by the condition of the article at time of entry.

When the lumber comes to the border line the Minister of Customs insists on going back over its previous history to find out if it was planed and afterwards sawn. He seems to think that the customs tariff gives him the liberty to look into the antecedents of that bit of lumber. The answer of the late government was that they would look at it when it came across the boundary, and if it was entitled to be free there, free it would remain, and that is all that the law has to say about it. I have endeavoured to show that this combination exists. If anybody still doubts it, I would like to read the Winnipeg 'Telegram.' I read the other day when I moved for these papers. I am sorry that I am put to the necessity of wearying the House by reading at least a part of it again to show that this self-confessed combine does exist.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. member that it is not permissible to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. KNOWLES. If I had the paper I could read it; but, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling. That article appeared after this government came into power and after this nefarious thing was perpetrated, and

the 'Winnipeg Telegram' distinctly says that the Lumbermen's Association met in the city of Calgary and decided that they would close up many of the running mills, sell off their horses, dismiss some 200 travellers, reduce the supply, have only one place for selling, meet all competition from the United States and put it out of business at any cost, and control the market. One of the sub-headings in that article states 'there would be absolutely no compensation. That was in the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' a Conservative paper, and therefore it will not be doubted by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is no doubt that the minister was warned before these people came to Ottawa, because that same article said that they were sending a deputation to impress on the government the necessity of greater protection, in order that they might establish a complete monopoly. What is a monopoly but limiting the supply and making it inadequate to the reasonable requirements of the demand? And that is what they were trying to do by coming to Ottawa to get more protection. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) asks what is our motive in bringing this matter up? I would ask what is the motive of our hon. friends opposite in the stand they take? Our motive is to get the Minister of Customs, even at this late date, to say that that ruling was erroneous and ill-advised and to retract it. Our motive is to warn him that when he undertakes to give greater protection to the manufacturers, he will find as determined and persistent antagonism to it as it is possible for an opposition to put up. That is our intention; what is the intention of the hon. gentlemen opposite in defending protection? What is the intention of the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), with all his sophistries and twaddle about the home market? The intention is that the poor homesteader on the prairie shall be bled for the benefit of the manufacturer, and we are against that from the drop of the hat. The Minister of Customs had before him this combine on the one hand, and the consumer, the farmer, on the other hand; to which would he give the preference? He tries to cast the responsibility on the Customs board, but he is only joking. This government try to cast the responsibility for everything on somebody else. Last night, being fearful of their own friends they shirked the 'Ne Temere' business and sent it across the Atlantic to the Privy Council. They are responsible for it, and the country will hold them responsible. The Minister of Customs had to decide between this great combine, rich and powerful, and well organized, and the poor consumers, not organized, not banded together, to a great extent the wards of the government, and he was not equal to the occasion. There he was at the parting of the ways. He capitulated to the strong and the mighty, and he turned down the poor consumers. He had before him the combine on the one hand, and the consumers, who are the nation-builders, on the other; he encouraged the combine and rebuffed the nation-builders. At the beginning of his career he made the mistake of penalizing where he should have encouraged and encouraging where he should have penalized. It is worthy of remark that the lumber interests came here in equal force at the time the late government went out of power.

I should never cease to be proud when I consider that the late government, which I supported in this House a number of years, interpreted the Customs Act as they did in spite of the fact that we had a solid number seven from British Columbia at the time opposed to that interpretation and all favourable to the lumbering interests but in spite of that the Laurier government decided in favour of the consumers. But this new government have changed it to meet the views of the lumber manufacturer to the detriment of the consumer. My right hon. friend who led the late government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) looked after the consumers. My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, would no doubt have found it hard to refuse his friends from British Columbia what they asked. To have done so would have embarrassed him. I think, however, he would have done better to refuse his friends when they were in the wrong than betray the people's trust. The result is that the homesteader, the consumer, has now to pay a duty which he did not previously have to pay. Change the Act or do anything you like with it, the result is there, and he has to pay today what he did not have to pay before.

It is noticeable, on going through this return which the Minister of Customs has brought down, not only did the department go to the special trouble of sending out, specially to all the customs collectors, instructions to be very careful about warning all the tax collectors to get all the duty they could on lumber, but they also provided the men at the frontier ports with stamps for use in stamping the face of the manifest with the words:

This car contains dutiable lumber.

That was to be done when the frontier officer was able to give this information on inspection of the car without unloading the freight. If the officer was able to inspect it and do a little detective work and find out that the lumber was dutiable, he should stamp on the face of the manifest the words 'this car contains dutiable lumber,' and then it runs the gauntlet before the collectors of customs at Regina or

Moosejaw, or wherever it eventually gets in.

There is something more which the minister does not include in the return. They got a man from Ontario and they sent him out to the west with a few bits of sticks to all the collectors of customs, and he said to them: When you get a stick with this particular mark on it, spot it.

So careful were they that by no chance would the consumers get the advantage of the interpretation which the late government had put on lumber during so many years. This shows more than a mere desire to carry out the spirit of the Act. It shows the desire of the new government to deliver the goods to their friends who had helped them into office. This shows that the right hon. the First Minister, and his friends were ready at that early day to give something to their supporters, the manufacturers, as an earnest of what they might expect later when this administration felt itself more secure in the saddle. And the manufacturers no doubt accepted this favour as an instalment of what would be given them when the government really got down to business.

It has been said this afternoon that the lumber brought to Canada was sold at prices ruinously cheap. That can be disposed of in one word. The hon. member for Kootenay trifled with it as with many other points. He said the dumping clause was never put into practice because the manufacturers had not asked for it. I do not know that it was up to them to ask for it. The government did not refer that question to them. If it was necessary for them to ask for it they could have asked for the benefit of that clause. But, in any event, according to their own statement the dumping clause has been violated and the Minister of Customs must face the issue. He stands now charged with an infraction of the law in not having enforced the Customs Act, which is more serious than a mistake in the interpretation of a clause of the Customs Act.

As regards what the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) said about his precious home market. It appears that British Columbia buys some of our oats and consequently say they we should buy their lumber. I do not know where we will stop if because it suits some people in British Columbia to buy our prairie oats we are to supply them with a market for everything they have. We do not get any more for our oats because these people buy them. They buy their oats as cheaply as they can; and if they found the prices on the prairies higher than in Oregon, if they could buy their oats from Oregon and pay the duty and expenses, and get them cheaper than in our own country, they would not buy them from us. But even if they do buy a few bushels, that does not do us any good. We sell our oats on an export basis, and it is a matter of indifference to us whether we sell them to British Columbia or not. This home market business is played out. If we have to tax the whole of Canada for the sake of giving some man a home market, then we are in a very peculiar position indeed. Let us take this home market policy and carry it to its logical conclusion. If it means anything, it means that it should constitute the permanent basic principle on which we should carry on the business of the country. Let us suppose that all we produce could find a sale in the home market. If there be a home market for 5,000 sets of working harness, the harness manufacturers will produce that much and will have no object in producing more. But the farmer is in a different position. He must produce enough every year to be ready for a bad year and still have enough for the home market. But when he has supplied the needs of the home market, what will he do with his surplus? Carry this home market principle to its logical conclusion, and it leads to absurdity. In agricultural products, we must be on an export basis. There is no home market for all that we produce, and we must find markets for our surplus. In this matter the manufacturer and the farmer are like two men, one of whom has a pocket into which he tells his friend he may put his hand and his friend will find nothing in it. Then he knows that his friend has a pocket into which he would be very glad to put his hand, and he says to him: You put your hand into my pocket, let me put mine into yours. A man who could put such a policy into practical effect would soon become a millionaire. These people say to us: We want your home market and we want to have the exclusive monopoly of it because we give to you our home market in which you can sell us a few bushels of oats for our horses. If a protectionist knows that he is asking a favour or a privilege, I can talk with him intelligently.

But if he persists in arguing on the basis that he has a fair and logical argument to go upon, I confess I have never been able to reach a basis of intelligent discussion with such a protectionist. Suppose a father has four sons, one of whom gets a percentage from the rest on all they handle. That son gets a privilege, and as long as he recognizes it as a privilege, you can understand the relationship of that family. But once that boy gets the idea that he rules the home and owns his brothers, that because he is privileged he is the big one of the house, there is no reaching an understanding—you can only put that boy out, he must be disciplined. And it seems to me it has about come to that in Canada. The protectionists have so long had too much to say; they have

been so long favoured and privileged, that they have lost a realizing sense of the fact that it is a privilege which we have given them, and it will be up to the people of Canada to give these people to understand that we cannot deal with them on a basis of argument, and that until they recognize that that which they hold is a privilege we are unable to intelligently discuss the matter. Now, what our hon. friends from British Columbia want is an exclusive market for their lumber on our prairies. They think that because they spend a little money in our country, because they buy some cereals—it suits them to do so—therefore they have an argument in favour of compelling us to purchase their lumber. For my part, I wish we could get rid of this home market business altogether. British Columbia can take its home market and stick it in its pipe and smoke it, so far as we are concerned. I represent 90,000 people of Saskatchewan who are not a whit better off for the home market. We are ready to do business as Canadians. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) grew patriotic—he would not be the good Tory he is if he could not grow patriotic. He presented to us a view of the whole country, each part building up the other. That is very fine, and we join with him heartily in it. But let this 'home market' talk be stopped. It does not help us in the west, so far as I know, nor does it help the agriculturalists of the Dominion generally. Consider, for instance, this 'home market' in British Columbia. We have 13,000,000 acres under crop, and we have the possibility of between 200,000,000 and 300,000,000 acres to bring under crop. The hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) told us not long ago of an immense track north of Prince Albert which had not hitherto been reckoned as arable, but which in the future would be devoted to agriculture. I figure that your home market in British Columbia would take about two and a quarter million bushels, or about one per cent of our present production, and about one-seventh of one per cent of our prospective production. That is the 'home market' which the hon. member so magnanimously offers to give us. In all kindness I tell him to take his home market, if he is going to quote it to us as a reason why we should give him a monopoly of our market, to put in his pipe and smoke it for all we profit by it. We have not as yet heard a number of our hon. friends, especially my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) on this subject. In the past they have put themselves forward as the zealous friends of the farmer. I trust that on this occasion we shall have the opportunity of welcoming them as true advocates of what I believe is the desire of their constituents in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminister). Mr. Speaker, after listening to these latter day spokesmen of what was once the great Liberal party, I am compelled to the reflection, which I am sure will be shared by many of the older members of that party, that still greater has been the fall thereof. The address which has just been delivered by the hon. member for Moosejaw might have been expected from a member of one of the legislatures of the United States. It might have been the hostile deliverance of some representative of Washington, of Idaho, or Montana, or of one of the other border states of the American union still feeling the soreness they have been experiencing since we in Canada, in our wisdom, decided that we would continue to administer our own affairs in our own way, and allow our American cousins to do the same on their side. To answer a question put by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, before the House has quite forgotten it, I will take up first some of his remarks instead of dealing with this matter as perhaps it might more properly have been dealt with in accordance with the sequence of events. The hon. gentleman asked, what is the motive of the supporters of the Conservative party in bringing this matter to the attention of this government?

I am in as good a position as any hon. member of the House to answer that question, because I had the honour, in pursuance of my duty to my constituents, to bring this matter personally to the attention of the Minister of Customs and to secure from him the action which was taken. And I have pleasure in telling the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) what was one of my motives, a strongly compelling motive, in coming to Ottawa to see the Minister of Customs. My motive was to endeavour to restore the Department of Customs to the path of rectitude which for so many years it had followed and from which it had departed, so far as we know, only in the declining days of the late administration when the grafters of Canada had made of the department their latest possession. We heard from the hon. member the statement made with the boldness and with the lack of accuracy characteristic of nearly every statement of supposed fact made on that side to-day, that no one thought it worth while to approach the late government with a complaint upon this score, that it remained for the Conservative party, the friends of the manufacturers to whom the hon. gentleman so contemptuously refers, to be in power, before the people who thought themselves aggrieved came to Ottawa seeking a

remedy. The House is entitled to expect from a member in the position of the hon. gentleman, when addressing it with a return in his hand, that if he purports to quote from the return he shall make a correct quotation. Yet, what do we find? In contrast with his statement that not until the Conservative party came into power was this issue raised, we find this letter in the return in the hon. gentleman's possession and in the possession of every hon. member on that side:

The North Pacific Lumber Company, Ltd.
Barnet, B.C., Aug. 9, 1911.

F. C. T. O'Hara, Esq.,
Deputy Minister
Department of Trade and Commerce.
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We wish to draw your attention to the tremendous increase in importations of lumber from the United States, particularly the increase in kinds admitted free of duty.

A number of manufacturers in the states of Washington and Idaho have ingeniously placed a saw behind their planers when planing their dimension lumber on one side and one edge, and by means of this saw endeavour to give the lumber the appearance of having been planed on one side only.

Lumber manufactured in this way is further manufactured and planed on one side and is therefore dutiable, but a great deal of lumber manufactured in this way is coming into our country free of duty. This is not in the best interest of trade and commerce and we cannot see why a smart practice like this on the part of the United States manufacturers should admit this particular lumber free of duty when the tariff places a duty of 25 per cent on all lumber planed on one side and one edge.

Yours truly,
North Pacific Lumber Co., Lt.,
Per J. H. MACDONALD.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that I made some misrepresentation?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think I was plain in what I said. I said the hon. member had stated to this House that the persons aggrieved by the importation of this lumber, had not appealed to the late government on the subject, but had waited until the Conservative party, the friends of the manufacturers, had come into office before they raised this question.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I said distinctly that not until after dissolution, when it was impossible to tell which party would be returned, was this question raised.

Mr. TAYLOR. I leave it to the judgment of the House whether the word 'dissolution' was mentioned before to-night.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is what I said.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now we have this answer, following this story for a time in its chronological order. First of all, I wish to say that this return, while it purports to give everything on the files in relation to this matter, is far indeed from presenting a complete story of the applications to this government in connection with this lumber duty. I say without hesitation—and it is unfortunate, in a limited sense, that there is so small a remnant present of the late government, because I would like to say to all these gentlemen that so far from this matter not having been presented to them until after dissolution, as the hon. gentleman has said just now, in correction of his statement as I first understood it—this protest had been presented to them a long time before, and had been discussed amongst the ministers themselves. I cannot say that it had been discussed in council, because I am not permitted to know that, but I do know that it was discussed amongst the ministers themselves, and that several ministers of the late government were deeply concerned indeed over the agitation by their own friends about this illegal importation of lumber. I believe there was in the possession of those ministers at one time an urgent representation from one of their colleagues that something should be done to stop this illegal importation. That record, this letter, it is true, is not among these papers, but there is evidence in these papers of representations made to the late government more than a year before dissolution, very strong representations, as to the illegality of the method being pursued by the importers of this contraband lumber, and appealing to them to take action.

Mr. KNOWLES. Where does the hon. gentleman find that in the files?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will supply the references when I come to them, they are under my hand; and I would suggest to hon. gentlemen that, before they stand up in this House in so serious a vein as they pretend to assume, it would be well for them to make themselves masters of their text, and to read the documents upon which they base their complaint. Now I would digress for a minute to say to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)—I am sorry he is not in his seat, but he will read it in 'Hansard'—that there is an explanation why the consumer in the northwest provinces never got any benefit from this illegal importation of lumber, and which shows how it happens that since that illegal importation has stopped the consumer suffers no injury, and the price has not been raised to him. We have another reason than the lumber bargain counter mentioned in this House, we have a reason based on the fact that in this con-

nection the late government, notwithstanding their present professions of so warm and all-embracing friendship for the farmers of the Northwest Territoies, when they got an opportunity to stand man fashion for these farmers, declined to do it, but crawled into the cellar, and allowed the dispute to go on, making no effort to settle it. I would remind those gentlemen that if at any time this government, or any government, finds that a duty is oppressive, it has at its disposal the resource taken by the government so recently in the matter of the duty on coal imported into the Northwest provinces. If these gentlemen had thought that the tariff as enacted oppressed the farmers of the Northwest, they had it in their power to declare that lumber coming in under any one of those items in the schedule should be free of duty. But did they do it? Is there a word from first to last in this document to show that they ever made a manly statement, ever gave notice to all concerned, that they were privileged to bring in this class of lumber? I say there is not one word. But these gentlemen chose to put themselves in the questionable position of allowing the matter to be carried out in an underhand way, and allowed the lumber to be invoiced into Canada under descriptions it was not entitled to bear. If these gentlemen were seized with the idea now advocated by those who have spoken with so great an appearance of feeling in this House, if these were their real sentiments, a stroke of the pen, an order in council, would have settled the question beyond any controversy. The hon. gentleman leads the House to believe that had the Liberal government remained in power, nothing whatever would have been done in the direction of enforcing the duty on lumber provided by this Act. Now, I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman who last addressed the house to an oversight on his part when he was quoting from the return—and he was the only gentleman who handled the return—when, by some miracle, he lost sight of this little letter. The letter is an answer to still another complaint addressed to the late government from the Island Lumber Company, Limited, dated at Duncan, British Columbia, on the 2nd September, 1911.

Hon. J. C. McDougald,
Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We are glad to notice through the medium of the press, that the matter of importing American lumber dressed on two sides, duty free, is to have your attention.

Now, here is the reference for which the hon. gentleman asked as to former representations to the government:

We were under the impression that the British Columbia Lumber Manufacturers' Association, Ltd., had written to you in Ottawa last year, on this important subject. We beg to state that many millions of feet, we believe more than 150 millions as a matter of fact, of material of this kind, have escaped payment of duty within the last year or two, mainly we think through the lumber being wrongly described.

The facts are these, that all joists, studding and scantlings are sized by machinery in order to bring each and every piece to exactly the same dimension, and it makes no difference whether the sizing is done by a planer or by a saw, the object can be accomplished in either way. The American manufacturers, however, do both. They are in the habit of planing this lumber on one side and one edge and then disguising the edge by slightly defacing the small surface with a circular saw, and their price lists and invoices are made to read 'Saw edged,' implying that only one side of the material is dressed.

We trust this information may be of interest to you, and it is needless to say that we shall be very glad to see that the proper duty is imposed.

Yours very truly,
Island Lumber Company, Limited,
Per (Sgd.) W. MARRIOTT.

One would think from the antics, Mr. Speaker—but I desire to be strictly parliamentary—the performances, the words of these hon. gentlemen this afternoon, that their government, upon receiving a letter of that kind, would have, to use a common expression, thrown a fit at the very suggestion that any concessions enjoyed by the farmers of the Northwest should be reduced in any way. One would expect to find that the Commissioner of Customs, or the late Minister of Customs himself, would be bold enough to address a letter calling down this man on Vancouver Island who suggested that any person in the Northwest should pay a duty on any product of the industry of their neighbours on the Pacific coast. We would have expected these gentlemen to be bold as roaring lions, and to declare that in no instance whatever, would they consent to any ruling or decision which would impose a duty as suggested. But great would be our disappointment, if we were not in that frame of mind, when we read the pacific reply, dated the 19th September, and which is as follows:

The Island Lumber Co.,
Duncan, B.C. (Vancouver Island).

Gentlemen,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd instant, respecting the importation of American lumber dressed on two sides.

I have carefully noted your representations regarding lumber sized by use of a planer or fine saw.

I have noticed in the newspapers the representations made at the meeting of the sawmill men at Vancouver on the 1st September, and expect to hear further from them in respect of the matter.

The Minister of Customs is expected to return here in a few days, when I will bring your letter to his notice.

I have the honour to be,
Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) JOHN McDOUGALD,

From that day until the happy release of the Minister of Customs on the 10th of October, that gentleman was not brave enough to utter the first syllable on behalf of the down-trodden farmers of the Northwest, but handed them over to the tender mercies of his successors in office, the manufacturers' friends, the Conservatives, to those whom he had every reason to believe would deal so ruthlessly with them, instead of settling up the matter man fashion, and deciding before he went out what the interpretation was with respect to that grade of lumber. I would ask you to contrast the statements of hon. gentlemen with the history, as shown in this return, indicating that the late government were too cowardly, if I may be permitted to use that language, to face the issue, that they were content to allow their friends in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan to go up and down on the hustings declaring their friendship to the people there while at the same time they were content to allow others in British Columbia and the manufacturing provinces to go around whispering words in the ears of those engaged in the great industries which have made this country what it is to-day, that they had nothing to fear from the continuance of the Liberal party in office. I would ask you to contrast that exhibition of cowardice with the brave words uttered to-day by these hon. gentlemen who are as impotent as they deserve to be.

One would fancy from the complaint of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), that something terrible had happened to his constituents and the farmers of the northwest generally, since a date in November, when the Customs Board, in the performance of their duty, directed collectors everywhere to enforce the law. One would fancy that these men had been impoverished by the extra amount they had to pay to the lumber dealers throughout that territory to recoup these dealers for the amount of duty they had to pay at the customs in Canada. One would fancy that if he did not know, what is a matter of notoriety, that the position is not as represented by these hon. gentlemen, that the farmers are not paying one dollar in extra price as the hon. member for Assiniboia, the hon. member for Moosejaw, and others have stated and whose addresses to this House, if taken literally, would lead to the belief that these men had been mulcted in considerable sums by the exorbitant prices that they had been called upon to pay. The fact is that they have not been mulcted one cent, that they have not paid any more than they have been paying for a long time past, and that, therefore, they could not have made any complaint to these hon. gentlemen that prices have been advanced, because of any action by this government. When we look at the records what do we see—that the whole quantity of dutiable lumber, in the form of sawed boards, and the lumber that we are considering to-day, imported into Canada during the month of November, the last month for which these hon. gentlemen can have statistics, is 4,523,000 feet. The duty, at $2 per thousand, would come to $9,000. This is the amount that was collected all over Canada on this lumber. Whilst I am referring to the hon. member for Assiniboia I would like to answer a question which he put to my hon. colleague from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), this afternoon which my hon. friend did not seem to understand. The hon. member for Assiniboia asked how it was that the people of British Columbia had grievance in respect to the lumber duty when, at the same time, the great bulk of the importation of that lumber was into the province of British Columbia, that they were, as he said in so many words, bringing it in themselves. I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman that his observation showed, to my mind, culpable carelessness in the preparation of his brief. It was a clear indication to any person familiar with the facts that the hon. gentleman must have thought so little of his case, and of those for whom he said he was speaking, that he had gone into the matter in a very cursory way indeed, that he had more words than ideas in what he said to this House, and that he was not at all careful that his words should be based on significant facts. It is quite true that during November, 1911, 12,000,000 feet of free lumber, the quantity to which he referred——

Mr. TURRIFF. Listen to this.

Mr. TAYLOR—Yes, listen to this, the hon. gentleman says——

Mr. TURRIFF. I am listening; go on.

Mr. TAYLOR—It is quite true 12,000,000 feet were imported through British Columbia, but I would like to tell the hon. gentleman, if he does not know it already, that when he reads in the customs returns that any dutiable article has been imported at this, that, or the other place, it does not mean that it has been imported by the people of the place indicated, or for consumption there, but it means, as in this instance, that this lumber was imported via the ports of British Columbia, that is that it came from the mills of Washington and Idaho across the boundary line at the most convenient port in British Columbia, and was passed on through

British Columbia to its destination in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

That is the answer to the hon. gentleman when he asks why we in British Columbia buy this lumber from the other side if its importation is so great a detriment to us.

Mr. TURRIFF. Is it true that a great deal of that lumber was imported into British Columbia by British Columbia sawmill men for the purpose of reselling it to save cutting their own lumber, they being able to buy it cheaper than they could bring the logs to their mills and saw them?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would not like to say that a great quantity of that lumber was imported under the conditions described?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is quite true, however, that lumber was so imported, particularly in the mountain districts of British Columbia near the American boundary line. It is quite true that the ruinous prices at which the rough grades of lumber are being sold on the American side make it a good business undertaking for those in the trade in certain parts of British Columbia to buy their supplies from the American side rather than to manufacture. The bearing that that has upon the point at issue is not clear to me but as a matter of fact it is correct.

Mr. TURRIFF. If that is the fact not all of the lumber imported last November could have been for customers in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. TAYLOR. Again there is an element of correctness in what the hon. gentleman says, but only an element. No doubt not all of the lumber was for customers in Alberta and Saskatchewan because it is quite credible that a board here and there was sold from the yards in British Columbia which imported it, but the fact remains—we are dealing with facts, not quibbles—that the great bulk of this lumber, practically speaking, was imported for reshipment to Alberta and Saskatchewan. I am referring to this 12,000,000 feet to which the hon. gentleman referred, the lumber which came in under the item admitting rough lumber free. The amount that came in dutiable, was, as I have said, the comparatively small total of 4,523,000 feet. The Minister of Customs has been attacked for yielding to some terrible organization known as the Lumber Combine. As I have said in this House before, I have no acquaintance with any lumber combine. The ignorance of these hon. gentlemen is perhaps excusable from the fact that their course as public men representing the territory from which they come does not encourage the establishment of industries in their vicinity. Perhaps on that account they are unfamiliar with the conditions attendant on industry, but I would like to remind them that there can be no successful combine of manufacturers or any other industrial interest without the presence of a very large body of workmen, that we have in the employment of the lumber manufacturers of British Columbia a very large number of the most skilled workmen in Canada who are amongst the highest paid workmen in Canada, men who would be a credit to any country, who are a great credit to Canada, and who are a source of pride to British Columbia, because they and their families are residents of that province. I would like to tell these hon. gentlemen that another motive compelling me to come to Ottawa and place this matter before the government, in addition to my desire to clear the Customs Department from the shadow under which it had fallen, was to preserve the livelihood of several thousand men engaged in the lumbering industry, who are residents of the riding which I have the honour to represent in this House. It was in pursuance of my duty to them, not because of any affection for or any knowledge of any combine that I addressed the Minister of Customs in these terms:

Ottawa, Oct. 25, 1911.

To the Honourable
The Minister of Customs,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I am requested to call your attention to the continuance and increase in volume of the importation of certain descriptions of lumber from the United States intended by the Tariff Act to be dutiable but which is permitted to escape duty because of the application of a process of manufacture not contemplated by the Act. This contraband article consists for the most part of 'jointed' lumber, that is, lumber sized by a process additional to the first sawing, the sizing being sometimes accomplished by what is known as a 'saw-jointer,' rather than by the planer in universal use until very recently. The effect, whether saw-jointer or planer is used, is the same, namely, to render the lumber fit for use in construction without further process.

I understand that this lumber is offered for entry under the description in tariff item 504 of not further manufactured than sawn and dressed on one side, and therefore claimed to be free. The fact is, however, that as to a large portion of the seemingly saw-jointed lumber it has been planed and then subjected to a saw to roughen the smooth edges already made by the planer; which lumber having been jointed by planing is clearly dutiable no matter what disguising process may be applied to it subsequently; while as to that saw-jointed without submission to a planer that is not the sawing contemplated by the words in section 504 on which the importers seem to rely.

I have submitted to the department letters of complaint addressed to me and which clearly set out the methods adopted by foreign

lumber manufacturers to evade the provisions of the Canadian law, and also a statement showing how great is the volume of importations made possible by this evasion.

Now I come to the request upon which the minister acted and for which the censure of the House is now invited and I would ask the House to pay particular attention to it:

I ask your earnest attention to the matter and that you may be pleased to direct officers at the ports of entry to make careful inspection of lumber imports to the end that jointed lumber, whether saw-jointed or planer-jointed may be recognized as such and subjected to the rate of duty provided for in the tariff.

What a monstrous request that was for the representative of an industrial riding to make to his government, that an article of manufacture, coming as he believed into unfair competition with the product of a large body of deserving workmen for whom he spoke, and so coming into competition under false pretences, should be scrutinized to ascertain whether or not the pretences were false and should be subjected, as I say here, to the rate of duty provided for in the tariff. It is for that you are asked to condemn the Minister of Customs, that he should cause something, whether lumber or anything else, to be subjected to the rate of duty provided for in the tariff. What course did the present Minister of Customs take? Did he shelve the matter? This matter had been left to him by his predecessors. It is true it had escaped his attention until it was personally brought before him at Ottawa a couple of weeks after he took office, but so late as September 19, the Commissioner of Customs, his deputy, had written to a complainant that the matter was on the files of the department awaiting the attention of the minister; that is awaiting the attention of this minister just as much as the attention of his predecessor.

It was his duty as time went on to clear the files of the department of all the business pending, and this was one item. No doubt his action was hastened by the representations made to him which I have described. But the Minister of Customs took the course prescribed by law. He recognized that the interpretation might be questioned, an interpretation which he was authorized himself to make if he chose, because to me it seems so perfectly plain that I wonder that any person could question it. But the practice, having gone on so long, constituted a question whether or not the then importers were justified in bringing in the lumber as they did; and therefore, that there might be no suggestion of political or other undesirable interference, the minister took the constitutional course of referring the matter to the Board of Customs. Who are the Board of Customs? Did that board change as a result of the elections of the 21st of September? Not a bit of it. The Board of Customs was constituted by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves when they were in the seats of the mighty, the board upon whose honour and honesty they must have had implicit reliance when they placed them in that position—this Board of Customs, inherited by the minister from his predecessors, as this question was, having had the facts submitted to it, took this position.

Declaration of the Board of Customs.

At a meeting of the Board of Customs, held in Ottawa, November 3, 1911.

In connection with the request for a decision as to the rate of duty payable on imported lumber for which free entry is claimed under tariff items 503 and 504, the Board of Customs declared, 'That sawn planks, boards, joists, scantlings, studding and other lumber of wood, dressed on one side, when also dressed wholly or partially on one edge, is dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, under the general tariff, on importations into Canada.'

(Sgd.) JOHN McDOUGALD,
Chairman.

What course could be more straightforward than that? Was there anything underhanded about that, any subterfuge? Was any one taken by surprise? It is not on the records, but it is a fact, that the importers of lumber and others were invited to attend at the session of the Board of Customs, and submit their case in the ordinary way? That board, sitting in a judicial capacity, took all the evidence possible, and made what we must accept as its decision.

Mr. TURRIFF. Was the consumer also given an opportunity to appear at the same time and present his side of the case?

Mr. TAYLOR. Every person was given an opportunity of being present for whom that privilege had been secured by the regulations passed by the hon. gentleman's friends, who had been administering the Customs Department for 15 years before that time.

Mr. TURRIFF. Were they notified that there was going to be a meeting on that day?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may answer the hon. gentleman in the same terms, that the Board of Customs followed the course laid out for them by the hon. gentleman's friends, who had been in charge of the board for 15 years. If there is any defect in the course provided for the board, these hon. gentlemen are responsible for it, and the new minister making his first reference to the board cannot properly be charged with any dereliction of duty, or any shifting of responsibility in not holding a serious inquiry into the constitution and habits of the board before referring the

matter to them. Upon the decision of the board this circular was sent out:

Department of Customs, Canada,
Ottawa, Nov. 11, 1911.

Memorandum:

Collectors should carry out the law in regard to the collection of duty on sawn lumber, dressed on one side, which is also dressed wholly or in part on one edge.

Collectors should also instruct outports to this effect.

Frontier ports are being supplied with a stamp for use in stamping the face of manifests with the words 'This car contains dutiable lumber' when the frontier officer is able to give this information on inspection of the car without unloading same.

All cars of lumber in bond must be examined by customs officers at port of destination.

(Sgd.) JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner of Customs.

What a commentary upon the condition into which the Department of Customs had been allowed to drift during the 15 years of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the very first memorandum sent out by the permanent head of that department after the change of government, was a reminder to collectors throughout Canada that the law of Canada had come into its own, and was once again law. This action of the department is nothing but a warning to the officers of customs that there is a law in Canada which they are there to enforce, and that it must be enforced. Horrible thing, these hon. gentlemen say, that there should be one law all over Canada, that there should be no longer a graft or a back door in the Customs Department, that offenders could have no longer immunity in the department if they entered as free matter that which was dutiable. We had the challenge from one of these hon. gentlemen this afternoon that if conditions are as asserted, why does not somebody do something? The hon. gentleman, like his colleagues on that side who have favoured us with their remarks, spoke without information of the regret of the only persons who feel themselves aggrieved by the action of the Board of Customs, and the Commissioner of Customs—because the minister does not really appear in it—that there has since been seized for contraband entry a large number of cars of this lumber which had been improperly manifested into Canada. This is a government that does something, and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson), who this afternoon asked why no person does anything, if this condition of affairs exists, has his answer; and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), if he really desires to secure lumber for any of his down-trodden constituents on the best possible terms, should attend the coming auction sale of the confiscated lumber, when he will no doubt be able to secure some for his constituents at a shade under the market price. Now contrast the record I have given with the resolution offered to this House:

That the Minister of Customs, in collecting a duty of 25 per cent on sawn planks, boards, joists, scantling, studding and other lumber of wood dressed on one side, when the edges thereof are neither jointed nor tongued nor grooved, is violating the Customs Act and unduly and illegally imposing a heavy tax on the people.

How under the sun could the Minister of Customs collect from anybody, unduly and illegally, anything imposing a heavy tax on the people that is not provided for by the law? Each of these importers knows there is a law in Canada and that there are courts in Canada to enforce the law, and it remains for hon. gentlemen opposite, when people come to them with complaints to the effect that the Department of Customs is collecting a tax it has no right to collect, to put into operation an appeal to the courts which will effectually prohibit the department from doing anything of the kind. This resolution answers itself, and it is the veriest trifling with the House to ask us to resolve that the Minister of Customs is doing something which we must know, as sensible men, it is absolutely impossible for him to do.

I would suggest to the hon. gentlemen that this expression of the grievance at this particular time by the users of lumber in the Northwest Territories is rather precipitate. I ask was it in the interest of the consumers of lumber in Alberta and Saskatchewan that the late government parted with nearly all the valuable timber land in northern Alberta for a trifling sum to various favourites closely allied with the gentlemen who have addressed the House this afternoon from that side. I would ask the hon. gentlemen who spoke so feelingly this afternoon where were they when this Alberta lumber was being disposed of? Why were they silent on that occasion? Why did they reserve their outcry against the possible creation of combines, against the encouragement of combines, until by the act of the government they supported, in which they themselves had participated, which they advised, encouraged, aided and abetted in every way, a combine had been created in Alberta lumber as binding as any that has ever been created in connection with any of the natural resources of the country.

I would ask these hon. gentlemen why they confine their solicitude for the farmer to the matter of lumber and why they show so implacable hostility to their neighbours in the province of British Columbia? Do

they stand for the idea that we are in Canada's nine provinces each at the other's throat to get for itself what seems best for the locality irrespective of the effect upon our neighbours of the other provinces? I would like to address my inquiry particularly to some of my hon. friends from Nova Scotia. It occurs to me to suggest to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that at this moment they cherish the hope that the present government may look favourably upon the proposition which they so earnestly urged upon the government lately in office to renew the bounties on steel. If these hon. gentlemen subscribe to the doctrine that each province should stand for itself alone, what position would they expect the members from British Columbia to take with respect to the steel bounties? As to these we are asked to put our hands into our unprotected pockets and contribute towards the payment of bounties to the industries of a province already generously protected. Digressing for a moment I will first ask the hon. member for Assiniboia why his solicitude is confined to lumber and why he has not included coal in his demand for freedom from the tariff? As the hon. gentleman well knows a man builds a house or a barn once in a lifetime but coal is an article of constant consumption particularly in our northwestern climate. The burden of the tax on coal is therefore infinitely greater than the burden of the lumber tariff could possibly be. Yet we hear no suggestion from these gentlemen that the government should remove the duty on coal.

Mr. TURRIFF. I can only say that we are dealing with lumber to-day, but if the government my hon. friend supports will bring in a proposition to put coal on the free list, there will be no stronger supporter of such a proposition than the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would invite the attention of the hon. member for Pictou to the tactics which he will encourage in this House if he supports this amendment. Lumber to-day on the free list—coal tomorrow. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he subscribes to this programme: free lumber to-day, free coal to-morrow? I pause for a reply.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon friend will hear from me when the occasion requires it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) is a type of the government he supported. When the lumbermen came and asked for action on this lumber business, the Minister of Customs was 'away'—'would be back in a few days.' The hon. member for Pictou will answer in a few days. I put the same question to the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). The very existence of his community as an industrial centre depends upon the prosperity of the coal mines. It is represented to the people of Ontario and Quebec who pay so heavily in connection with the coal duty that that duty is a necessity to the prosperity of these mines. I ask the hon. member for North Cape Breton—and I will give him an opportunity to answer—whether he subscribes to the doctrine of free lumber to-day and free coal to-morrow?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not particularly concerned about lumber. I was always in favour of a duty on coal. I am now and always will be.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a beautiful illustration of these hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) wants everything free that he consumes. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is like one of the famous products of his waters, dumb, and the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) wants protection for himself but no protection for his fellow-citizens in British Columbia.

Mr. McKENZIE. I did not say that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry if I misjudge this hon. gentleman. The vote on this resolution will be the test. He cannot support this amendment unless he is in favour of depriving the main industry of British Columbia of what small protection is now afforded it by the law of the land. I invite the attention of the hon. members I have named to consider just where resolutions of this kind will lead us. For my part, I believe in the policy of protection as the only policy that will make of Canada—the policy that has made of Canada—a great country. I want to advance the interests of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba in every possible way. I want to trade with them, to sell to them and to buy from them. I ask the representatives of these provinces to meet us from British Columbia in the same way. I hope I am not speaking boastingly when I say, to meet us in the same broad-minded way in which we endeavour to meet them. For our artisans must live. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) who was Minister of the Interior until lately, and who seems to think that this appeal was so great a joke, that these people have not the resources that he has had. They have only their toil to

depend upon for a living. And he has not the right to sit here and make a jibe or a joke of a proposition to deprive them of their livelihood.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The motion before the House is not a motion for the increase or decrease of the tariff. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) tells us that he is a protectionist and is in favour of a protective duty on lumber. Rough lumber has been free in this country since 1894. If the hon. gentleman is in favour of protection on lumber, being a prominent supporter of the government, he has a way to bring it about by trying to induce the government to put a duty on the lumber which now enters Canada free. But what we on this side object to is that whilst the tariff makes rough lumber free, the law is violated by collecting a duty on lumber which by law is free. That is the question before the House.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not go before the courts?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the court of parliament, the greatest of the courts; this is the place to decide whether the law is observed or not observed. I would ask my hon. friend who interrupted me, that if the fact be as we allege that the law of the land is violated by those who are now entrusted with the execution of the law, is there any place but this where the question should be threshed out? We can go to the courts, but going to the courts does not take away the primary jurisdiction of this parliament to decide whether jus—

Mr. FOWLER. But I would point out to the right hon. gentleman that if all those grievances were threshed out in this court of parliament the time of parliament would be occupied to the exclusion of our proper business, while the courts are the proper place in which to thresh out the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If any hon. member has a case to bring up in this parliament, it is his duty to bring it up whatever time may be taken by it. Now, the very wording of the amendment shows that the question is highly technical, and will require some explanation even at this stage of the debate in order that its points may be appreciated by hon. members who now do me the honour to listen to me. The reason for this motion is to be found in the letter which has just been quoted by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), and which he addressed to the Minister of Customs. After having complained that certain articles were coming into Canada from the United States upon which no duty was imposed, and having stated from his point of view the duty that ought to be levied upon the same, he concluded:

I ask your earnest attention in the matter and that you may be pleased to direct the officers at the ports of entries to make careful inspection of lumber imports to the end that jointed lumber, whether saw-jointed or planer-jointed, may be recognized as such and subject to the rate of duty provided in the tariff.

Upon this the Board of Customs made a regulation. Now, the Board of Customs is not, as has been said by some hon. gentlemen in the course of this debate, an independent body. It is composed of officers of the Customs Department—well qualified, I admit—who are simply the officers of the minister, and responsible to the minister as the minister is responsible to parliament. I have nothing to say against the Board of Customs. I know them all, and I give every one of them credit for being a man of eminent ability. But, like all human beings, they are fallible; and though I do not in any way question their integrity nor the motive which led them to make the regulation which has been brought to the attention of the House, still I submit that in this matter they have greatly erred.

I again recall attention to the petition of the hon member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) it was to the effect that lumber imported which was jointed, whether by saw or by plane, should be subject to duty. Now what is the regulation? It is in these words:

In connection with the request for a decision as to the rate of duty paid on imported lumber for which free entry is claimed under tariff items 503 or 504, the Board of Customs declare that sawn planks, boards, joists, scantlings, studding and other lumber of wood, dressed on one side, when also dressed wholly or partially on one edge, is dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem.

Now mark the regulation. The prayer was that lumber which was jointed either by saw or by plane should be subject to duty. The regulation is, not that lumber which is jointed, but that lumber which is dressed upon one side only or partially, should be subject to duty; a regulation altogether different from the petition made by the member for New Westminster. Why was this? Why were not the terms of the regulation in the terms of the prayer? Why did one ask for lumber jointed, when it was not lumber jointed which was subjected to duty, but lumber wholly or partially dressed on one edge? There is a reason for it, and to this I now direct attention.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the right hon. gentleman will follow me—I would like to say that as I understand it, the description in the tariff board means jointed lumber, what I understand as jointed lumber.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If jointed lumber was meant, why didn't it say jointed lumber? It was so easy to take the language of my hon. friend. But if it had been jointed lumber, there could have been no duty then on the article. There is a difference. Here is the article 504 of the tariff.

Lumber—planks, boards and other lumber of wood, sawn, split or cut, and dressed on one side only, but not further manufactured, is free of duty.

Mr. REID. ((Grenville). Read the next item.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will. Now let us understand what this means. Here is a piece of lumber which goes into the mill; it is sawn into planks, boards, studding, scantling and joints; it is then planed on one side, and if it is planed on one side it is still counted as rough lumber and comes in free of duty; but if it is planed on two sides, then it is no longer rough lumber, it becomes dressed lumber and is subject to duty. Now I come to the next article:

Sawn boards, planks and deals, planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed, tongued or grooved, subject to 25 per cent duty.

Now see the effect of the two articles. By one article lumber which is dressed on one side alone is not subject to duty; but that same piece of lumber, by the following article 505, when it is dressed on one side, or is jointed, tongued and grooved, then becomes subject to duty; but if it is not tongued, grooved or jointed, then it is not subject to duty. But my hon. friend from New Westminster asked that this kind of lumber should be declared to be tongued. The minister did not dare to say that that kind of lumber to which I referred a moment ago was tongued, but he says 'Dressed wholly or partially.' Well, if the hon. gentleman has authority to say that lumber which is not tongued, jointed nor grooved, but which is dressed on one side, wholly or partially, is subject to duty, where is his authority to say that tongued lumber is subject to duty? This is importing a new article into the code.

Mr. GOODEVE. The minister does not say that, neither does the ruling of the board. But the minister and the board say that where the lumber is jointed or planed on one or two sides, or planed on one side and jointed, it is subject to 25 per cent duty. The word 'partially' there is only to show where they tried to hide the fact that it had been jointed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I think I have some knowledge of the English language, and I will read again the ruling of the department:

Mr. TAYLOR.

Sawn planks, boards, joists, scantling, studding and other lumber of wood, dressed on one side when also dressed wholly or partially on one edge.

There is no mention of 'jointed' there, but 'dressed wholly or partially.' If it is dressed but not jointed, tongued nor grooved, where do you find authority to say that it is dutiable when dressed partially or wholly? This is importing a new article.

Mr. GOODEVE. The hon. gentleman must read the ruling in conjunction with the article on which the ruling is asked. The ruling was asked by the lumbermen only on lumber that was jointed. But if they have partially planed away the joint, it is still dutiable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then if it is jointed it is dutiable, if it is not jointed it is not dutiable. The ruling says that the duty shall be collected, not upon jointed lumber, but upon lumber partially dressed. Now there is some meaning in these words. If that lumber was jointed, it was just as easy to say it was jointed, then they could have collected the duty. But we shall find the explanation of the matter in the letter which is to be found on the file, and which was addressed to the member for New Westminster by the Emmerson Lumber Company on October 11. I must say that this is a very able letter. I do not know the writer of it, Mr. E. D. Rowe. He states his case very well, but while stating his case very well, he gives it all away. I will read the letter:

Dear Mr. Taylor,—I understand that Mr. L. A. Lewis has had some conversation with you in regard to the importation of sized lumber from the American side which is evading the duty. I think you will understand that certain joists and studding for use in house construction must be properly sized before it is ready to use. In other words, the material as it comes from the sawmill is too irregular in size to be serviceable. The usual method adopted by mills is to run the lumber through a planer, dress it on one side and one edge. This is the most economical way of handling it.

Now comes what has been called the alleged evasion of the law:

In order to evade the duty the American mills to-day are adopting two methods other than the above. It is usual to dress or size this lumber immediately it comes from the sawmill and pile it in the yard ready for shipment. Where this has been done our American friends are returning it to the mills before shipment to Canada and are roughing the dressed edges with a saw to eliminate the planer marks.

Allusion was made to the fact this afternoon that when the lumber had been planed and dressed on both sides it was put on the mill again and the saw run

behind the planing to erase the marks of the planer, that being described as one method of evading the duty. I will come to that later on. Another thing that he says is this:

Another method being generally adopted is to dress the lumber on one side only and then to run it through a rip-saw which 'joints' or 'sizes' the lumber to an even width.

Mark the words. After it has been planed on one side only it is run through a rip-saw which 'joints' or 'sizes' the lumber to an even width. There, you have the process. The lumber is put into the mill, it is planed on one side, put into the mill again and passed through a rip-saw and they can say that makes a joint. It is a question whether it is a joint or not, but I will come to that presently. But, this sizing is not making a joint and I think I can show that also by what follows in the same letter:

The matter was brought up in the Customs Department at Ottawa and an effort was made to have lumber prepared by either of the above methods declared dutiable under items 504 and 506 of the customs tariff. Under 504 the contention was made that the lumber was 'further manufactured' because it had to go through an additional process. Under 506 the contention was made that it was a process of manufacture not otherwise provided for. I honestly believe that under either of those items we are entitled to protection, but the department ruled against us, claiming that they could only be cognizant of the condition the lumber was in when presented to them at the boundary. My own belief is that item 505 is a much more favourable clause than either of the others and that the application should have been made under that item in preference to the others. I will quote a part of the item, eliminating some words in order to simplify, the changes do not alter the meaning.

505. Sawn boards, planks and deals, planed or dressed on one side, when the edges thereof are jointed.

The words which are omitted should not have been omitted, because they are very significant. The item reads in this way:

Sawn boards, planks and deals, planed or dressed on one or both sides when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued or grooved.

Then the writer goes on to say:

I would be willing to stake the whole case on the word 'jointed.'

I call the attention of the House to this. The gentleman who writes this says that he would be willing to stake the whole case on the word 'jointed.' I appeal to the unbaised judgment of this House that the very words which follow show that the process which is there used was the rip-saw process and that the product cannot be called 'jointed.'

Any carpenter or mill operator will tell you that in the lumber business the word 'jointed' means 'straightened' or 'trued' and a board may be jointed with a plane, a saw, or a knife, or any method which will straighten or true the edges. For instance, the finest cabinet work would have to be jointed with a hand plane, other work not so particular may be done on a planing machine, but for rough construction work the saw-jointer may be used.

According even to the statement of these gentlemen the work which has been passed through a rip-saw may be jointed for rough work, as he says, but not for the higher work of the cabinet maker.

Mr. FOWLER. It is jointed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will read the words again:

For instance, the finest cabinet work would have to be jointed with a hand plane——

Very good.

—other work not so particular may be done on a planing machine but for rough construction work the saw-jointer may be used.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the statement of these gentlemen. Here is a piece of work that has been passed through a rip-saw. The rich man buys it, it is not jointed for him and he has to get it jointed by a plane.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, these are the very words.

For instance, the finest cabinet work would have to be jointed with a hand plane.

Therefore, the rich man who buys this lumber will not have to pay any duty because it is not jointed for him, but for the poor settler of the prairie it is jointed and he has to pay 25 per cent duty.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman how he makes that out of the statute. The statute says that if it is jointed by any means it must pay duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If it is jointed—but if it is not jointed?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What I say is that it is not jointed. If it is jointed for one it must be jointed for all.

Mr. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman, a moment ago said that if it was planed for the rich man it would not pay the duty. When it is planed for the purpose of jointing and it is jointed in that way the statute says it shall pay duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, but let me say to my right hon. friend that here is a case in which the jointing is made by a saw.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, that is free.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Here is a case in which the joint is made by a saw It is jointed and, if it is jointed, the poor man has to pay, but here is the wrong, that for one man it is sawed by a saw while for the other it is jointed by a plane and therefore you have a different interpretation for one class of men from that which you adopt for another class of men.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like my right hon. friend to explain or withdraw what he said a moment ago. He said that if it were jointed by means of a plane for the rich man it came in free of duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With the same joint.

Mr. BORDEN. The same joint and the same method by saw.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the very thing that is in issue at the present time. Here is the law:

> Sawn boards, planks and deals, planed or dressed on one side or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, 25 per cent.

Here is a piece of timber which has been passed through a rip-saw and the minister says that it is a joint. Well, if it is a joint it is a joint for everybody. But the man who makes the demand of the minister that he should declare this a joint tells him that it cannot be a joint for the highest work, that it cannot be a joint for the rich man—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, that is what he says.

Mr. FOWLER. If the rich man bought a piece of timber that was jointed with a rip-saw would he not pay the duty on it just the same as the poor man would?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the rich man who buys this in order to use it must pass it through the plane after he has got it, I say it is not a joint.

Mr. FOWLER. He pays the duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The law must be the same for everybody. If it is a joint it must be a joint for all kinds of work, cabinet work, carpenter's work or any other kind of work. If it is not a joint then it is not a joint for anybody.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly not, and what is the result? You have this as a fact that in the interpretation placed upon the law it has never been understood that a joint was made only by a plane. This is the usage of the trade.

But you have a new saw to-day, and because it is a finer saw than the one usually used, you say it is creating a joint. I say it is not, because the man who wrote me assures me that for the higher classes of work this lumber cannot be used, but must be planed again. Therefore, it is not sufficiently manufactured to be the subject of duty, and this is the reason why my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff), has drawn this matter to the attention of the House. The Department of Customs is collecting a duty which they have no right to collect. Sawing timber has never been considered as jointing it. There is a machine for jointing which is well known, and the moment you do not use that machine, but saw the lumber and not plane it, then we say you are putting upon the Act an interpretation which the law does not warrant. The statute is explicit. In order to make the duty collectable the piece of timber which had been planed on one side must be grooved, tongued, or jointed. If it is not grooved and tongued, it is not liable to duty, if it is not jointed, it is not liable to duty, and the question now is, have you any reason to say or are you justified in stating, that you would subject the poor settler, the man who must be protected above all others, to a duty that never was collected before because this lumber is sawn by a finer saw than that generally used in the past. Of course the man who buys the lumber, the man in Ontario or even in Manitoba, the rich farmer or the mechanic, or the merchantman, or the professional man may use that lumber, but before using it he would have to have it planed further, otherwise the joints would not be true. But the poor farmer is not so particular, he will take his joint, imperfect as it is, and indeed any man who has been in the Northwest knows that the settler is not so fastidious about these things, he will build up his shack of anything he can get, he does not consider whether the lumber has been jointed or not jointed. He may have two or three boards that will not be true. They may not be good joints, the wind may pass through them, but after all he will have a shelter over his head, and if he cannot have the lumber then he will have the sod on the prairie. There is no tax on the sod, and he can use it, and often does use it, when he cannot get lumber. In such a case he will take the sod and place it against a hill, and makes a shelter for his head. But you have here the department putting the most harsh construction upon the letter of the law in order to collect an undue duty, an illegal duty, from the man who of all men, ought to have the protection of this government, and of this country.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the right hon. gentleman claim that in order that this lumber should be dutiable, it must be jointed and tongued and grooved?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, either. It must be jointed, or tongued and grooved.

Mr. STEVENS. Then if it is not tongued and grooved, does he claim it is not jointed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say that according to my humble view it is not jointed. I say there is no jointing done by saw, jointing is done by the plane, and you cannot have a joint unless you have a smooth surface over it.

Mr. STEVENS. Is it not a fact that this timber has chiefly been brought in jointed by plane and not by saw? This saw matter is a later consideration?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If it has been jointed by plane, why not say so under the regulations. If it is jointed by plane then it would have been easy to say in the order; sawn planks, &c., dressed on one side, when also jointed by plane. That would have been easy to understand and then you could collect the duty lawfully.

But it has been stated this afternoon that all of this was done by fraud. I do not see the fraud in this matter. I cannot see that there is any fraud.

I come now to the other point on which it was stated there was a fraud. My hon. friend who has moved this motion consulted me in advance, and asked whether he should bring a new point I am going to present to the House, and I told him there might be some doubt about it, and I would not, but I shall take the point which has been made this afternoon that American mills were evading the law because when the lumber had been planed on one side and one edge they would put it in another machine and run a saw behind it so as to erase the planer marks. That is what was said:

> When this has been done our American friends return it to the mills before shipment to Canada and are roughening the dressed edge with a saw to eliminate the planer marks.

If the Americans were to do that I do not know if this would be a fraud against the law. What are the words of the law upon this point?

> Planks, boards and other lumber of wood, sawn, split or cut, and dressed on one side only, but not further manufactured——

So it appears that according to the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite the American mills, after having planed the lumber on two sides pass a saw over it to erase the planer marks. Is that further manufacturing it?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, my hon. friend is altogether wrong. This is demanufacturing it, it is making it worse than it was.

Mr. FOWLER. It does not affect the trueness of the joint, it is an evasion of the law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The joint has been disposed of. To show the extent of absurdity to which men can go when they want to evade the law, here is, we will suppose, an American mill with a board which is planed on two sides. This board, if it comes into Canada, has to pay duty, but the American lumberman, in order to evade the duty, does not further manufacture but on the contrary, although he has a good surface ready for use, he makes it rough again; therefore it should not be liable to pay duty at all, and I do not see how it is possible to satisfy these gentlemen. Can any man say that when a board which has been planed on two sides has been roughed on one side, and made rough lumber again it is further manufactured? On the contrary, this is bringing the lumber to the pocket of the poor farmer so that he can get it even if it was not so fine as it was the day before.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do they rough it again if not to evade the law?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend will say that roughing it again is further manufacturing it, he is going further than I would care to go.

But the point covered by the motion before the House is that when lumber is not jointed or tongued or grooved it is not dutiable, and I believe this is the very language of the law. Again I appeal to the House that the Minister of Customs did not dare say in his regulation that a joint which had been made by a saw was a joint. He simply stated that the lumber had been partially dressed. For this interpretation he has no authority whatever, and he is going beyond the very letter of the statute.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend has addressed the House at great length upon a number of technical questions with regard to the jointing of lumber, and I am sure that whether or not he has convinced us that the lumber is jointed, he has at least convinced everybody in this House that his own argument on the question is very much disjointed. Now, let us look for a moment at the regulation which is the foundation of all the argument which the right hon. gentleman has addressed to the House at very great length:

> At a meeting of the Board of Customs held at Ottawa on November 3, 1911, in connection with the request for a decision as to the rate of duty payable on imported lumber for which free entry is claimed under tariff items 503 and 504, the Board of Customs declared 'that sawn planks, boards, joists, scantlings, studding and other lumber of wood, dressed on

one side, when also dressed wholly or partly on one edge, is dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, under the general tariff, on importation into Canada.'

Dressed on one side means something more than sawn, does it not? I think my right hon. friend will not deny that. Then the regulation says: 'when also dressed wholly or partly on one edge.' That also means something more than sawn, does it not? I am speaking of the regulation which is the basis of the whole argument which has been addressed to this House by hon. gentlemen opposite. This regulation was made by the Board of Customs, and their regulation is absolutely within the terms of the statute. My right hon. friend seems inclined to doubt that. What does he understand the meaning of the word 'jointed' to be? I suppose it means something more than rough sawing. We are all agreed on that; and I would suppose that we would all agree, in view of the arguments that have been addressed to the House, that that jointing might be done in more than one way. But as a matter of fact I am informed by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs that this regulation has been applied only where there is distinct evidence of planing and distinct evidence of the use of a saw for the purpose of concealing that planing. Uuder these circumstances the Minister of Customs would not be discharging the duty he has been sworn to discharge unless he carried out the law under that regulation made by the Board of Customs. The right hon. gentleman made a statement for the purpose of evoking the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite, which I understood to be that lumber planed carefully for the rich man would come in under the statute and under this regulation duty free. I called his attention to it at the time, and asked him either to explain or withdraw it. He did neither. I say there is no warrant for any such statement, and the right hon. gentleman well understands now that there is no warrant for it. As a matter of fact, the word 'dressed' is used in the regulation, and I understand that that word is used by those who manufacture and deal in lumber in the sense of planing. Am I right or am I wrong in that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what I understand.

Mr. BORDEN. Then, what is wrong with the regulation in that case? What does 'dressing lumber wholly or partially on one edge' mean if it does not mean jointing? My hon. friend the Minister of Customs has already explained, and in this I am speaking by his authority, that this regulation has only been applied in cases where there is evidence, from the appearance of the lumber, that it was planed in the first instance to create that jointing which is referred to in the statute, and where there is an attempt made to conceal the jointing by running a saw over it afterwards. That is the whole gist of the case from first to last, and that is the evil which was sought to be dealt with by the regulation made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, my right hon. friend is misinformed. I quoted from a letter from Mr. Roe, in which he stated that the annoyance of which he complained was made in two ways—first, by planing and effacing afterwards by a saw; secondly, by running a rip-saw without any planing at all.

Mr. BORDEN. Whether that be the case or not, I would suppose that by the use of a small saw it would be possible to joint lumber to all intents and purposes, and my hon. friend is admitting that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not what my right friend stated a moment ago.

Mr. BORDEN. I know it is not, but I am covering both points.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the face of the letter which I have read, I say that jointing cannot be done by sawing, because the gentleman who writes the letter says that for higher work it would have to be planed.

Mr. BORDEN. All I have to remark with regard to that is that the statute does not say anything with regard to higher work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, but I find in the statute the word 'jointing', and when it is stated in the letter that sawing cannot make a complete jointing, but it would have to be planed afterwards, I say this regulation is not according to the statute.

Mr. BORDEN. The jointing may not be capable of being created by rough sawing, but it is quite possible it might be created within the meaning of the statute by a smaller or special saw.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not according to the letter.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not care about the letter to which my right hon. friend refers. I do not know who wrote that letter or that the writer had any authority to define for anybody in this House exactly what the word 'jointing' means.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is the very gentleman for whom this ruling was made.

Mr. BORDEN. Suppose he was, are we to put aside our intelligence, and our reasoning powers in connection with the interpretation of this statute because some

gentleman has given utterance to a chance expression in a letter. My right hon. friend must be driven to very desperate expedients when he resorts to such an argument.

Sir WILFRED LAURIER. In a matter of this kind, in which neither my right hon. friend nor myself is a competent judge, I would take the judgment of a man who is in the business.

Mr. BORDEN. As far as regards the competency of judging, my right hon. friend can speak for himself, and not for me. I am quite content to leave that matter there and go to another point. The right hon. gentleman in this debate has taken the somewhat strange position that this Board of Customs is not an independent body.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Subject to ministerial control certainly.

Mr. BORDEN. Now let us look for a moment at that. I find that this board was created by section eight of the Customs Act, which declared:

> There shall be a board of customs which shall consist of the Commissioner of Customs or any officer for the time being acting as such, who shall be chairman of the board, and such other duly qualified officers of customs as the Governor in Council from time to time appoints.

Under section 58 of the Customs Act, these powers are conferred and these duties imposed upon them:

> Whenever any difference arises or doubt exists as to whether any or what rate of duty is payable on any class of goods, and there is no previous decision upon the question by any competent tribunal binding throughout Canada, the Board of Customs may declare the rate of duty payable on the class of goods in question, or that such goods are exempt from duty, subject in each case to an appeal by any person interested to the Governor in Council; and any such declaration of the Board of Customs, when approved by the minister, or any such declaration when made by an order in council upon appeal, shall have force and effect as if the same had been sanctioned by statute.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. When any one interested presents a question of that kind to the Board of Customs, they are bound to exercise their independent judgment on it and a person who is dissatisfied with their decision has an appeal to the Governor in Council. Therefore, to contend that in the first instance this board has to act by the direction of the Governor in Council although there is an appeal to the same body—in other words that they are not to exercise their independent judgment, to admit in short that there is an appeal from their judgment to the body which dictates it—this seems to me a construction of the statute which is absolutely contrary to its terms. So far as the Commissioner of Customs is concerned, any one who knows his record and the faithful service he has given the country for the last twenty years would be the last to say that John McDougald is a man who would not exercise his absolute and independent judgment on a question of this kind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BORDEN. Then what is the right hon. gentleman complaining about? He is moving a resolution of censure upon the Minister of Customs because when a difference arose with regard to a decision under the terms of the statute, that difference was referred to the Board of Customs and the Board of Customs made this pronouncement and the law was carried out accordingly. My right hon. friend is condemning these men for having exercised their independent judgment on that question submitted to them under the law of the land, and he suggests that such a circumstance justifies him and his friends in moving a resolution of censure on the Minister of Customs. It does seem to me that in all the arguments presented by hon. gentlemen opposite, there is not one which has any claim to our support and I ask the House to reject the amendment accordingly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let me read the complaint of the British Columbia lumbermen:

> In order to evade the duty the American mills to-day are adopting two methods, other than the above. It is usual to dress or size this lumber immediately it comes from the sawmill and pile it in the yard ready for shipment. Where this has been done, our American friends are sending it to the mills before shipping it to Canada and are roughing the dressed edges with a saw to eliminate the planer marks. Another method being generally adopted is to dress the lumber on one side only and then to rough it through a rip-saw with joints or sizes of lumber to an even width.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to make a few remarks on the general question, but before doing so I would like to give my opinion with regard to the validity of the regulation of the Customs Department on the question of jointed lumber. When the regulation says that lumber which is partly dressed on one edge is dutiable, it purports to say that lumber which is partly dressed on one edge is jointed lumber. In my humble opinion, when the lumber is only partly dressed on one edge, it cannot be jointed lumber.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to say another word on the question of the respective burdens imposed as regards the higher classes of work and the cheaper work. The man who requires to use fully dressed and jointed lumber will import his lumber in the rough and dress it afterwards to suit his purposes and, therefore, will get it duty free. But the man who only requires that lumber for the purpose of building a common shack will import it ready for such use and under the ruling of my hon. friend will pay duty.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Explain how.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to take up the time of the House. I repeat that the man who wants to use lumber in the higher classes of work will import the lumber rough and duty free, because he requires it to be highly dressed for the purpose for which he requires it, and because he cannot buy it in that condition from the mills. Is that plain?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Then the man who only wants to build a prairie shack, but wants to have the joints as tight as may be, will buy rough lumber which, under the minister's regulation, will be called 'jointed lumber,' and will pay the duty.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If it is rough, how can I call it jointed?

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman had done me the honour to listen to me at the beginning of my remarks he would understand. I said that in my judgment, lumber that is only partly dressed on edge cannot in the nature of things, be jointed lumber.

Now, I wish to refer to some remarks made by my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), and also some remarks made by hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), in which they pointed out the great sympathy they have for the settlers on the prairie, and how the settler on the prairie was not going to suffer by reason of this imposition by the Minister of Customs. We are thankful to these gentlemen for their sympathy. We are willing to do business with them on a business basis; all that we want is a square deal. We are Canadians just as they are Canadians, and we want to build up Canada; but we do not want the lumber interests of British Columbia to get what is not a square deal out of the people of the prairies. It was not the late government that made rough lumber free, it was the government of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) was a member.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. They made rough lumber free because, though they were a protectionist government, they found that the burden that was laid upon the prairie settler by reason of the duty upon lumber as it had been up to that time was such as to deter the settlement of the prairies, and the progress of Canada. In the interest of the country at large they made rough lumber free. If it was sound public policy in 1894, that rough lumber should be free in the interest of the prairie settlers; it is just as sound policy to-day.

And when the Minister of Customs makes a change in the regulations whereby he imposes a duty upon that lumber not hitherto imposed, he is placing a deterrent upon the settlement of the prairies, upon the prosperity of this country, and upon the prosperity of the lumbermen of British Columbia.

Mr. BRADBURY. Does the hon. member (Mr. Oliver), wish the House to infer that that is what the hon. minister has done?

Mr. OLIVER. That is exactly what I understand the hon. minister to have done. That is what I am going to vote on.

Mr. GOODEVE. When the government, of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce was a member, made rough lumber free, at the same time they made planed and dressed or jointed lumber dutiable, and that stands to-day just as rough lumber stands free.

Mr. OLIVER. Sure. And I assume that the interpretation of these words stood from 1894 until 1911—under the government of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce was a member, just as under the government led by the present leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). And it stood until the friends of my hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) came down here, as one might say like a wolf on the fold, flushed with the victory of the 21st of September, full of the idea that to the victors belong the spoils, and with the idea that this change was what they had paid for and fought for, and they were bound to collect their proper toll in return for what they had done. They came down, they demanded their price, and the Minister of Customs delivered the goods. And the prairie settler to-day is paying that price.

Now, what does it amount to? It may seem to some hon. gentlemen that the difference in the duty on lumber that builds the settlers' shacks cannot amount to much. It cannot in each individual case; and if it did it would prevent the settler from building his shack. In the year ending 31st March, 1911, the quantity of lumber imported into Canada duty free was 193,523 thousand feet. The

value was about three and a half million dollars. The object of our friends, as they have declared here, is to bring this lumber under duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Not under this section. But I say that my hon. friend from Kootenay and my hon. friend from New Westminster declared themselves distinctly and emphatically in favour of putting a duty on rough lumber as well as on planed lumber. Now, what would it mean to the people of Canada, the users of lumber, if these hon. gentlemen were able to carry their point? Twenty-five per cent on three and a half million dollars is $875,000.

Mr. GOODEVE. Just that I may not be misquoted, I desire to say that, clearly stated, speaking for myself, in order that there might be no future misunderstanding that I would like to see lumber dressed on one side dutiable, but not rough lumber. I made no such statement as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) attributes to me.

Mr. OLIVER. At the least we have the hon. gentleman's words now that he declared himself emphatically that certain lumber which has hitherto come in free should be dutiable. And he knows as do others who are familiar with lumber that of that three and a half million dollars worth probably ninety per cent comes in in that condition. Besides that he declared himself for a protective policy, for building up the interests of British Columbia at the expense of the prairie settlers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to say that I made such a declaration as he now lays before the House?

Mr. OLIVER. I would say most emphatically that what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster) said, conveyed that idea to my mind.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no recollection of using any language that would convey that idea, nor had I any intention of using language that would convey that idea.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, following the hon. gentleman's own tactics, I would ask him to say whether he is in favour of a duty on rough lumber or not.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think we are entitled to a duty on rough lumber; but I am content to allow the situation to remain as it is at present as a measure of assistance to my neighbours in other parts of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is well satisfied to have the condition remain as it is, levying a duty on certain lumber when the law says that such lumber should be free. Now let me point out exactly what this vast sum of money amounts to, by comparison. If these gentlemen had their way they would be taking out of the prairie settler as much money each year as the province of Nova Scotia receives in annual subsidies from the Dominion government, and $238,000 a year more; they would be taking as much money as the province of New Brunswick receives, and $237,000 a year more; they would be taking $41,000 a year out of the prairie settler more than the province of Manitoba receives to-day as Dominion subsidies.

Mr. GOODEVE. Would the hon. gentleman object to putting on 'Hansard' the figures to prove the statement he has made?

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I have been trying to do, I think my hon. friend will find them there. I was going to say that this amount is $161,000 more than the province of British Columbia receives in subsidy from this Dominion each year; it is one-third of the total subsidy of Ontario; it is nearly one-half the total subsidy of Quebec; it is two-thirds the subsidy of Alberta, and is half the subsidy of Saskatchewan. Yet my hon. friends think that the proposal to impose such a burden as that upon the prairie settlers is a joke, is something most amusing to them, and I suppose also to their constituents. I must say to them that I do not think that method is the best to build up a united Canada, or is for the well-being of this country.

Mr. GOODEVE. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman again, but I must say that unless there are further figures which he has not yet placed on 'Hansard' he has not proved his case. He has made the bald statement that if certain ideas to which he has alluded were carried out it would mean so much money. What I want is the figures on which he makes his deduction.

Mr. OLIVER. My statement was this, that in the year 1911 there was 193,520,000 feet of lumber imported into Canada, duty free. My hon. friend will find that in the Trade and Commerce Report. It is also stated in the same report that the value of that lumber was something over three and a half millions. Now 25 per cent of that is $875,000.

Mr. GOODEVE. That is rough lumber duty free. It is difficult to get my hon. friend to deal with the question we have argued upon. That lumber is still duty free.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the fact that my hon. friend is getting up so often is evidence that I am dealing with the subject. Now with regard to the matter of

building up the sawmill interests of British Columbia at the expense of the prairie settler, I want to say a few words. It would appear that as soon as the late elections were over, in the estimation of those who had won those elections, the time had arrived to collect their tolls, they wanted the protection that they had not had before. If this saw milling industry of British Columbia was to-day on a legitimate financial basis, if it was a question of securing wages for the friends of the hon. member from New Westminster, whatever their condition or colour may be, we would appreciate the position. But that is the smallest part of it. It is a notorious fact, Mr. Speaker, that whatever may be the conditions in other parts of Canada in regard to the over-capitalization of industry, there is in no part of Canada an industry more atrociously over-capitalized than the saw-milling industry of British Columbia. It is the demand of those who have control of that industry that the settler of the prairie west shall be bled through lumber duties in order to pay interest on that over-capitalization. That is what these gentlemen are talking for, that is the interest they are here to represent.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the petitioners who addressed those letters to me as those whose industry is over-capitalized?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know anything about the petitioners, I am speaking of the lumber industry of British Columbia, I am speaking of the milling industries that are running in the hon. gentleman's constituency.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken so far as those industries are concerned. They are privately owned concerns, and have no watered stock at all.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not say that there may not be mills in British Columbia which do not form part of a merger, and which are not over-capitalized. But I say again, it is a notorious fact that, speaking at large, the milling industry of British Columbia is atrociously over-capitalized. I have here the 'Monetary Times,' which, in its annual review dated January 6, 1912, gives a statement as to the amalgamation of individual industries, and it mentions these companies as being absorbed by: The Canadian Pacific Lumber Company, Limited; The Anglo-American Lumber Company, Limited; Gibbons Lumber Company, Limited; Barclay Sound ber Company, Limited; Rivers Inlet Timber Syndicate. The initial capitalization of these five industrial organizations was $840,000. The Canadian Pacific Lumber Company, Limited, of Vancouver, which absorbed these five different organizations, was authorized to issue three millions of common stock and two millions of bonds, a total capitalization of $5,000,000, on an original capital of $840,000.

Of this amount of common stock $2,000,000 has been issued, and of bonds $1,750,000 has been issued. That particular section of the sawmill industry in British Columbia which initially had a capital of $840,000 is to-day carrying a capitalization of $3,750,000, and it has $1,250,000 of capital yet to issue. This is the industry on whose behalf my hon. friends made their eloquent plea this afternoon in order that the prairie settler should have the most unfavourable interpretation that could be put upon the Custom law enforced against him and in the interest of the lumber companies.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman referred to the initial capitalization of the company?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would he give the capitalization of these companies at the time the merger took place?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I could not give that. I can only give my hon. friend what is contained in the 'Monetary Times,' and I think the authority is very good. But, however the amount is arrived at makes no difference; the initial capital was $840,000 and that industry to-day is carrying a load of capitalization of $3,750,000. If that increased capitalization is arrived at out of the earnings of the companies, then I must say that the companies have been doing very well out of their access to the Northwest market, and out of their profits taken from the pockets of the Northwest farmers. My hon. friend may have it either way he likes it; either it is largely water or it is undue profits, but in no case can that enormous capitalization be justified on fair and reasonable grounds or as an ordinary business proposition.

The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) was very emphatic in his desire to furnish a market to the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta by developing the sawmill industry of British Columbia. He told us that it was the policy of his party to build up the milling industry of British Columbia in order that there might be interprovincial trade. Per contra, I suppose that it is the policy of his party to prevent external trade in order that interprovincial trade might be built up. There are something like 400,000 people in British Columbia. I do not know how many are interested in saw-milling, but we will suppose that they are all interested in and de-

pendent upon that industry. It is estimated that the flour from seven bushels of wheat is about what the ordinary man uses during the year. The population of British Columbia, on that calculation, would use a little less than 3,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. The production of wheat by the prairie provinces in the last year, according to a statement of Sir Byron Walker, head of the Bank of Commerce, was something like 135,000,000 or 165,000,000 bushels, of which the farmer will have to sell to somebody certainly a great deal more than 100,000,000 bushels or he will go broke and the sheriff will get him. My hon. friend offers the prairie farmers the magnificent market of possibly 3,000,000 bushels. The policy of his party is to build up interprovincial trade and to make the prairie farmer rich, by giving him a market for 3,000,000 out of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat that he must sell or he will go out of business.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would the hon. gentleman tell us about the quantity of agricultural products that British Columbia took from the prairie provinces in 1910?

Mr. OLIVER. I can only give it on the authority of the hon. member for Kootenay who said it was about $14,000,000 worth.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a desirable market, we want that market, we want to increase it, but I must say that when we have to sell $150,000,000 worth of products in a year in order to keep going it after all does not make a terrible lot of difference whether the people of British Columbia take $14,000,000 worth or $15,000,000. Not but what we would be glad to have them take $16,000,000 worth or $20,000,000 worth. But, they will have to grow a great deal larger than they are to-day before their market will take up what we need to dispose of in order to keep the sheriff away from our doors.

An hon. MEMBER. We want growth.

Mr. OLIVER. We want growth and the hon. member for Westminster—or was it the hon. member for Kootenay—I forget which—has told us how they are increasing that market for us. They have shut down all their mills and their men are walking the streets in the cities of British Columbia, notwithstanding the increase in the duty that the prairie farmer has to pay.

Mr. BURNHAM. Is it true, or is it not, that the middle west is the most prosperous part of Canada to-day?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that question; I am not familiar with all parts of Canada. But, I can tell the hon. gentleman that it will never be made more prosperous by the imposition of a higher duty on the necessities of the lives of the people there, and it is not being made more prosperous by the lumbermen of British Columbia holding their meeting this fall and deciding that with a Conservative, protectionist government in power the time was ripe for them to force an increase in the price of lumber, and that they could afford to shut down their mills, throw their men out of employment, sit back and wait for the price of lumber to rise. That is not going to make the people of the prairie provinces rich and it is not going to make the people of British Columbia rich. That is what has occurred. They have told us that there is no combine amongst the lumbermen of British Columbia. They have told you to-night, Mr. Speaker, what the British Columbia lumbermen have done, and if that is not the evidence of a combine—of a combine destructive both in British Columbia and in the prairie provinces—then I do not know anything that would constitute a combine, and a most destructive combine.

My friend was greatly worried about the conservation of the timber of British Columbia, and it seemed that under present conditions it was an injury to that province because only the most accessible timber was cut and sent into the prairie provinces. Or is the theory that the worst timber, the least accessible only should be cut, and that the man in the prairie provinces must take that in the interest of conservation? We have another way of securing conservation of our timber resources. We say: Let the man of the prairie who wants to buy lumber buy it where he can get it cheapest, and if he can buy from the other side of the line, if the millers on the other side are willing to deplete their natural resources for our benefit, surely, in the interest of the conservation of Canadian resources it is no harm to let them do so. This is in line with the conservation of Canada's natural resources, for which these gentlemen stood so strongly up to the 21st September, but which they are so very much against now. The imposition of this unauthorized, unwarranted and additional duty on the lumber required by the prairie settlers is all the evidence that the country needs as to the change of policy that occurred in the administration of the affairs of this country on the 21st September. Before that time the settler, the man who needed every advantage to establish himself, got the advantage, if advantage there was; but when the 21st September placed in power the combines, the trusts and the mergers then Mr. Speaker—

An hon. MEMBER. I thought it was the Ne Temere.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps the Ne Temere put them in, but they are the people who are there, who are in control, and the evidence of this is that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, on the first demand that is made, makes a change in the law that may have the effect of imposing a burden of over $800,000 a year upon the people of the prairie provinces, and he does that at the demand of the most outrageous of all the combines, of all the mergers that exist in this Dominion of Canada.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs) Mr. Speaker, this case has been so well put by the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), the member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), the member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), and the member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), that there is little for me to add. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia reads:

That the Minister of Customs, in collecting a duty of 25 per cent on sawn planks, boards, joists, scantlings, studding and other lumber of wood, dressed on one side, when the edges thereof are neither jointed nor tongued nor grooved, is violating the law, &c.

If the hon. member can show that we have collected duty on lumber imported into Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan or any other part of Canada of which the edges are neither jointed, nor tongued nor grooved, I will guarantee that the duty will be immediately refunded to any person who has paid them. I make the statement and I defy the hon. member to name one instance where any single individual in Canada has been asked for any duty on any lumber which can be thus described. Throughout the whole discussion I and other members have asked the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) to name an instance, but he has not been able to do so. No collector of customs has exacted any duty on any lumber in accordance with this resolution. I ask him now if he can name any individual or firm? When I came into office as Minister of Customs, I found on file a letter dated September 19, from a firm applying for an interpretation of the Act claiming that lumber was being imported in violation of section 505. I asked the Commissioner of Customs what was the practice in matters of this kind. I looked up the Customs Act, and there it is plainly set forth in section 8 that the Board of Customs is appointed under the Act by parliament and I believe that these gentlemen notwithstanding what the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated, are upright, honourable men whose word would not be questioned by any man in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say anything against them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). From the remarks made by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I would come to the conclusion that the insinuation made was that I had done something to influence those men in their decisions. The only person to whom I mentioned the matter was the Commissioner of Customs, and all I said was: Take that to the Board of Customs and let them decide or do what they like in the matter, and their decision shall be final. In addition to that I said to the Commissioner of Customs: Notify every person whom you think this will interfere with. The commissioner did notify the importers. The case, as I understand was put in this way, and I only asked for the information since. The commissioner wired to have the collector at Winnipeg send a sample of a carload of lumber here, and that was submitted as evidence. In addition to that he notified the importer of the lumber and told him and any one interested to appear. The hon. member knows if he has made inquiries that they did send a representative from Winnipeg who came before that board and who did not object to the decision of the board. What did he ask for? He came here to appear on behalf of the importers of lumber at Winnipeg. In regard to the lumber entitled to free entry under 503 and 504 of the Customs Tariff he said:

I claim that the words, 'but not further manufactured' in item 504 mean that the lumber of wood, to be admitted free, . . . may not be further manufactured than sawn, split, or cut and dressed on one side only.

That comes in free, since it is planed only on one side. The board did not rule differently. It goes on:

(2) I claim that lumber of wood in the form of boards, planks, studding and furring, when sawn only by circular saws, gang saws, rip-saws or other saws, is not further manufactured than sawn, and that such lumber of wood so sawn and dressed on one side only is entitled to free entry under item 504.

The board agreed with him, and that lumber comes in free. He made another claim:

(3) I also claim that the term 'jointed' in item 505 is intended to apply to the dressing of the edges of lumber by means of a plane or planing machine——

The board agreed with that.

—and that the term jointed is not properly applicable to boards, planks, studding or furring made to a uniform width by means of any sawing operation applied thereto.

The board agreed to that. Boards or planks that are jointed with a saw come in free to-day.

Mr. TURRIFF. Might I ask him if a copy of that document was in the return brought down?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know whether it was or not. This was a report before the Board of Customs. If it was not, he can have a copy of it.

Mr. TURRIFF. It was not in the return brought down.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know why; it is not private. This man admitted that lumber dressed by a plane or planing machine was dutiable. The board agreed to allow lumber to come in free which it was admitted may have been planed, and a small saw run across it afterwards. So long as this obliterated the whole of the planing, so that the customs officer could not detect it, the board were willing to let it come in free. They went as far as they possibly could under the law to give the people of the Northwest lumber free. We did not make the law; the law was made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Assiniboia was sitting in this House in 1907 when the law was made putting on the duty of 25 per cent, and he never said one word in opposition to it, but upheld it in every way. This man goes on further:

(4) In woodwork, jointing usually applies to the planing or dressing of the edges of lumber which come together. In covering studding it is the flat surface of the boards or sheeting which comes in contact with the edge of the stud, and the point of contact is not usually described as a joint.

(5) In regard to the samples of lumber submitted, I contend as follows: that Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 are all partly dressed or jointed on one edge and dressed on one side.

He admitted that these were dutiable, and that was the decision of the Board of Customs. Then he says:

That No. 5 is lumber entitled to free entry under item 504. Samples 6, 7 and 9 I claim to be free, although there is a small dressed spot on edges of Nos. 6 and 7. Samples 8 and 9 have planed edges to a small extent, but are useless except for the purposes of sawn lumber. All the samples are dressed on one side.

(Sgd.) CHARLES HIGGERTY,
Customs Broker..

He was sent there by the importers of Winnipeg.

Mr. TURRIFF. What is that document? Is it a report by that broker or a letter to the Customs Department?

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is evidently a memorandum which this man submitted to the Board of Customs.

Mr. KNOWLES. Why was that not in the return which I moved for?

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is nothing private about it. Let me say that so far as I am concerned, I did not in any shape or form try to influence the Board of Customs. They acted on their own judgment. Lumber that is planed on one side only certainly comes in free. United States citizens without a doubt have used a small saw for the purpose of trying to defraud the customs revenue. If they succeed in obliterating the planing, and we cannot detect it, we have to allow it in as sawn lumber; but if it shows part of the original planing, it is evident to the customs officers that it was planed, and the Board of Customs claim that it should be dutiable. So far as I am concerned I am only administering the law as passed by this parliament. I have no desire to impose a duty on the people of this country more than the law calls for. At the same time, I claim that in this case I have carried out what has been the custom of every government in this country for many years past. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite know that this Board of Customs meets regularly once a month, I think on the first Tuesday of every month, and at every meeting there are cases before them. I never follow these cases up. They come in and are simply handed over to the Board of Customs, whose decision goes forth as law. This is not a special case. It just came up in the ordinary way, and it came up at the first board meeting after the application was put in. Any action that I have taken in this matter has simply been in my position as minister to transfer the case to the Board of Customs, and to carry out the decision of the board which they are authorized by parliament to make.

At this late hour I do not think I can add anything to what has been so well said by hon. members on this side, and I would ask the House to reject the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. The question before the House is on an amendment to the original motion, and the hon. gentleman therefore has not the right to a second speech. The original motion was that I should leave the Chair in order that the House might go into committee of supply and the hon. member for Assiniboia moved an amendment to that motion. The question is on the amendment.

House divided on the amendment.

YEAS.

Messieurs

Béland,	Lovell,
Bickerdike,	Maclean (Halifax),
Boivin,	MacNutt,
Bourassa,	McCraney,
Boyer,	McCoig,
Brown,	McKenzie,

Buchanan, Bureau, Carroll, Cash, Champagne, Chisholm (Antigonish), Chisholm (Inverness), Clark (Red Deer), Clarke (Essex), Cruise, Delisle, Douglas, Emmerson, Fortier, Gauvreau, German, Guthrie, Hughes (King's, P.E.I.), Knowles, Kyte, Lanctot, Lapointe (Kamouraska), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Loggie, McLean (Sunbury), McMillan, Marcile (Bagot), Molloy, Murphy, Nesbitt, Neely, Oliver, Pacaud, Papineau, Proulx, Pugsley, Reid (Restigouche), Richards, Robb, Ross, Seguin, Sinclair, Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Tobin, Turgeon, Turriff, Verville, Warnock and White (Victoria, Alta.)—62.

NAYS.

Messieurs

Aikins, Aiguire, Ames, Armstrong (Lambton), Armstrong (York, O.), Arthurs, Ball, Barretto, Bellemare, Bennett (Simcoe), Best, Blain, Blondin, Borden, Boulay, Bowman, Boyce, Brabazon, Bradbury, Burnham, Burrell, Carrick, Chabot, Clare, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Clements, Cochrane, Cockshutt, Coderre, Crocket, Cromwell, Crothers, Currie, Davidson, Doherty, Edwards, Elliott, Fisher, Foster (King's, N.S.), Fowler, Gauthier (Gaspé), Girard, Goodeve, Guilbault, Lennox, L'Esperance, McCurdy, McKay, McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.), Meighen, Merner, Middlebro, Mondou, Monk, Morphy, Munson, Nantel, Nicholson, Nickle, Osler, Paquet, Paul, Pelletier, Porter, Rainville, Reid (Grenville), Robidoux, Roche, Rogers, Schaffner, Sexsmith, Sharpe (Lisgar), Sharpe (Ontario), Shepherd, Smith, Smyth, Staples, Steele, Stevens, Stewart (Hamilton), Stewart (Lunenburg), Sutherland, Taylor, Thoburn, Thompson (Yukon), Thornton, Tremaine, Walker, Wallace, Webster, Weichel, White (Leeds), White (Renfrew), Wilcox, Wilson (Wentworth) and Wright.—107.

Mr. SPEAKER.

PAIRS.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
Beattie,	Demers,
Foster (Toronto),	McCrea,
Baker,	Kay,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Barnard,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Sevigny,	Ethier,
Perley,	Law,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Northrup,	Carvell,
Hepburn,	Lafortune,
McLean (York),	Martin (Montreal),
Broder,	Power,
Lewis,	Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Lamarche,	Lachance,
Elson,	Cardin,
Fripp,	Devlin,
Forget,	Wilson (Laval),
Barker,	Michaud,
Marshall,	Brouillard,
Achim,	Lapointe (Montreal),
Macdonell.	Martin (Regina).

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee of supply.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Borden House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 24, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. SPEAKER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to tender you my most sincere congratulations upon your reading of the prayer in French. If I were sure of the soundness of your doctrine I would invite you to address a meeting in the province of Quebec.

Mr. MONK. I join in the compliment extended to you, Mr. Speaker, by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for the manner in which you have read the prayer in the French language. I am very happy to join in my right hon. friend's congratulations.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TYPEWRITERS AND SUPPLIES.

*Mr. MURPHY:

What are the names of companies, firms and individuals to whom orders for typewriters and typewriting supplies have been given since October 10, 1911?

Mr. ROCHE. E. R. McNeill; Hopewell and McNeill; Federal Typewriter Company; Ottawa Typewriter Company; M. G. Bristow; Monarch Typewriter Company, Limited; E. A. Mitchell; Wilson Carbon Paper Company; National Typewriter Company; Remington Typewriter Company; National Office Supplies; F. G. Pumpelle; United Typewriter Company, Limited; A. Milne Fraser; A. Godbout; Clement and Clement.

ASSISTANT KING'S PRINTER.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has a position styled 'Assistant King's Printer' been created at the Printing Bureau?
2. If so, what are the duties and salary attaching to such position?
3. If not, is it intended to create such a position?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Not been considered.

DISMISSALS AND APPOINTMENTS AT PRINTING BUREAU.

* Mr. MURPHY.

1. What are the names, former occupations and salaries of the employees dismissed from the Printing Bureau since October 10, 1911?
2. What are the names, occupations and salaries of the persons appointed at the Printing Bureau since October 10, 1911?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. A. Bart, pressman, $19.50 per week. Frank E. Law, linotype operator, $22.43 per week. A. D. Helmer, carter, $75.00 per month. M. Kealy, carter, $75.00 per month. A. Lacelle, carter, $75.00 per month. J. Mahoney, carter, $75.00 per month. Mrs. P. J. O'Connor, carter, $75.00 per month. Joseph Langlois, compositor, $17.00 per week.

2. C. H. Durkin, machinist, $18.00 per week. J. Brennan, carter, $75.00 per month. Ed. Chivrier, carter, $75.00 per month. H. Hobbs, carter, $75.00 per month. W. R. Peacock, carter, $75.00 per month. R. H. Walker, carter, $75.00 per month. E. J. Berry, machinist, $24.00 per week. W. J. McCoy, clerk, $1,000.00 per year. G. Shierlaw, engraver, $25.00 per week. A. Lamont, compositor, $17.00 per week. T. McCadden, compositor, $17.00 per week. J. A. Poloquin, compositor, $17.00 per week. W. C. Bouvrette, linotype operator, $22.43 per week. Yves Fortin, monotype operator, $19.50 per week. R. M. Graham, bookbinder, $17.00 per week. Geo. Shore, bookbinder, $17.00 per week. J. W. Bailey, bookbinder, $17.00 per week. J. O. Grecco, helper in bindery, $12.00 per week. H. Charbonneau, apprentice in bindery, $4.00 per week. R. Goulden, helper in bindery, $12.00 per week. Miss L. Juneau, folder in bindery, $3.00 per week. Miss A. Alarie, sewer in bindery, $6.00 per week. Miss A. Blais, pager in bindery, $6.00 per week. Miss S. Guilbault, table work in bindery, $6.00 per week. Miss J. Burke, folder in bindery, $3.50 per week. Miss L. Tink, table work in bindery, $6.00 per week. A. W. Schulthorpe, pressman, $18.50 per week. P. E. Watters, pressman, $18.50 per week. F. Mooney, pressfeeder, $11.25 per week. W. Archibald, pressfeeder, $8.00 per week. A. Smith, pressfeeder, $12.25 per week. G. Sampson, pressfeeder, $11.25 per week. F. Uhlman, pressfeeder, $12.25 per week. Miss A. Coursolle, pressfeeder, $6.50 per week. Miss G. Plant, pressfeeder, $4.00 per week. Jos. Daveluy, copyholder, $12.00 per week. S. Sparks, labourer, $10.00 per week.

VACANCY IN CARLETON, ONTARIO, 1905.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. On what date in 1905 did Mr. Edward Kidd, member for the electoral district of Carleton, Ontario, tender his resignation to the Speaker?
2. On what date did Mr. Speaker issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election to fill the said vacancy?
3. When was said writ issued?
4. What date was fixed for said election?
5. On what date did the member elected to fill said vacancy take his seat?
6. Who was the member so elected?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Edward Kidd resigned, 19th January, 1905.
2. Speaker's Warrant dated, 20th January 1905.
3. Writ issued, 21st January, 1905.
4. Nomination, 4th February; Poll (if any), 11th February, 1905.
   Election by acclamation, 4th February, 1905.
5. Took Seat, 7th February, 1905.
6. Robert Laird Borden.

EXPENDITURE IN WHARFS.

Mr. CLEMENTS:

1. What has been the total expenditure by the Dominion government for the last ten years on wharfs and public buildings, respectively, in the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and British Columbia, respectively?

2. What is the length of coast line in each of said provinces?

Mr. MONK:

1. Total expenditure on Public Buildings and Wharfs, Piers, Breakwaters, etc., (including construction, repairs and maintenance).

Total Expenditure on Public Buildings and Wharfs, Piers, Breakwater, &c., (including Construction, Repairs and Maintenance).

—	Public Buildings.	Wharfs, Piers, Breakwaters, &c.	Total.
Nova Scotia	$ 1,547,440 17	$ 3,054,150 68	$ 4,601,590 85
New Brunswick	897,555 93	2,381,247 43	3,278,803 36
Quebec	5,185,207 90	10,461,565 19	15,646,773 09
Ontario	16,021,273 21	5,910,460 88	21,931,734 09
British Columbia	1,958,080 07	1,080,405 12	3,038,485 19
Grand total	25,609,557 28	22,887,829 30	48,497.386 58

Mr. SPEAKER. The second part of the question stands.

DRY DOCK AT PRINCE RUPERT.

Mr. CLEMENTS:

What information has the government regarding the building of the proposed dry Dock at Prince Rupert, B.C., by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, for which a subsidy is to be paid by the Federal government, and when will the said dry dock be commenced and completed?

Mr. MONK. Subsidy agreement between the Department of Public Works and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was signed on 30th, November, 1911. Work to be completed within two years from that date.

INTEREST ON DEBT.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What is the average rate of interest payable on the interest bearing portion of the public debt of Canada?

Mr. WHITE: As on the 31st December, 1911, 3·398 per cent.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON CANALS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the total sum expended on capital account in the construction of canals in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, respectively?

2. What was the average cost to the country, in excess of capital expenditure, for operating and maintaining said canals for ten years ending March 31, 1911?

Mr. COCHRANE. Cost of canals on Capital Account for the last 10 years, ending March 31, 1911—

Mr. ROCHE.

1. Quebec canals:—

Beauharnois	$ 1,636,690 26
Carillon and Grenville	4,182,092 96
Chambly	701,001 13
Culbute	382,776 46
Lachine	12,628,810 05
Lake St. Francis	75,906 71
Lake St. Louis	298,176 11
Soulanges	7,228,835 30
St. Ann's Lock	1,170,215 63
St. Ours Lock	121,537 65
Total	$28,426,042 26

Ontario Canals:—

Cornwall	$ 7,234,767 14
Murray	1,248,946 71
Rideau	4,085,889 97
Sault Ste. Marie	4,923,329 97
St. Lawrence River and Canals	3,469,913 41
Tay	489,599 23
Trent	9,555,950 41
Welland	28,743,292 99
Willamsburg	10,485,611 69
Total	$70,237,300 76

2. Cost of maintenance of canals, for the last ten years, ending March 31, 1911:—

Income	$ 3,732,747 04
Staff	4,274,274 49
Repairs	3,786,866 12
Total	$11,788,887 65

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received a resolution reported as passed

by the Montreal Board of Trade strongly recommending the retention of the present Harbour Commissioners?

2. Is it true that a round robin signed by members of this House has been handed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries praying for the dismissal of said commissioners?

3. If so, what names appear on said round robin?

Mr. HAZEN. The answer prepared to the first question of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was that,

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not received such resolution.

But I may say to my hon. friend that since that answer was prepared, in fact this morning, a resolution of that character was handed to the minister.

2. No round robin has been handed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

3. Answered by number 2.

PARTICIPATION OF OFFICIALS IN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Are any officials of the outside service allowed to seek municipal honours?

2. Is the Minister of the Interior aware that J. E. Sevigny, recently appointed clerk at the immigration office in Montreal, is at present an aldermanic candidate in said city?

3. Is the minister aware that J. E. Sevigny has declared at a public meeting that he will get the federal patronage through the influence of his brother, a member of this House?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. The Interior Department does not interfere in such matters.

2. No.

3. No.

'L'EVENEMENT' PUBLISHING COMPANY

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Is the Prime Minister aware that one of his ministers is said to be a director of 'L'Evenement' Publishing Company?

2. If so, will any more contracts for departmental advertisements be given to 'L'Evénement'?

Mr. BORDEN. In answer to this question I beg to say that the Prime Minister is not so aware.

MR. OLIVER ASSELIN.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has Mr. Oliver Asselin, of Montreal, been appointed by the Minister of the Interior to investigate the working of some immigration agencies in Europe?

2. If so, by whom was he recommended?

3. What salary does he receive?

4. How long will Mr. Asselin's mission last?

5. Was Mr. Oliver Asselin the defeated Nationalist candidate in St. James division, Montreal, at the recent general election?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. By the minister.

3. $150 per month.

4. Four months.

5. Understand he was a candidate at the last election.

MR. J. E. SEVIGNY.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Is the Minister of the Interior aware that J. E. Sevigny, recently appointed as clerk at the immigration office at Montreal, is an alleged illiterate?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.

SOLICITOR OF QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who has been appointed solicitor of the Harbour Commission at Quebec?

2. Who recommended such appointment?

3. What is the salary paid?

Mr. HAZEN:

1, 2 and 3. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has no information on this subject.

PROMOTION OF CAPTAIN BOURASSA.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries aware that petitions are being circulated in Montreal with a view to promote Captain Bourassa, deputy harbour master?

2. Are officials of the outside service allowed to use political influence to get promotion?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has no information.

2. A Minute of Treasury Board passed on the 25th January, 1879, and not since rescinded, enjoins upon every public officer the duty of abstaining from all attempts to influence the ministry to accede to applications for increased salaries, etc. 'by means of the private solicitations of members of parliament and other persons of political influence.'

COASTING TRADE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has any order in council been passed by the present administration extending the time in which foreign vessels may trade between Canadian ports?

2. If so, what is the date of such order in council?

3. To what class of vessels does it apply and what extension is given?

Mr. REID (Grenville) :

1. An order in council has been passed by the present administration extending the time in which vessels of the countries named below may participate in the coasting trade of Canada between any port in Nova Scotia and any port in the province of Quebec and vice versa.

2. 8th December, 1911.

3. The steamships of not less than fifteen hundred tons gross tonnage each, of the following countries: Italy, Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, Belgium, the Argentine republic and Japan.

MR. W. A. HATTIE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has W. A. Hattie, preventive officer at Mulgrave, N.S., been dismissed?

2. If so, for what reason?

3. What salary was he receiving up to the date of his dismissal?

4. At whose instance was he dismissed?

5. Was there any investigation?

6. If not, will an investigation be granted?

7. Who was appointed in place of Mr. Hattie?

8. What is the salary of the present appointee?

Mr. REID (Grenville) :

W. A. Hattie, acting preventive officer of customs at Port Mulgrave, N. S., has not been dismissed.

DONATION OF LAND FOR DRILL HALLS.

* Mr. McCRANEY:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Militia been called to the following news item which appeared in the Saskatoon 'Capital' of January 17, 1912:—

'Military facilities for Saskatchewan cities. Deputations from Saskatoon and other places wait upon Minister of Militia.

'Ottawa, January 16.—Deputations from Moosejaw, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, North Battleford and Red Deer have waited upon the Minister of Militia in the last few days with a view of obtaining the approval of the government for the erection of drill halls and rifle ranges, and to organize city corps in their respective cities.

'The representatives from Moosejaw asked for the acquisition by the government of sufficient land in the vicinity of the city for camp grounds.

'In every case the deputations promised to donate on the part of the city or town authorities, land sufficient for the drill hall. The following were the various deputations:—

'Moosejaw—Messrs. Willoughby, Erratt, Rothwell and Dr. McGibben.

'Saskatoon—Messrs. McLean, Balmer and others.

'Prince Albert—D. W. Adam, A. J. Manville, D. W. Baker, and others.

'North Battleford—M. J. Howell, J. W. Miller, J. A. Foley, and others.

'Red Deer—E. M. Mitchner, M.P.P., and G. W. Greene.'

2. Is it the intention of the government to require donations of land from western cities and towns as a condition for the erection of drill halls?

3. Has any encouragement been given to the minister that donations of land for drill hall purposes will be made by the cities and towns above named?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. The attention of the Minister of Militia has not been called to any such news item.

2. This government is pleased to receive donations of land not only from western towns and cities but from towns and cities all over Canada, whereon to erect drill halls. It has not been made a requirement but, as may readily be understood, the town or city showing public spirit enough to hand over a valuable site, would be more likely to receive consideration than one failing to do so. It is felt that, inasmuch as drill halls are being used by the municipalities for cadet corps, boy scouts, public entertainments of various descriptions, local, industrial and agricultural exhibitions, in short for purely local purposes as well as for military purposes, that the municipalities are merely displaying a proper public spirit by giving legitimate assistance to the government for drill halls.

3. Yes, Moosejaw offers a site valued at $40,000; Saskatoon has not given a site, but one was purchased at great expense by the late government in that town. It is regarded as unsuitable. Prince Albert offers a very valuable site estimated at $20,000; North Battleford also offers a very valuable site of several acres; Red Deer offers a site; Minnedosa does likewise; so also do Grenfell and fully a score more towns in the west and also in the east. Port Arthur and Fort William each offer sites valued at $20,000 and upwards; Regina offers one valued at from $75,000 to $100,000 in cash; Calgary offers one estimated to be worth $100,000; Edmonton one worth from $40,000 to $60,000, while British Columbia towns and cities everywhere offer sites.

SOLICITOR GENERALSHIP.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the government to appoint a Solicitor General during the present session of parliament.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). The matter has not yet been determined.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the names of all persons employed on the steamers 'Earl Grey' and 'Minto,' respectively. with the place of

residence and occupation of each such person.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and all other documents, and of all complaints and charges, in any way relating to the suspension of Joseph Venoit, checker on the Intercolonial Railway at Pictou, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all the correspondence between the Prime Minister of Canada, or any member of the government, and Messrs. Fielding and Paterson, during the time the latter gentlemen were in Washington last year, on the subject of the negotiations for a reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a copy of all correspondence from the 1st day of January, 1910, to the 1st of October, 1911, between the Right Honourable James Bryce, British Ambassador at Washington, and the government of Canada, or any member thereof, with reference to the negotiations for a reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a copy of all letters, requests, petitions, telegrams, complaints or charges received by the Post Office Department since October 10th, 1911, relating to the postmaster at Glenelg, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

That the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to amend section 477 of 'The Canada Shipping Act' so as to exempt from the compulsory payment of pilotage dues such ships as are propelled wholly or in part by steam and employed in trading between the province of Ontario and the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, or any of them.—Mr. Edwards.

ASBESTOS IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. BELAND moved:

For a return showing the total value of imports of asbestos manufactures imported into Canada since the 21st September, 1911, divided by countries or origin, and the total amount of duties assessed thereon; and the classification of manufactured asbestos goods by countries, divided into paper, millboard, cloth, sheet packing and tape, plain; treated for automobile use, as brake band lining, thread and yarns, seam and other laid packings and gaskets; pipe coverings, magnesia, plaster of Paris, air-cell and miscellaneous, itemized; asbestos shingles, sheets, &c.; the name of shipper and the port of origin; name of consignee and port of entry, and the ultimate destination of each shipment of entry; the method of assessing duty, either by pounds, weight or measure in square feet, or ad valorem, specific or both; the percentage of duty assessed; the price per pound or square feet at which goods were entered for duty. In the case of any goods having been admitted duty free, in bond or for any other reason, particulars of each entry, and the reasons for admittance without duty. And in the case of any manufactures of asbestos goods having been entered as raw material, for subsequent manufacture in the Dominion, such as asbestos paper, sheathings, or millboards, cloth, plain or rubbered for gasket manufacture, &c., the reasons for allowing such entry, and full details as to shipper, port of origin, port of entry, ultimate destination, consignee, and an itemized list of articles, with weights, square footage, entered value, &c.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is the objection to this motion passing in its present form in that it would infringe the rule of the department not to disclose information as to names of importers and the prices they pay, &c. I would like the motion to stand until I can consult with the hon. member (Mr. Beland) so that he may be able to get all the information possible without our violating the rule.

Motion allowed to stand.

DISMISSAL OF JOSEPH MOREAU.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, recommendations and reports respecting the dismissal of Joseph Moreau, as postmaster at St. Germain, Kamouraska, in the year 1905.

Mr. PELLETIER. I thought this motion had already been adopted.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). No, the other motion was in respect to the dismissal of an official last fall. This concerns the dismissal of Mr. Moreau four years ago.

Mr. PELLETIER. Well, they are the same papers.

Motion agreed to.

EX-GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. WILSON (Laval) moved:

For a return showing all the employees of the different departments at Ottawa, and also in the nine provinces and territories of Canada, and other places outside of Canada, in the inside and outside service, who have left their employment since the 1st October, 1911, up to the 10th January, 1912, inclusively, with their names, Christian names, age, nationality, employment and salaries respectively; the date of their appointment; the date of leaving; their salaries at the time of their appointment and at leaving; the reasons of their leaving; and if replaced or not; the names, Christian name, age, nationality, employment and salary of those who have replaced them; and in the case of dismissals, a list of the persons who asked for their dismissals; in the case of these replacing them, a list of the persons who recommended their successors.

Mr. HAZEN. I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that his motion covers not only dismissals, but resignations of persons who have left the service of their own volition. The motion does not state whether it is

intended to cover employees of the naval service, such as sailors and others on the ships. Persons enlisting are not persons appointed. I am willing to furnish the information if my hon. friend will be kind enough to let me know whether he wishes to include enlistments as well as employees in the naval service.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). I am not referring to enlistments at all, simply to employees. If the hon. minister is willing to have the motion carried, I shall be delighted.

Motion agreed to.

ITEMS OMITTED FROM 1913 ESTIMATES.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved:

For a return showing an itemized list of all appropriations appearing in the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1912, and omitted from the estimates of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1913, indicating the electoral division and province in which such omitted appropriations were proposed to be expended?

Mr. MONK. As the motion reads it would involve a very great deal of work. If my hon. friend would indicate the works in reference to which he wishes information, or even restrict his motion to one province, it would simplify the preparation of the return. The officers of the department are extremely busy, and this would involve the preparation of a report almost equal to a departmental report.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Many items that appear in the estimates submitted before Christmas do not appear in the estimates that have since been presented. I refer only to unexpended items, and the insertion of the word 'unexpended' after 'all' would perhaps meet the difficulty. Then it would only be necessary to compare the list presented before the holidays with that presented since.

Mr. MONK. We cannot do that until March 31. If the motion was amended by inserting 'and unexpended' before 'and omitted' it would simplify the return.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That will serve my purpose.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would point out that my hon. friend cannot make the comparison full until he has the supplementaries for 1913. Items in the 1912 estimates that are not in the estimates for 1913, may appear in the supplementary estimates for 1913.

Mr. SINCLAIR. With that suggestion I would be willing to allow the motion to stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

Mr. HAZEN.

CONTRACT FOR THE ENGRAVING OF DOMINION NOTES, &c.

Mr. EMMERSON. I received, as I suppose every hon. member has received, a paper giving the terms and conditions of tenders for engraving Dominion notes, postal orders, &c. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds) if there were restrictions as to tenders. I understood that one of the conditions was that tenders were limited to people in this country, and in Great Britain, but I do not find any limitation stated in this document.

Mr. BORDEN. The Minister of Finance was called out of the House a few moments ago, but will shortly return. I will direct his attention to the question the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) has asked. Perhaps during the afternoon there will be an opportunity to give the information. If not the information will be given to-morrow.

THE BANKING ACT.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it the intention of the government to introduce the Banking Act this session?

Mr. BORDEN. That is purely a consideration of the time available for parliament. The hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) I suppose, will appreciate the importance of not having the session too long drawn out, as we were occupied with a very long session last year, and an election campaign as well. I speak without special consultation with the Minister of Finance, but I think he would be very glad to have the Bill passed if it could be done without unduly protracting the session. Possibly, when the Minister of Finance is in his place to-morrow, he can give fuller information than I can at the moment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The reason why I inquired is that I was asked concerning this measure by a very prominent banker.

MANITOBA BOUNDARIES.

Mr. TURRIFF. May I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) when we may expect the Manitoba Boundaries Bill to be brought down?

Mr. BORDEN. It will be announced in due course to my hon. friend.

Mr. TURRIFF. I was asking when?

Mr. BORDEN. Well, I have answered.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. MURPHY. May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) when he expects to bring down the return in connection with the trade of the West Indies and British Guiana?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I think that is prepared. I will make inquiry.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

On the orders being called:

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Turriff for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. BORDEN. Stand.

Mr. TURRIFF. I hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) will give me the opportunity to go on with this Bill at an early day.

Mr. BORDEN. I really have not been able to give a great deal of time to it since the hon. member moved it before. But just as soon as the pretty urgent demands upon my time will permit, I will give the matter the best consideration I can. I beg to assure the hon. member that the delay I am asking is not with any desire to impede him in endeavouring to carry out his proposal, but purely for the reason I have mentioned.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. STEVENS moved the second reading of Bill (No. 9) to amend the Criminal Code. He said: This is a technical amendment in order to make this provision of the Criminal Code applicable to conditions in British Columbia. At the present time this section of the Code, which has reference to the piracy of saw logs, is confined to 'the rivers, streams and lakes of Canada'. The amendment proposes to make the section applicable to harbours and coast waters as well. I ask that it be read the second time to-day. When it goes into Committee of the Whole it will appear with certain slight alterations suggested by the Minister of Justice. The amended Bill should have been printed to-day but it is not ready. We can have the Bill as revised distributed to every member.

Mr. DOHERTY. I have no objection to the passing of the second reading of the Bill with the understanding that the hon. member has just set forth—that it will be modified in committee. If the Bill were to stand precisely as it is, I think there might be some objection to the effect of its provisions. But so far as I can see, there should be no objection on my part to carrying out what I understand to be the real intention of those who desire to see this measure passed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Burnham, that, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that a select special committee should be appointed by this House to make an inquiry into an Old Age Pension system for Canada, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). I offer my thanks to my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) who leads the House, and to his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) for being good enough to agree to the adjournment of the debate on the resolution of my hon. friend from Peterboro (Mr. Burnham) in order to enable me to be present when the matter was finally determined. Hon. members who look at the order paper will see that the third order under 'Notices of Motion' is a resolution which I intended to propose to the House, and which I placed upon the order paper at a very early day, dealing with this very important matter.

The purport of my resolution was to ask the House to come to a conclusion in favour of the principle of old age pensions. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) who was thinking apparently along the same line and about the same time, placed upon the order paper, a resolution which we are now considering. Believing that it would further the ultimate and earlier attainment of the end which we both seek, the establishment of a system of old age pensions in Canada, I gladly join in supporting his resolution that a committee of this House be appointed to go fully into the question and obtain all information necessary to enable the House ultimately, I hope, to supplement it with legislation. The discussion which took place upon this matter on the original motion I have read in the 'Hansard,' and I was gratified to note that the proposition was received with a considerable amount of favour, and to note with satisfaction that the hon. the Minister of Finance speaking for the government agreed to the appointment of a committee.

I think that in Canada we have been somewhat late in dealing with this question. The colony of New Zealand led the way among the different nations that go to make up the empire, in dealing with this question. Their attitude and their legislation was favourably received in the mother country, and was a potent factor in inducing public opinion to deal with the situation there. The result of the legislation that has taken place in England has been of the most satisfactory character. Even those who at some stage doubted the wisdom of a system of old age pensions, are to-day found its most willing advocates. No less an authority than a Prime Minister of England is on record as having said of this system of old age pensions:

It is a new departure, reaching along an almost unmeasured road of future social progress.

Another gentleman who had filled the position of Prime Minister of England stated with regard to such legislation:

I view its consequences as so great, so mystic, so incalculable, so largely affecting the whole scope and fabric of our empire itself, that I rank it as a measure far more vitally important than even the great Reform Bill.

Testimony of that character is of the greatest possible value to us in considering this question. Those who are students of history have been accustomed to regard the era in the national life of the mother country when the Reform Bill was passed into legislation, as marking one of the greatest steps in the advancement of the classes there that has taken place in her whole history. This testimony from the sources to which I have referred, indicates that, in the judgment of the leading minds of the mother country, this question is of an importance even greater than the principle which was involved in the Reform Bill. I think we in Canada have been perhaps somewhat laggard in dealing with this question. We may have been too busy in laying the foundations of our national advancement and progress, too busy with what might be called the material phases of our situation to deal with what is after all an important social problem, the problem under which the men and women who are too old to work may be assured, out of the common fund of the nation to which they belong, a guarantee against that humiliation which every self-respecting person resents and revolts against, the fate of going to the workhouse or the poorhouse. It must be remembered that there are in this world two great divisions that have always existed, the class of the rich and the class of the poor. There is this singular difference of condition that marks both these classes, people of ample means, or who might be classed within the category of the rich, and the young men who always depend upon the old. The accumulated funds pass to the head of the family and are usually retained in his custody and control as long as he is permitted or can hold them. When he comes to pass away, under settled conditions, that goes to the elder member of his family, and so on. But it is when you are dealing with the men who do not belong to the rich class, that you are dealing with conditions under which the old must of necessity depend upon the young. Where you have a head of a family who has devoted to the maintenance of his family all his hard earnings in industrial life, or agricultural life, or any other mode of life where work and labour are essential to the upkeep of the family where you have to deal with a condition where the head of the family has striven to provide by education the best facilities for his family, all the time having to face the greatest problem, after all, of existence, that of getting his daily bread, where you have to deal with these conditions it must be manifest that, except in rare circumstances, the old man has to depend on the young. Then you have to consider the difficulties which the man and woman who are not of the rich class, have to contend against, with advancing years, when an epidemic of sickness in the family may sweep away all the little savings which have been the accumulation of years, and left the head of the family in such a condition that he is handicapped by reverses which years will never enable him to overtake. Continued ill health in the family produces conditions that equally can only be met by the intervention of the state in some way, if you are going to preserve the latter days of such a person from penury, which, under the most favourable conditions, in the most favoured country, is almost sure to follow.

It is said by some gentlemen who discuss this question that we have an annuity system in Canada, and that consequently, we have solved the problem. I do not appreciate that proposition at all. The annuity system does not reach the class of men, honest but poor men, who are not able to accumulate enough money to buy an annuity. Annuities after all are only within the reach of people who have a reserve fund, financially, that will enable them to speculate in a financial proposition. Yet in the cottage homes, whether in city, town or country, the great majority of people are never in a position to grapple with the proposition of buying annuities. In this twentieth century we cannot help but observe that the old men are being pushed to the wall in every employment of life, in almost every profession of life, and every profession of the arts. I would like to know from any one who has any doubt about this question, what they would say shall be the refuge of the men who have reached that stage that they are told they are too old to work. The tremendous advance in the industrial sciences, the development of machinery, and of the technical knowledge which is necessary in order to operate in the various up-to-date conditions that are found in the great industries of this country, must of necessity drive to the wall the older man. Where we have a country great as this is in its possibilities and in its actual conditions, the problem is to bring technical education to the homes of the poor where young men are growing up, and to give them the opportunity of acquiring a knowledge which will enable them to make their way in life. In Canada we have sent out a commission to look into this question, and to discover if possible, some method by which you

can apply to the common people the benefits of technical education in a more diffusive way. In the meantime, all over this land there are found men who are being told that they are too old to work even though their age has not impaired their physical powers to such an extent as to prevent them from engaging in certain kinds of manual labour.

And after all, there is that penalty which attaches to men who, of necessity, have not adapted themselves to the newer conditions of life and that is the sentence meted out to them. It is in the interest of the state that the most ideal conditions possible should prevail and if you cannot have them ideal, conditions as close to that as you can get them should exist for older people. What are these conditions? They are, first, personal comfort. The very least that any one who has come to the age of 65 or older should demand inherently, supposing he has done the best he could in his own particular sphere, is that he should have an element of personal comfort which is a condition of things essential to all persons at that time of life. Then, persons who have reached this age ought to be able to have some idea of independence in their actions and thoughts. These are two essentials. It seems to me that where they do not exist, as unquestionably they do not exist in this or any other land, the least that the state can do is to provide them to the best of its ability in order to ensure that its best citizens, because from the cottage homes of England and Canada sprang in the days that are gone and are springing to-day men and women who are the best citizens of our country, may enjoy in the declining years of their lives that personal comfort and independence to which they are entitled. The very least that the state can be expected to do is to provide those conditions of comfort and independence which do not exist to-day for people who have reached the time of life of which I have spoken.

How are these conditions of comfort and independence to be obtained outside of the intervention of the state? They may be obtained by the accumulation of years of savings. I have pointed out that no matter how thrifty people may be their accumulations acquired under normal conditions and with exceptional care might be swept away by a period of illness or misfortune which might destroy the little holdings that had been got together. Then, there is the other source—the source of present earnings—the amount of money that a person of 65 or over could earn by engaging in some occupation. The impairment of the value of the labour of a man of that age is something that I have already referred to. But, where you have present earnings and where you have the exceptional case in which these earnings are sufficient, the intervention of the state is not required and it is not supposed that the old age pension system would apply except with such limitations as would guarantee its operation only in such cases as those in which this source of revenue did not exist. Then, there is the third source of assistance to aged people—their children, a common source of help everywhere, be it said to the honour of the men of our race, as previous speakers upon this question have remarked. It is a gratifying thing to know that in Canada this assistance is freely rendered and that love of parents is a characteristic which exists to a very great degree among our people.

But, look at the impossibility of such assistance being absolute in its character. Take the man and woman who have brought up a family in an industrial centre, or in any condition of life; the young people have grown up, gone out and married and formed families of their own. Here, the proposition is put forth sometimes that you should not have an old age pension system because the young will look after the old. Thus the doctrine of individualism would apply. That is all very fine to theorize about, but any one who has lived close to industrial centres knows how impossible it is to get rid of the necessity for the intervention of the state upon the theory that the children must look after their fathers and mothers. The problem becomes a successive one to be solved by the son or daughter just as it was in the case of the father. Is there anything more humiliating, after all, than to see an old man or old woman at the eventide of life absolutely dependent, without any independence or freedom of action, sitting perhaps at the fireside of the son, who feels it the greatest possible imposition no matter how strong may be his desire to perform the onerous duty of fulfilling the obligation which rests upon the child towards its parents. These are some of the reasons why we are told in some quarters that the state should not interfere.

To my mind these sources which I have enumerated are all inadequate. No matter how satisfactory the individual conditions may be amongst the poorer classes in different parts of the country, after all you have a great percentage of the people who have sprung from those who are not rich and for whom the necessary comforts of life can only be obtained by the intervention of the state in some such way as is being done in these other countries to which I have referred, and as ought to be

done in Canada. Take, for instance, the conditions in very many places in the eastern part of Canada; where are the young men? The east in Canada has been the fruitful nursery not only for our own western lands but for other nations, unfortunately. Is there anything more pathetic than to find the old man and woman living alone on a small farm somewhere in eastern Canada unable to work, and, as frequently occurs, having to make some arrangement with some third party in order to obtain a guarantee that they will get their bed and board until the time comes to close their eyes? The children are so far away that it is impossible to reach them or to secure that assistance from them which might otherwise be available. Take again another pathetic case. One of the great problems in Canada to-day is the problem of the migration from the farm to the town. With our advance industrially there has gone on the depopulation of the farming districts which have been the recruiting ground in order to give us the men who work in the factories and mines. There is nothing more pathetic than to see the old man and the old lady left upon the farm by the boy who has gone to get work in the city, following him or a daughter there and finding themselves as isolated almost as if they were living on the desert, having no touch with the community in which they live and dependent upon the assistance which may be rendered by the son or daughter. Then again, the son bids farewell to the farm and goes away, and these people are left stranded with perhaps a little money, but not enough to maintain themselves under their own roof tree. These are instances of numerous cases which exist all over the country and particularly in eastern Canada where the intervention of the state is absolutely necessary not only in the interest of these people but in the interest of Canada.

In the west the optimism of the people is great as a result of the continuous immigration which is going there. The efforts of the nation are being put forth in order to solve the transportation problem by railway extension, and tremendous expenditures of money have been going on all over that country. While the people keep going there and while this money is being spent throughout the country of course they are optimists and splendid optimism it is, but this country is in its most infantile stage as far as development and social problems are concerned, and day by day there are developing the conditions under which the older men in that land will very properly feel that there ought to be some consideration of the problem of how those essential things which are demanded, and which exist in every country which has a pride in its people, can and should be provided by the state because all the other sources are inadequate.

The Minister of Finance told us that one of the things to be considered in Canada was that there was no public agitation on this question. Well, we have been having a strenuous life in Canada for the past ten years; in the east and the west the growth of our country has been marvellous, and doubtless our people have not stopped to consider the solution of these social problems. But, this question has nevertheless been discussed in a great many parts of the country. In my own province where a great number of people have been engaged for years in the coal mining industry, and where we have very intelligent labour organizations the question has been seriously considered and has formed matter for discussion in various election campaigns. That it has not been much discussed in the press is not an indication that there is no public opinion on the question, although of course as the hon. member (Mr. Verville) says, public opinion is largely formed by the press of a country. And, the reason why there is not more public opinion on this question is because our public men have not been to the fore in placing before our people the importance of dealing with it, as the motherland, as New Zealand, and as many of the other world nations have done. I do not think the Minister of Finance presented a strong argument when he suggested that it might not be wise to advertise that there were conditions in Canada which rendered old age pensions necessary. Everybody knows that people grow old in Canada as elsewhere, and the fortune-seeker who comes here and thinks that he can get everything he desires by simply landing on our shores must of course become disillusioned. Possibly, those who come to Canada imbued with such an idea never think of what will happen when they do grow old, or perhaps they dream that old age will not overtake them. No one will seriously contend that there never will be a condition in Canada which will free our people from the penalities which invariably follow old age in every land, and, Sir, while we are laying strong and firm the foundation stone of our great future along industrial lines, every patriot must believe that to be really great we must as well make social progress in a direction advantageous for our people. It becomes, in my opinion, very important for the well-being of the people of Canada that we should create here a system similar to that which obtains elsewhere in providing for our aged poor. I trust that the fullest information may be gathered by the committee which has been agreed to by the Minister of Finance as regards the working of this system in all countries,

and that as a result we may look forward with hope and confidence to being able to solve in this parliament, this question, which should be of deep concern to us all.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton). I am glad that the government has been asked to take the first step to investigate this question as to the best method to be devised to make our aged poor happy and comfortable in their declining years. It will, I think, be acceded to by all, that there should be some means in this country, either by state aid or in some other way, to help those old people, who, by no fault of their own, find it difficult to provide themselves with a livelihood when age prevents them longer taking part in the battle of life. The question then remains as to what is the best scheme to accomplish this end. In many of the most enlightened countries a system of old age pensions has been devised, and in the mother country there is a system of state aid to the aged poor in the shape of old age pensions which, I understand, has worked out very well. Several schemes have been developed in other lands, and amongst them the system of old age annuities. The late government of Canada developed such a system and there is no doubt that old age annuities, by which people by the payment of a certain sum per month for a certain number of years can buy an annuity when they reach a certain age, is a sound proposition so far as it goes. But the trouble at present with us is that it is difficult to make the people generally understand and appreciate what this annuity system means. Under the late government, agents were sent to all parts of Canada to bring the system to the attention of the public, and I regret that the present government has seen it desirable to withdraw these agents. The government has not yet told us what its intentions are in the way of substituting some other means of publicity, but they must be aware that unless the system is widely and continuously advertised, and the people induced to take advantage of it, there will be not much use keeping the Annuity Act upon our statute books. Now, there is also in some countries of Europe an old age pension system which is called the Universal Scheme, and by which all persons who arrive at a certain age, whether they be rich or poor, are granted state aid. I do not think it requires much consideration to see that this so called Universal Scheme is not desirable in a country like Canada. It means that a man who is worth a million dollars, and a man who is worth nothing are equally benefited by its operation.

Mr. BURNHAM. What does the hon. member mean by saying that the rich will benefit equally with the poor?

Mr. CARROLL. This universal scheme which has been adopted in some countries but which has not been adopted in England, although it has been seriously discussed there, provides that every person of a certain age is entitled to state aid.

Mr. BURNHAM. Is the hon. gentleman aware that that has nothing to do with the question before us now?

Mr. CARROLL. I am not talking about whether it has anything to do with it or not, I am simply referring to what schemes have been adopted in other countries along this line. This, I do not think would commend itself to the public opinion of this or any other country. The scheme that has received the most cognizance and that I think should commend itself to the people of this country is what is known as the deserving poor scheme. Under this scheme a person must of course be a British citizen resident in Canada, and of the age of 60 or 65 years. He would have to show that he had endeavoured to the best of his ability to make a living and to save something for a future day while he was able to work. He must also show that he had not received poor relief during the days that he was capable of earning a livelihood unless under very extraordinary circumstances. He must show further that he has not sufficient income to keep him comfortably in his old age. The question arises, is there such a condition of affairs in Canada to-day that an old age pension system is actually desirable? Is there any public opinion on this question? We may be told that this country is and has been for a number of years too prosperous to justify us in thinking of bringing into effect any system of old age pensions at the present time. Well, it is one of the ironies of fate that the greater the industrial development of a country the more poor people it has. It is one of the ironies of fate that during the last twenty or twenty-five years, while the conditions of the labouring people in this country have been greatly improved in the way of better wages, more temperate living, more and better medical aid, yet all these things do not help to solve the problems of what is going to become of the aged poor. It is one of the ironies of fate that notwithstanding these improved conditions, it is more difficult for an old man in Canada to-day to earn a living than it was twenty or twenty-five years ago. This I take to be due to the increased pressure under which modern industry is carried on in Canada. Now, there are very many ways besides state aid whereby people in their younger days may be helped, if they have become sick or unable to work, without being obliged to go to the poorhouse or some almshouse or being placed upon the poor list. In our fac-

tories, our coal mines and our steel works, the labour unions have done a great deal to alleviate suffering in this way, by establishing relief funds, to which some of our local governments have contributed, by means of which a man gets from $4 to $6 a week if he is incapacitated for working, provided he has himself contributed a certain amount per month to the relief fund. A great number of the relief societies, however, are beneficial only to the working people when these people are themselves able to work and have not ceased to work. None of these relief societies have as yet arrived at a stage where they could provide for the aged poor without the latter contributing to the fund. That is one of the reasons urged against state aid.

The hon. Minister of Finance, who, I believe is taking a keen interest in this subject, as I think every public man should, has said that in some parts of this country to-day there is no necessity for any state aid. I agree with the hon. minister so far as the agricultural districts of Canada are concerned, which, I presume, contain 60 per cent of the population of this country. So far as the agriculturists of Canada are concerned, we need not worry ourselves about state aid, because from the time they enter on the farm they are putting themselves in a position to look after their own old age, and their occupation is well calculated to enable them to do so. But what about the 20 or 30 per cent of the people of this country who are artisans and labourers? What about the men who work in factories for from $1.50 to $2 a day? What about the men who work in mines, some of whom make high wages, while others get wages on which no man in this country should be asked to live, $1.50 or $1.65 a day? How is it possible for people in this condition to live and bring up a family, taking into consideration the very high cost of living in this country to-day? It is absolutely impossible for them to lay by anything for the comforts of their old age. These are the people we must consider. It would not require very much from the treasury of Canada to maintain and keep in good working order an old age pension system such as I have outlined, and I am happy that the present Minister of Finance is interested in the question. In the eastern section of Nova Scotia, which is an industrial section, we have our steel works and our coal works, and the question of old age pensions is a living and burning question in that vicinity at the present time. I understand also that in the coal regions of the west and in the industrial centres of Quebec and Ontario public opinion is being developed on this question; and while the percentage of people in Canada to-day who would be looking for state aid is happily small, yet it is sufficient to make it desirable that this government should take into consideration and formulate some scheme by which the old age of these people may be made more comfortabe and happy.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, when I was Minister of Labour, this question was brought before the House and a committee was appointed to study the working of the old age pension system. Unfortunately it was at the end of a long and strenuous session, and the committee did not do very much work. It met only once and was never convened again.

I hope that this time a strong committee will be struck and that we will gather as much information as possible on this very important question. Much valuable information can be collected now that we have the results of their experience in England of the working of the Old Age Pension system. I may say, en passant, that this debate has been the means of vindicating the policy of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer which has been so much abused on the other side of the Atlantic. Every one remembers that when Mr. Lloyd George brought that question to the fore in the House of Commons in England he was severely criticised, but to-day after a few years' experience, every one admits that his old age pension has been quite a success, and it is now adopted as part and parcel of the British system.

I agree with the Minister of Finance that while the old age pension may be a necessity for England, it does not follow that it is a necessity for Canada. I am bound to say that in England there are not only the unemployed but the unemployable. I heard that expression used some years ago by the great labour leader, John Burns. He said that the question which concerns England to-day is not so much the army of unemployed, as the army of unemployable. Fortunately for Canada, we have not the unemployable, and we have very few unemployed. There is no pauperism in Canada. I would not wish to import politics into this debate but since 1896 at least, we have seen no evidence of pauperism in Canada, and my hope is that under the able guidance of the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) there will never be pauperism in Canada.

Whilst this committee would gather very valuable information and would educate the country on that very important question, there is one which, in my judgment, is of more importance still, a subject that was mentioned the other day by the Min-

ister of Finance and by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I refer to the annuity system organized a few years ago by the then Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright. I wish to refer hon. members to the very able and substantial speech delivered on that occasion in the Senate by Sir Richard in presenting his Bill. He made one of the best exposés of the annuities system ever made in any parliament. The annuities system has been working fairly well since its establishment in Canada. I fear, however, that it has not been advertised as it should have been by the authorities of both the late and the present government. There were, I think, ten or twelve lecturers to explain to the people of Canada how to practise thrift in a very economical way indeed. The annuity system is, after all, the system which obtains on the continent of Europe. In France they have tried to establish the old age pension system but it has come to be a complete fiasco. The system which obtains in France to-day is that of the annuity system. They established 25 or 30 years ago La Societé des Prevoyants de l'Avenir. They have had such success that the government have had to intervene and divide the profits among the more recent members of the society. The annuity system has not had the success in Canada that it should have obtained. It is an excellent system and the best means of educating our people to thrift and economy.

I am sorry that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), should have dispensed with the services of the lecturers. I know that he thought he was administering his department on safe lines in transferring this system to the Post Office Department. In England the postmasters are the agents of the government for the payment of the old age pensions, but I am sorry that, after having transferred the annuity branch to the Post Office Department, the government should not have thought proper to continue the employment of lecturers, either the old officials or new ones, to explain to the people the workings of the system. Reading over the Annuities Act it takes some time to understand its workings. The different systems embodied in the Annuities Act have to be explained carefully to the people so that they may understand the advantages of one plan over the other. It takes an expert to explain to the people the workings of the annuity system. The country and city postmasters have too much business to attend to of a very practical nature to have time to explain one by one to the applicants the workings of the various plans in connection with the annuities system. You must have agents or lecturers to explain to the labour societies, and the various bodies who take an interest in these matters, just how this system is worked. I hope, therefore, that whilst we may gather important and valuable information as regards old age pensions, the government will in the meanwhile do a little more to propagate the system of annuities. It is an excellent system when one understands it. Do you imagine that the various insurance companies, like the Sun Life or Canada Life, are satisfied with advertising in the newspapers that they have head offices in Montreal and Toronto, and are ready to receive the applications of the various people who wish for insurance policies? No, they have active agents, and you know how many agents are after you in a year's time. You find them everywhere, in the cities, in the villages; nearly every notary or doctor in my own native province is an agent for some insurance company. I would urge upon the government the necessity of spending a little more money in getting proper agents for the propagation of the annuity system. I am quite sure that the various plans would be found so advantageous for the people that, after a while, the Minister of Trade and Commerce would be in a position to show a larger increase than ever in the number of applicants.

Mr. BURNHAM. Have the various insurance companies any system of annuities?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Some of them have systems of annuities, but they are not as cheap, and, in the minds of the people at large, not as safe as the government annuity system. The very fact that it is a government annuity system is of itself an advertisement, and an inducement to bring the people to accept it.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I do not wish at this time to go into the discussion of the main question, but only to touch on a point or two made by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) with reference to the annuity system. It may not be necessary, but just for fear it is, I wish to correct one or two of what seem to be misapprehensions with reference to the action of the government in this matter. In the first place, neither am I nor is the government of which I am a member, opposed to the annuities system. And in the second place, anything that has been done has been done with no other idea than that of making possible a continuous and progressive working of that system.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Are you enthusiastic?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I have some enthusiasims left yet; and this not one of the least of them, perhaps. Another im-

pression that is not correct is that there was anything of partyism either in the policy of the change that was made or in the carrying out of that policy. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) hoped that the government would come to the conclusion later, if not to employ the old lecturers then to employ new ones. I can assure him that if the system of employing lecturers had been thought a good one, there would have been no change in those appointed so long as they carried out the duties entrusted to them in a proper way. I think I explained before, but perhaps it is as well to say a word on this question now, it did not seem to me that the Department of Trade and Commerce, with its comparatively limited affiliations, was the proper department to carry on this work unless the country made up its mind to a very large expenditure. It is not fair to liken the annuities system to an insurance company. The insurance company is in the business for profits; it has humanitarian principles, I dare say, but, while it co-operates with the sentiment that demands protection, it works on the line of advantage to the shareholders. The government cannot make anything out of an annuity; on the contrary, it must add to the contribution of the purchaser, so that every annuity represents an outgo rather than an income. Therefore it would be impossible for the government to undertake to operate the annuities scheme on the basis of an insurance corporation; the expense would become so great that the system would fall of its own weight. Nor am I enamoured of the system of lecturerships; quite the contrary. We had this system for two and-a-half or three years. I can bring down a statement of the meetings held and the numbers that attended. Whatever might happen if you were to put $100,000 a year into it and carry on a propaganda that should be wide and distributed, certainly the lecture system has been a dreary repetition of unsuccesses so far as audiences were concerned. Audiences of twenty-five, seventy-five, in a very few cases over a hundred, were all that the lecturers—and some of them were men and women of ability—were able to attract. If you were to continue the lecture system, you would have to give every part of the country as good an opportunity to hear as every other part. You cannot spend money in the county of Carleton to set forth the benefits of the annuities system without carrying out the same policy in every other county. And my hon. friend will see from this—as he would see more clearly if the papers were referred to—that the expense involved would become unbearable and would in the end bring the system to ruin. Now, taking this branch from the Department of Trade and Commerce and putting it into the Post Office Department is not to smother it or clip its wings, but to give it greater freedom of movement and greater opportunities of success. The Post Office Department, as my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) knows—none better—covers every community in the Dominion. The gentleman who has charge of the Annuities Branch—and I give him credit for being not only able but enthusiastic—loses nothing of his ability or enthusiasm when transferred from my department to the department of the Post Office. Nor am I sure that the Annuities Branch has got into a department that has less sympathy with the object and the work than has the department over which I preside. The intention is not to hide its light under a bushel but to expand the light so that every community may know the name and object of the system, and to lay the basis for a successful propaganda. In every fairly representative post office there will be a government advertisement calling the attention of the public to the fact that there is a Government Annuities System. That in itself will be a great advertisement for the annuities and a great education for the public. Tables showing the advantages of the system will form part of that advertisement. My hon. friend says that the annuities system is an abstruse system. The actuarial calculations upon which it depends are technical, and you will find few people in this country who are capable of following them. But that is not true of the results as they are set forth in the tables of rates.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I quite agree, that, as regards publicity, it is excellent. But will there be any inducement to the postmaster to explain the working of the Act? I suppose that every postmaster could be given a commission for each annuitant secured.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I was going on to show some of the ways in which the system can be better worked out under the Post Office Department than under the Trade and Commerce Department. But I do not think we need to argue any more about the question of publicity, the question of getting the system before the masses of our people.

Every postmaster and postmistress of a money order office, whether it should go further than at present I do not know, will have a distinct financial interest in canvassing, in explaining, and in actually getting the purchase and making the sale of an annuity, as a commission will be given for every annuitant obtained. Now, when we lay aside the difficulties and the technical knowledge necessary in drawing up a scheme, and making calculations of the annuities, and getting it all into concrete tabular form, the advantage to the public will be manifest. A child, any man

of ordinary intelligence, can see in a moment what that leads to, that by paying in a certain amount every year he may, at a certain time, when old age comes on, be able to draw so much during the remainder of his life. Now taking all these things into consideration it seems to me you have done a great thing when you advertise it and call the attention of the people to it. If one wants a little guidance, that guidance is easily obtained, once the attention is drawn, after a man begins to think there is a chance for an annuity. There is the school teacher whom he meets every day, there is the clergyman whom he meets every day, there are neighbours who are more financially inclined probably than he is, and there are various sources in every community for a man to get more knowledge, which will help him to make up his mind. There is one other thing I will add. It is a part of this system, and it remains a part of it, to prepare careful readers for the press. This system is being pushed, and will be pushed just as largely as it can be. At the present moment my hon. friend will notice in paper after paper an article commendatory of the scheme, and we find that newspaper men generally are very willing and glad to put these readers in their papers, and give the public the benefit of that publicity. Putting all these things together, I am sure that under the present system of management, not only shall we avoid over weighting the scheme in the matter of expense, but we shall infinitely enlarge it by means of the dissemination of the instrumentalities that are now carried on as compared with the old system.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland). I am sorry I cannot concur in what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) has said as to the prospects of the enlargement of the annuity system. The very first statement made by my hon. friend with respect to the slim attendance at the meetings which were held by the special agents of his department in the past, is an indication that the subject of annuities is not a live one among the people. Taking it for granted that it is in their interest to purchase annuities, it must be admitted that they are not alive to the advantages of the system. Now if it is left to postmasters throughout Canada to propagate the system, to advertise it, to disseminate it among the people, I fear that very little if anything will be done. I have only to remember the conditions prevailing in the county I have the honour to represent. I venture the assertion that there is not a postmaster in any of the more important places who would be likely to take any great interest in the subject. Take the city of Moncton, the towns of Sackville, Salisbury and other towns and villages throughout that county, if this work of disseminating information is left in the hands of the postmasters, there will not be that wide dissemination of information which, in my judgment, is desirable in the interests of the public. My hon. friend is familiar with the assessment insurance companies. Take, for instance, the Royal Arcanum, the Independent Order of Foresters, and like organizations and associations. If it were left to mere advertisement, nothing would ever be done in the way of increasing the benefits of these organizations. I remember years ago when the Royal Arcanum was first inaugurated in the province of New Brunswick. There was some progress made by means of agents who went out and remained in a community two or three weeks or a month, and after creating an interest among the people, and explaining the system to individuals, he perhaps made a movement towards organizing a court or a lodge in that community. The same with respect to the Independent Order of Foresters. But the Royal Arcanum, after they had once established their courts in the province of New Brunswick, failed to employ these agents and withdrew them. Consequently the order practically died out in that province and in eastern Canada. In face of the competition of the Independent Order of Foresters they were not making any headway, in fact they were losing ground, and the result was that they had to return to the employment of agents, and to send them broadcast throughout the country in order to educate the people to the advantage of insurance in organizations of that character.

Now I fear the same will be true with respect to annuities. I remember the agents of the department going to certain sections of New Brunswick and attempting to hold meetings. At first their efforts signally failed, and it was only by repeated attempts on their part to arouse the interest of the people by explaining to them the advantages of annuities, that they made any headway at all. Now, putting up an advertisement in post offices with respect to these annuities, while it may catch the eye, it will not attract the interest. You might let it stand there for months, and you would not have an inquiry from any one. In my judgment a mistake has been made, though I hope the result will prove otherwise. I think the course adopted by the government will be a dismal failure. A discussion with respect to annuities has arisen out of this resolution, and that is an advantage. I am in favour of the object of the resolution, which is to appoint a committee to inquire into the whole subject of old age pensions. It is to be remembered that the conditions prevailing in this country are different from those prevailing

in Great Britain; yet I believe there are in certain sections of this country people who are interested in old age pensions. I think that the great body of organized labour in Canada is in favour of the system, and certainly it is due to them, and due to the interests which they represent, that a very thorough and accurate inquiry should be held into the whole subject, so that not only the members of this parliament may become seized of the necessary information to enable them to legislate with wisdom, but that the people at large in every section of Canada may have that information before them.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT

House in committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Inspection and Sale Act by providing, (a) for the inspection of feed imported into Canada, and of flour, meal or feed manufactured, sold or offered for sale therein; (b) that every bag or package of flour, meal or feed shall be marked with the name of the manufacturer or packer, the place of packing and the weight of the contents, and (c) for the imposition of penalties for offences in contravention thereof.—Mr. Foster (Toronto).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the object of this?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). It is to make some amendments and additions to the Inspection and Sale Act. The matter will be explained when the Bill comes before the House.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 78) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide for a Tariff Commission consisting of three members, to be appointed by the Governor in Council, whose duty it shall be—

1. To make, under the direction of the Minister of Finance, in respect of any goods produced or imported into Canada, inquiry as to—

(a) the price and cost of raw materials in Canada and elsewhere, and the cost of transportation thereof from the place of production to the place of use or consumption;

(b) the cost of production in Canada and elsewhere;

(c) the cost of transportation from the place of production to the place of use or consumption, whether in Canada or elsewhere;

(d) the cost, efficiency and conditions of labour in Canada and elsewhere;

(e) the prices received by producers, manufacturers, wholesale dealers, retailers and other distributors in Canada and elsewhere;

(f) all conditions and factors which effect or enter into the cost of production and the price to the consumers in Canada;

(g) generally all the conditions affecting production, manufacture, cost and price in Canada as compared with other countries, and to report to the minister.

2. To make inquiry into any other matter, upon which the minister desires information, in relation to any goods which if brought into Canada or produced in Canada are subject to or exempt from duties of customs, and to report to the minister.

3. To hold, when empowered by the Governor in Council, an inquiry under section 12 of the Customs Tariff, 1907, in the same manner as the judge of the Exchequer Court or any other judge therein referred to may hold inquiry when so empowered.

4. To inquire into any other matter or thing in relation to the trade or commerce of Canada which the Governor in Council sees fit to refer to the commission for inquiry and report.

That the commissioners shall have the power of summoning before them any witnesses and of requiring them to give evidence on oath or on solemn affirmation and to produce such documents and things as the commissioners may deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to examine, with such power with regard to attendance of witnesses and compelling witnesses to give evidence as is vested in any court of record in civil cases.

That there be employed in the service of the commission a secretary, and such officers, clerks and employees and persons having technical or special knowledge as may be necessary.

That the chairman of the commission be paid an annual salary of seven thousand five hundred dollars, and the other two members an annual salary of seven thousand dollars; that the secretary be paid an annual salary to be fixed by the Governor in Council, not exceeding three thousand dollars, and that all salaries and expenses incident to the carrying out of the provisions of any Act founded on these resolutions be payable out of any appropriation granted to His Majesty by parliament for the purpose.

He said: His Royal Highness the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, commends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—ENGRAVING AND PRINTING GOVERNMENT BILLS AND STAMPS.

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

Mr. EMMERSON. During the absence of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) I asked the government what the limitations were that were put upon tenders with respect to the engraving work for which tenders are now being asked.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am sorry that I was absent from the House when the question was asked by my hon. friend. I do not know precisely what my hon. friend means by limitations, but I presume that it is as to whether there are any limitations as to the firms or corporations that may tender.

Mr. EMMERSON. Whether it is open to tenders from the United States, Great Britain, or Canada.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Tenders will be received from any firm or corporation no matter whether resident or domiciled in Canada or elsewhere, but, of course, the tenders are subject to the provisions of the specification. Section 7 provides that:

All work under the contract, with the exception of the engraving of the original dies of portraits and vignettes used in connection with any work under the contract, shall be done at the City of Ottawa, in such building or buildings as are approved of by the Minister of Finance, such building or buildings to be fire-proof and to contain all necessary fire-proof vaults to ensure the safety of the work, and the contractor shall not do or permit to be done in such building or buildings any work other than the work under the contract.

Section 8 provides:

The contractor shall by the first day of October, 1912, provide such machinery and plant as in the opinion of the Minister of Finance will be of sufficient capacity and suitable for executing the work under the contract.

I may say that the specification substantially follows the provisions of the specification of, I think, 1896. It is very necessary that this work should be done in the city of Ottawa. The engraving of Dominion notes especially, is a work that should be protected by fire-proof buildings, and must be carried out here, because the relationship between the department and the engraving company is of the closest, in order that Dominion notes can be supplied from time to time to exchange for gold as the demand for circulation may require.

I think that substantially answers the question of my hon. friend. In 1896, copies of these specifications were sent to the High Commissioner's office in London, and certain printing firms were notified in order to give them an opportunity of tendering, but of course they would have to be prepared to establish themselves here before they would be in a position to do so.

Mr. MURPHY. I assume that the specification contains a clause or clauses defining the character or quality of the work that is to be turned out. In drafting that clause, did the Department of Finance have the assistance of expert advice from outside the department?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My recollection is that we did not have any expert advice outside of the department. The specification follows generally that of 1896. Section 14 of it is as follows:

14. All work shall be executed from best quality steel plates, to be engraved in the highest style of art current from time to time, and all such work shall be of a standard and quality not inferior to that of the notes, stamps and other supplies now in use. All such work shall be done and executed by artists, artisans and workmen perfectly skilled in the various branches therof, and the contractor shall agree that from time to time during the existence of the contract he will introduce and use in connection with the work to be done thereunder, all improvements in the art of steel plate engraving and printing which experience shall show to be useful therein. For the purpose of tender specimens of the finished work may be seen at the Finance Department, Ottawa.

I think that will protect the point to which my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy), referred.

Mr. MURPHY. When the work is turned out will the hon. Minister of Finance have the benefit of an expert to pass on the quality of the work?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If it were necessary, I should think so. The quality of the work is subject to the approval, without question, of the Minister of Finance, as are the plates and designs. The original specification was drawn with great care. The clause I have read, I believe, was in the previous contract. And I think the only substantial modification was the introduction of the usual clause in government contracts with regard to labour, and also a clause with regard to the capacity of the plant to turn out Dominion notes—the plant must be of a certain capacity, so that there may be no danger of a shortage of supplies at a critical time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there anything in the specifications calling for the printing of Dominion notes and stamps in French?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I thought I had explained to my hon. friend, that, while any person, firm or corporation might tender, they must establish themselves here in order to carry on the work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I was asking the Minister of Finance if there was anything in the specifications providing for the printing in the French language of Dominion notes and postage stamps?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend must make——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) is not going to raise a discussion on that point now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am simply warning my genial friend (Mr. White, Leeds), that he must make friends at once with his two neighbours, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works. They have been crucifying my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and your humble servant, because, forsooth, we did not print Dominion notes and postage stamps in French as well as in English. Now that you are going to renew the whole machinery you make no provision to carry out what they promised. What have these hon. gentlemen done in council? Have they not advocated the use of the French language——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), that he has spoken twice on this motion. While a question may be permitted, it is hardly in order for him to raise a discussion.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Perhaps I may be permitted to explain. The notes, stamps, &c., of course, will be such as may be decided upon from time to time. In my opinion, the contract is sufficient to cover printing in either language. The bills and stamps would have to be made in accordance with instructions.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When may I expect the return moved for some time ago with respect to the selling of rails to the Harvey & Salisbury Railway Company, and also the return with respect to the appointment of commissioners under the Boundary Waters treaty. I am anxious to have these returns as soon as possible.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). We are quite as anxious as my hon. friend to get the returns off our hands. I will make a note of the matter.

TRANSATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) to a dispatch which appears in this morning's 'Citizen,' and which interests me as the former member for Gaspé. It reads:

WINTER NAVIGATION.

Quebec Board of Trade Letter to Postmaster General.

Quebec, Jan. 23.—The Quebec Board of Trade have sent an interesting letter to Hon. L. P. Pelletier, Postmaster General, in regard to winter navigation. The letter says:

'The Quebec Board of Trade have been informed that the government of Newfoundland has voted a subsidy of $75,000 per annum for 25 years to a London syndicate who propose to build a railway from Green Bay to Bay of Islands, Newfoundland, and a fast and powerful car-ferry steamer to carry trains winter and summer from the latter point to Gaspé or Dalhousie. This service will be in connection with fast ocean steamers from Green Bay to Ireland or England. As this project would be of very great importance to Canada, not only for a faster English mail service but also as making a daily and more intimate connection between this province and Newfoundland, the council of the Quebec Board of Trade would respectfully suggest that so as to prove the perfect practicability of this route in winter—as has been affirmed by our most experienced navigators—the government steamship 'Montcalm' on her next trip to the gulf in the month of February should make a run from Gaspé to Bay of Islands.'

I do not rise specially to advocate the scheme referred to in this article, but I wish to ask if anything has been done yet, in regard to the contract for the conveyance of the mails between Great Britain and Canada. I will inform the hon. member (Mr. Foster) that the railway from Metapedia to Gaspé Bay has now been completed and is in operation as far as Grand River. The balance of the road only waits inspection by the Department of Railways to go into operation. When this line is in operation, the shortest route from Great Britain to Canada will be from Gaspé, but as I intend to speak on this question later I shall not dwell on it now. I also see it stated in the newspapers that the ice-breaker 'Montcalm' has gone to make experiments as to the ice flow between Newfoundland and the coast of Gaspé. I am informed that that part of the gulf has been free from ice this winter, as during the last three or four winters. In view of the completion of the railway to Gaspé Basin, it is very important for us to know if winter navigation can be maintained in those waters.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Other than the initial steps to gather information, and conferences which have taken place regarding the contracts for the conveyance of the mails across the Atlantic, nothing has been done yet. I will remember the statement of my hon. friend that this railway to Gaspé Basin has been finished, and that he believes it will provide the shortest transit to the old country. I am afraid, however, that much more will have to be done before we can make arrangements for the running of large steamers from that port. I have not heard anything of the subsidy said to have been granted by Newfoundland for the project hinted at. I should

almost doubt it, but nothing is impossible these days. If there is a well-founded project on foot for abridging the distance especially in the winter time, I have no doubt this government would be glad to co-operate with the government of Newfoundland in demonstrating its feasibility.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a subsidy paid to the S.S. 'Bruce.'

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Yes, between Sydney and Port au Basque, and that has been re-voted.

Mr. MACDONALD. The present contract for the conveyance of the mails across the Atlantic expires in May next, and the Minister of Trade will of course admit that if he delays calling for new tenders, it is manifestly impossible to have boats of increased speed to conduct that service. There has long been a feeling in this country that the subsidy granted by Canada should involve a somewhat faster service than that now in existence, and I am sure the Minister of Trade and Commerce appreciates the necessity and desirability of that.

But we cannot have that in May next, and what does my hon. friend propose to do in the way of a service during the coming summer? I would like to point out to him that in addition to increased speed and other facilities to be guaranteed under any subsidies that he gives under a new contract, he should endeavour to see that a line of steamers runs from the nearest port in the maritime provinces to Great Britain all the year round. The passenger service of this country has increased to such an extent that that seems to be within the bounds not merely of reasonable accommodation but of absolute necessity. I know that my hon. friend desires to make progress in this matter. Both his friends and mine have been talking a great many years about increased speed, and it seems to me we ought to have it now. But if my hon. friend is only thinking about calling for tenders, if this thinking and do nothing disease which seems to have seized on his colleagues falls on him also, I am afraid that we shall not have much advance in the way of faster lines to Europe for some time to come. Apparently this year we are going to be just where we stood before. I hope my hon. friend will give us some information as to what he is going to do in the way of advance.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad my hon. friend applies a higher standard to this government than he did to the last. For fifteen years my hon. friend has been supporting a government which I was going to say has been neither thinking nor acting on this question. I can assure my hon. friend that the question to which he has alluded is engaging the attention of the government, and I hope within a reasonable time to be able to make an announcement.

Mr. MACDONALD. What are you going to do this summer?

Mr. FOSTER. I will then tell my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot help expressing my surprise at the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the late government did nothing to improve the steamship service between Canada and Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not aware that I made that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the late government came into office the mail steamers were running between Great Britain and Portland in the state of Maine, making a call at the port of Halifax. All that was changed by the late government, and through the generous assistance that was given, the steamship service has been greatly improved. To-day the Allan Line, the Canadian Pacific railway, the White Star line and the Canadian Northern are running steamers between Canadian ports and Great Britain which I think are highly creditable to Canada as well as to the steamship companies which have shown such great enterprise in putting on the splendid steamers which now give service across the Atlantic. I am not one of those who are greatly wedded to what are known as ocean greyhounds. I think what we should aim at in this country is to have comfortable steamers of large capacity; not of too great speed, but cheap freight-carrying steamers, with accommodation for perishable products so as to enable our farmers to ship their products to the markets of the old world in as good condition and as cheaply as possible.

STENOGRAPHIC SERVICE FOR MEMBERS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time ago there was voted the sum of $8,166, forming part of a vote of $14,000 to provide for a service of stenography and typewriting for the use of members. It was understood when that vote was proposed, as a result of some conversation across the House and of consultation among members on both sides, that the service was to be available for opposition members as well as for members supporting the government. I have heard it rumoured that our friends opposite, or some of them, have been given the services of stenographers, who are being paid for out of that vote. I have asked my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition if any communication has been made to him on the subject, and he informs me that none has been made. Certainly no communication has been made to me or as

far as I know to other members on this side of the House. It does not seem to me that is treating the members on this side with the courtesy to which we are entitled. I would like to ask my hon. friend what has been done in reference to the disposition of that vote, and what arrangement, if any, has been made for the employment of stenographers for the use of members.

Mr. FOSTER. I am given to understand that this matter has not been allowed to remain without attention being paid to it, nor has there been any lack of courtesy. I believe that the Speaker and the Clerk are now carrying out the intention of the vote by arranging for the services of a stenographer for each group of members, no distinction being made between members on one side of the House and on the other. If members make application to the Speaker, I think they will get full information, and will also be satisfied that the project is being put into operation and with perfect equality to all members.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that I have consulted with several members of the opposition, and several groups have already been defined. I informed them that I would be prepared at any time to furnish a supply when five or six of them could agree to use a stenographer regularly. I have supplied several groups already on that side of the House, and have done the same on the government side.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I suggest that the selection of the stenographers should be left in the hands of the members? I will explain why. I would accept any stenographer recommended by you, Mr. Speaker; but we all know that political correspondence is always more or less of a confidential nature, and it seems to me that each group of say four or five members should be allowed to suggest the name of their stenographer.

Naturally members do not desire to dictate their correspondence to a stenographer who is not more or less in sympathy with them politically. I would suggest that members of the opposition should be entitled to name their stenographers. It is a matter of confidence, and members I think should receive that measure of justice at your hand.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is exactly what has been done. Therefore I can say no more.

Mr. NESBITT. I must relieve Mr. Speaker of any accusation of partiality because he did exactly what my hon. friend suggests for a group of which I am a member. Mr. Speaker is prepared to do what is absolutely fair.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to hear that this plan has been adopted.

Mr. MONK. The Committee on Internal Economy is endeavouring to solve this problem which has been urged upon it by Mr. Speaker. We have taken it up several times, but we have not yet been able to make any concrete suggestion. At the last meeting the clerk was requested to ascertain how clerical assistance was furnished to members in the United States where they have an allowance for clerical assistance. My personal belief is that ultimately it will be necessary to make some allowance for the members themselves——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. —which they themselves will arrange to employ in the best manner possible. It is almost impossible to give a member a stenographer whom he has not chosen himself. It is very difficult also to say to a member that at such an hour that stenographer will be at his disposal, and at no other hour, and in such a room, and nowhere else. Members who have been a long time in opposition, as I have been, know how difficult that is. I believe that ultimately those who study the question will come to the conclusion that it will be necessary to make an allowance in conformity with the exigencies of modern times, in order that a member may have some clerical assistance, without which it is impossible for him to fulfil the duties of his position. Nothing has been finally decided, and in the meantime members of the board will be glad to receive any suggestions which will show what is the opinion of the members on both sides of the House.

Mr. KNOWLES. Turning to a cognate matter, I have a suggestion to make to the Minister of Finance. Members of parliament are entitled to a certain allowance for travelling expenses when coming to and going from a session. It has come to be the settled practice that in every session we have at least one adjournment of almost a month, and another at Easter, when the great majority of the members go home, although they may miss a day or two by doing so. I would ask the Minister of Finance to consider whether the travelling allowance should not be given to all members of parliament, whenever there is an adjournment over some specified time, whatever is reasonable. I make no apology for this suggestion, because I am sure the minister will realize that the same philosophy which justifies the granting of a travelling allowance at the beginning and end of a session, would justify the same allowance when it is reasonably necessary for a member to go home during adjournments. The Christmas adjournment this session lasted over a month, and there is no alternative for the average member, but to go home. The interests of his constitutents demand that he should be there, and not idling about Ottawa, and if on no

other ground than the interest of the constitutencies, this allowance should be made in order that the member may spend his long adjournments among his constitutents. Could not a section be inserted in the Act making that travelling allowance as often as there are adjournments of a certain length of time, seven days, or whatever might be thought reasonable.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I would be very glad, indeed, to take the matter into consideration.

SUPPLY.

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

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—Public buildings, Quebec—Quebec Customs House $107,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the Minister of Public Works please explain this item?

Mr. MONK. This vote is for the restoration and placing of an additional story on the Quebec customs house. The attic and half the first floor of this building were destroyed by fire on October 16, 1909. A temporary roof was placed over the building and the openings on the first floor were closed to prevent the rain and snow combined with frost from endangering the main wall. The amount already paid on the contract is $82,120; fittings, $10,000; passenger elevator and motor, $5,650; freight elevator, $1,450; sidewalk, $1,500; contingencies and superintendence, $9,280; total, $110,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the passenger elevator yet installed?

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the minister intend to give the contract to the Otis-Fensom Company, or to call for tenders?

Mr. MONK. Though the Otis-Fensom is supposed to be the best, I think we shall call for tenders to see what can be done.

Quebec—drill hall extension, $50,000.

Mr. MONK. This is a revote to make provision for the extension of the drill hall at Quebec on land containing 8,240 feet expropriated December 6, 1904, at a cost of $20,000, in order to afford much-needed additional accommodation for new corps to be formed. The present accommodation is entirely insufficient for the existing corps of the city

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are any of the political parties allowed to hold meetings in the drill halls?

Mr. MONK. I cannot speak as to that. When we build armouries, we hand them over to the Militia Department. I think the question would come in better when the militia estimates are under consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to say here that I was very much amazed when, some months ago, after the general election of 21st September last, a political gathering was held at the armouries of the 65th battalion in Montreal. The hon. gentleman (Sir Rodolphe Forget), who represents two counties—and I do not know how one can continue to represent two counties in this House—was brought to Montreal triumphantly by his friends. I think the hon. gentleman was present. At all events, the hon. member from Montmorency and Charlevoix was brought triumphantly in a golden chariot to the armoury of the 65th regiment, where speeches were delivered by the would-be ministers, as I do not think the Cabinet had yet been formed. Now, while I do not object to a meeting held by Conservatives in the armouries in the province of Quebec, I ask if the Liberals would have the same privilege of holding political meetings there.

Mr. MONK. I am not able to answer the question for the reason already given. All we do is to build the armouries and drill sheds, which are afterwards placed under the control of the Department of Militia and Defence. I suppose there is some rule in the department. I will endeavour to get the information for my hon. friend. But in the meantime, I may say that we have nothing to do with it in our department. I was present at the meeting my hon. friend refers to, and enjoyed it very much. I had no cares of office at that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thought it rather regrettable that a building which had been erected by the old government at the request of Colonel Forget, now member of parliament for Montmorency and Charlevoix, should be used officially for the first time in opposition to the government which had done so much for the 65th Regiment. However, I do not object. Political parties, after all, are associations of gentlemen in the public interest, and I suppose that they must at times find some place where they are protected from the inclemency of the weather while they enjoy themselves. But if it is a rule for one party, it should be a rule for the other. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to what is likely to happen when the reaction takes place in our province, a reaction which has already set in.

Mr. MONK. There was nothing hostile to my hon. friend at that meeting, it was just a little jollification. I am sure my hon. friend would have approved everything we did on that occasion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is the addition to the drill hall in Quebec to be erected at the rear of the present building or in front?

Mr. PELLETIER. We have not decided yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What portion of the building is going to be altered by this addition?

Mr. MONK. There was a site purchased under an order in council of the 3rd February, 1904. The then acting Minister of Public Works purchased on the Grande Allée a piece of land containing 9,240 square feet, for a sum of $20,000 as a site for the addition. In order to arrive at a settlement of the price to be paid, the matter was referred to three persons conversant with the value of real estate in that city. They reported that, owing to the special location of that property on the Grande Allée, a fine residential street, and considering the advancement in values which had taken place, they were of the opinion that $1.40 a square foot frontage would be a fair price.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand this piece of property referred to was purchased for an addition to the drill hall. I do not think it was meant to add to the frontage of the building. I understand that a site was provided in the rear part of the drill shed, which was obtained from the Militia Department. Certainly, nothing has been paid for that, there has only been an exchange of titles between the two departments.

Mr. MONK. There may have been pour parlers, but I do not think anything has been done.

Quebec post office enlargement, $40,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is that enlargement to be made in the rear or at the side?

Mr. MONK. It is on property owned by the government along the hill, next to the present building. The present quarters are totally inadequate for the transaction of the postal business. It is a prolongation of the old building.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is much needed indeed. The post office business in Quebec is in a somewhat congested state, and my hon. friend has some officers upstairs who have not proper accommodation for the work they have to perform. I would suggest that arrangements be made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to purchase that lot in the rear of the post office, which would be much better than to widen the building. My hon. friend must remember that the post office at Quebec is one of the most imposing structures in the city, it is indeed a fine building, and it would be a pity to do anything which would mar the architectural beauties of that building. I think arrangements might be made by which the Grand Trunk Railway Company could co-operate with the government in building on the rear portion. There would be room enough, if I remember rightly, for all the offices of the government. Mr. Decarie, the resident engineer, would have room enough for the various departments occupying that building, and at the same time the Grand Trunk Railway Company could occupy the first floor. At any rate, I hope the hon. gentleman will preserve the architectural beauty of that edifice.

Mr. MONK. I know the locality very well. An extension in that direction would be very desirable, but the difficulty would be to get the Grand Trunk Railway Company to consent to it. My hon. friend knows from his own experience that that is not easily done.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am sure that a friendly chat between the Minister of Public Works and Mr. Hays, or Mr. Wainwright, would settle that matter very amicably.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had communication with the authorities of the Grand Trunk railway, and while they were not willing to sell the land, they stated that they would be very glad to make arrangements with the government under which they would put up a building they would rent to the government and that building would be constructed in harmony with the architecture of the present building.

Mr. PELLETIER. The plans which I have seen are prepared in such a way that provision is made for the future and also to preserve the architectural beauty of the building.

Rigaud public building, $15,000.

Mr. MONK. This is to complete the building.

Shawinigan public building, $33,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is this for the ordinary accommodation of post office, customs and excise?

Mr. MONK. Customs and post office, but no excise.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Have you purchased a site?

Mr. MONK. Yes, the contract is let and the work actually under construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I am right in the statement that there is not an item in these public buildings for Quebec, but was provided for by the late government. I am right in that, am I not?

Mr. MONK. Well, most of them were begun, or under construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All were in the old estimates?

Mr. MONK. I could not say whether they were all in that position, but most of them were.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would appear, looking down the list, that every item was in the estimates of the late government.

Mr. MONK. In most cases they are revotes.

Sherbrooke post office—rearrangement of wiring system and addition to building, $2,000.

Mr. MONK. The addition to the building is not required and I would move to make the vote $1,000 and to strike out the words 'and addition to building.'

Motion agreed to.

St. Lambert public building, $20,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the work been started at St. Lambert?

Mr. MONK. No, the work has not yet been started. The contract is let.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Who is the contractor?

Mr. MONK. N. Patenaude, of Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was some criticism, I do not thing it was very well founded, as to the site which was purchased by the late government for the public building at St. Lambert. May I ask my hon. friend if the building is being erected upon that site?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Rainville) is not in his seat, because he could probably inform my hon. friend of what is going on in St. Lambert. But this is a very progressive town and with the real estate development which has taken place there and at another place, the name of which I do not recall at the present moment——

Mr. MONK. Brooklyn Park?

Mr. LEMIEUX No, Green park. At all events, it is a very progressive city, and I think that within five or six years there will be at St. Lambert a very much larger population there than there is at the present time. Is it not better for the hon. gentleman to provide for the future and erect there a substantial building; Does my hon. friend know whether this building is located on the square or is it attached to some other building?

Mr. MONK. I think it stands by itself. It is on the public square.

Mr. LEMIEUX. From whom was the site purchased?

Mr. MONK. On the public square it has a frontage of 30 feet and a frontage of 100 feet on Marcille avenue and Notre Dame street. I think it is a very suitable site. It is a substantial building. I believe there will be great improvements at St. Lambert, but it will probably be necessary to provide postal accommodation in other directions, but I think the building will be good at any rate for several years.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am not criticising the site, but I simply wanted to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that St. Lambert is increasing very rapidly and that in the near future some addition will have to be made to the public building

St. Thérèse public building, $15,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has anything been done there?

Mr. MONK. The site has been purchased, under the authority of an order in council dated 21st October, 1908, for the sum of $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Have tenders been called for that building?

Mr. MONK. Not yet. We are just awaiting the adoption of the estimates to proceed with the work.

Three Rivers—new public building to replace buildings destroyed by fire, June 22, 1908, $70,000.

Mr. MONK. This is for the reconstruction of what was destroyed at the time of the fire. There is nothing decided as to the site. We received a petition from a very important section of the city down there asking a change of site and that matter is being considered by the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I hope my hon. friend will not be impressed or imposed upon by any political considerations in dealing with this matter. I am sure that my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), who always showed excellent judgment when he was a member of the Liberal party, when he was one of the faithful, will admit with me that there is only one available site at Three Rivers, and that is the old historic site near the Monument Laviolette. I understand that the substructure was started last year, and if I remember well the opponents of my hon. friend the ex-Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) criticised the site during the elections.

Surely the minister will not yield to such pressure, but will see that this important building is erected on a proper place. The

only place at Three Rivers where such a building should be erected is the old historic plateau where the governor's palace was built. I believe it already belongs to the government. It was old military ground which passed from the French government to the British government, and then to the Dominion government at confederation. When I was Postmaster General I was consulted about the post office building, and it was understood that a building which would be a credit to the city would be erected, and that it would include all the federal offices, post office, and all, which I consider a most convenient thing. I understood that the foundations had already been laid on the plateau.

Mr. MONK. There are no foundations laid; we have merely cleared away the ground. This is for a building on the original site on a place known as the Plateau.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Then we are agreed.

Gananoque post office, $25,000.

Mr. MURPHY. This item is increased by $21,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The original vote was for $4,000 to repair the old building, but I take it that the minister after inquiry has decided to erect a new building.

Mr. MONK. That is the idea.

Kingston Royal Military College, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would save inquiry as to these items if the minister would answer this inquiry: It is true, is it not, that all these items are to provide for buildings which were provided for in the estimates submitted by the late government?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Midland public building, $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Has a site been decided on, and will work be commenced this season?

Mr. MONK. As soon as the site has been selected work will be begun.

Ottawa—Departmental Buildings—improvements in lavatories, plumbing, &c., $12,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I wish to take this opportunity of vindicating myself, and I am glad to see the hon. Postmaster General in his seat. Some weeks ago the Conservative papers, especially those in the province of Quebec, came out with the statement that the ex-Postmaster General had treated his employees like slaves, that he had kept them in the cellars of the building, and that even the rats had invaded the place and had not only gnawed the files but devoured the employees themselves. I was given a very hot roasting for having dealt so ungenerously with the officials of the Post Office Department. Now, I am quite sure that the hon. Postmaster General was not responsible for the publication of such a—shall I say lie?—I do not like to use an unparliamentary expression—but such a story. Let me state in two words what happened whilst I was the incumbent of that very important office. As my hon. friend knows, the Post Office Department should occupy at least three floors of the Langevin building, but it is confined to one floor and the cellar. The business of the department has increased so tremendously of late years that it has become quite congested. The government was aware of that. I made representations to my colleagues, especially to the Minister of Public Works, and the government, in face of the necessity not only of the Post Office Department but of nearly all the departments, decided to erect new departmental buildings. We had taken nearly all the available buildings in the city of Ottawa for our offices. With regard to the Post Office Department, as I happened to be not only Postmaster General, but Minister of Labour, I directed the Labour Department to report on the congested condition of the Post Office Department, and a full report was prepared by the gentleman who was then deputy minister and afterwards became the minister of the Labour Department. That report was brought before council, and action was immediately taken. A site was purchased and expropriation proceedings took place, and the government was going to proceed with the construction of the new building. I may say in passing, that it is a question whether the site expropriated is the best one. I think we should give as much beauty as possible to the government buildings, and it is a question whether it would not be advisable to expropriate a little further on Sussex street. At any rate, as regards the Post Office Department, we might have removed some of our officials to outside buildings; but the Postmaster General knows that the work of that department is of a special nature and that the officers from the top to the bottom must be congregated together. I myself brought the matter to the attention of the deputy Postmaster General and the heads of the various branches in the department, and they were a unit in protesting against any dislocation of the department. It is impossible to have the Post Office Department divided, with one set of officers in the main building and the others in other parts of the city. As an instance of that, I may say that we were weak enough some years ago to allow the railway mail branch to take outside apartments, and it was a difficult thing to get at it. I wanted to give as much space as possible to the officers of the department. I made re-

peated applications to my colleagues for the upper stories of the building, but it was impossible to get them, because the other departments were also in a congested state. I wish to vindicate myself, because the papers seemed to think that I had deliberately treated the officials like slaves. I did my best to protect them and to invite the tender commiseration of the Minister of Public Works, and we did as much as possible to precipitate a change. Unfortunately it took time. As my hon. friend will find, it takes time to carry a plan to completion. It took 15 years of my work in parliament to obtain the construction of a railway in my county—the Gaspé railway. In the same way it takes time to obtain the construction of public buildings, and a man should not be branded as a persecutor because he does not succeed in getting at once what in his soul and conscience he believes should be had for his employees.

Mr. PELLETIER. I wish to state in a very few words how this matter stands, and I think the committee has a right to know after the remarks made by my hon. friend from Rouville. I may say at the outset that what the papers have said is not a lie, is not an exaggeration, but is absolutely true.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the truth?

Mr. PELLETIER. I am going to state the facts as I found them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You said something is absolutely true. What is it?

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has said that the statements, he did not like to call them a lie—

Mr. LEMIEUX. As regards myself.

Mr. PELLETIER. I say it is not a lie and I am going to give the conditions as I found them in the department. My hon. friend may laugh and the papers have laughed over this question of the rats in the department. As a matter of fact, one morning the money orders in the department were found with a great portion of them completely eaten out during the night by the rats.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why does not the hon. gentleman have traps set for them?

Mr. PELLETIER. We have had some traps set that were successful lately and now we will come to deal with these. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) may say what he likes. I do not say it is his fault but the condition of affairs in that department is absolutely disgraceful.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is where I said the lie was, that it was my fault.

Mr. PELLETIER. We will see; perhaps it is the fault of his neighbour, because I find on the record that it is the fault of the Minister of Public Works, that my hon. friend did his best.

Mr. PUGSLEY. His shoulders are broad.

Mr. PELLETIER. We have heard that sometimes. I shall give credit to the hon. member for Rouville for having found on the record that he had time and again asked that this state of affairs should be remedied but that the Department of Public Works never would consent and this is the truth and the plain truth, and the record shows it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Public Works Department, then, is too economical.

Mr. PELLETIER. If the Minister of Public Works was so economical, I suppose my hon. friend was right in leaving the condition of affairs we found there. I say it is poor economy and it is the first time I have heard of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) being so economical.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is well to know the facts.

Mr. PELLETIER. I have been told that economy was not his strong point. I am not saying that with any idea of being offensive, but I have heard that my hon. friend from St. John was pretty lavish sometimes in his expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must not believe more than half of what he hears.

Mr. PELLETIER. If this was done on account of economy the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) had very little faith in his own colleague the late Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) because if the Minister of Public Works knew, and I think he did, at least his department did, the condition of affairs, and if, for reasons of economy, the employees of this department have been left in the position in which they were, I say it was an outrage that public employees should have been treated as these people were. There are in this department at the present moment as many as 75 people in one room. Some of the employees have no place to sit down and write, they have to stand in corners and to work the best way they can. I think the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) knows that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Quite so, but can you divide them?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes, it can be done.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Putting them in an outside building?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was not the view of the heads of the branches in my time.

Mr. PELLETIER. Then their views must have changed, because we have found one way of coming to the relief of these poor people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How?

Mr. PELLETIER. We have, with the present head of the Department of Public Works, a man who does not believe so much in economy at the expense of the lives of the public employees, and he tried and succeeded in getting the Blackburn block.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is that the next building?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it not true that the Blackburn block has only recently been completed, and did not my hon. friend find when he became Postmaster General, that negotiations were already on foot for the renting of premises in the Blackburn building to afford this very relief which my hon. friend says has now been afforded?

Mr. PELLETIER. I found that certain negotiations had taken place between the Department of Public Works and the Blackburn people, but that they had not been able to come to any understanding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When was the Blackburn building finished?

Mr. PELLETIER. The Blackburn building is being finished now. But if the Blackburn building had not been finished there was room somewhere in Ottawa to accommodate these people who are working for the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But not contiguous to the Langevin block.

Mr. PELLETIER. Contiguous or not, no reasonable man should have allowed the employees of that department to have been congested and crammed like sardines as they were in that department. Some of them are failing in health on account of it. Put them any where, but do not leave them in the position they are now in. Any man who would go into the rooms allotted to the postal stores in the cellar would come out absolutely disgusted. So bad are these rooms that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), had to shorten the hours of the employees who worked there, because the physicians of these men told him, and made representations that their lives would be threatened if they were obliged to work the same number of hours which other employees are required to work. That is a fact. Can this go on any longer? We said no, and my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), has devoted his time to this matter and those people are going to be taken care of now. It has cost a little money, but I do not think the expenditure can be criticised, if we try and find some means to accommodate those people. I absolutely concur in the views expressed by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), that it would be much better indeed if the whole department could be kept together. That is true for all departments, but more especially for the Post Office Department. We have been obliged to put our railway mail branch outside, but the head of that branch spends one-third of his time running from his quarters to the Post Office Department and back. That is most unfortunate. But for the moment we have found means of taking care of these people and the Minister of Public Works has given us three flats in the new Blackburn building. We have found means of putting Mr. Northrup with his branch in that building. He can go there with the least inconvenience, although there is inconvenience. That gives us room for the other branches. We hope to find a location for the Postal Stores before long; that has to be done.

This state of things has lasted for the last six or seven years, and I am bound to say that five years ago the Hon. Mackenzie King, then deputy Minister of Labour, came to that department at the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) and inspected the whole department and made a report which my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) had absolutely no justification for not following. Mr. King, the deputy Minister of Labour, who later on became one of my hon. friend's colleagues, reported, and the report is on record, that in no manufacturing establishment in Canada would he tolerate such a condition of affairs as that which he found in the Post Office Department. That report has been on file for five years. Are we to be told that during five years this state of things should not have been remedied. Too long, that was left too long. When the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) wants to do certain things, he does them quickly. He did not choose to do this and he must take the responsibility. Perhaps he may divide it with his leader but certainly the responsibility must be somewhere.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very soon after I became Minister of Public Works, my attention was called to the state of affairs in the Post Office Department, but I am bound to say that the officials with whom I communicated did not put the matter quite so strongly as my hon. friend the Postmaster General does. It is true that a number of employees were crowded into one room.

But that was the case, and I presume is the case to-day, in most of the departments; there is very great need of additional accommodation. The Postmaster General must see that, after all, all that could reasonably be expected of the Minister of Public Works was to secure accommodation for the different departments as rapidly as he could conveniently do so. With regard to providing accommodation for the Post Office Department, we were met with the difficulty that it was not thought wise to divide any branch of that department and leave part in the Langevin block, while placing part of it elsewhere. I endeavoured to induce the Minister of Agriculture of that time to move to some other premises, but, while he considered the matter, he was not favourable to doing so. I was very glad when the opportunity seemed to offer of securing additional accommodation through the erection of the Blackburn building. The Postmaster General surely would not expect that other accommodations would be sought for while that building was in course of construction. The only way was to wait until it was finished. And he knows that negotiations for the renting of part of the Blackburn building were undertaken by myself, when I was Minister of Public Works. We have gone on pretty rapidly in the last three or four years in getting accommodation for the different departments. We have rented the building now occupied by the Birks concern on Sparks street, and quite a number of others; I think we have done everything that could be reasonably expected of us to give accommodation, particularly in view of the fact that accommodation must be of a temporary character owing to the plan which the late government had of erecting new departmental buildings on Sussex street.

And, while I am on my feet I must make some observations with regard to criticisms, very unfair criticisms, I think, of the purchase of the land on Sussex street.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot finish before six o'clock, but with the permission of the committee I will proceed. The government had decided, before I became Minister of Public Works, to erect public buildings on Sussex street. Plans had been called for, and it had been determined to proceed with the work. I see that newspapers opposed to the government are charging that it was a great piece of extravagance to buy land on Sussex street, and then abandon the idea of erecting buildings there, before going out of office.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) that I must report before six o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then, I will resume when we are next in supply.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I ask if any of the officials have been transferred to the Blackburn building?

Mr. PELLETIER. They are being transferred now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the postal notes officials?

Mr. PELLETIER. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the officials in the cellar?

Mr. PELLETIER. We are attending to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is understood that I am to be allowed to resume?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 25, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill (No. 80) respecting Dominion Trust Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Dominion Trust Company.'—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Northern Territorial Railway Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Saskatchewan Power Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 84) respecting certain patents of Thos. D. Rambout.—Mr. Ames.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CHARLEMAGNE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What is the name of the contractor who now carries His Majesty's mail between Charlemagne and the Intercolonial railway station?

2. On what date will the contract between the present contractor and the Post Office Department end?

3. Has this contract been annulled? If so, at whose request?

4. What are the alleged reasons for cancelling this contract?

5. Has the dismissed contractor been advised of the reason for cancelling his contract, who has been recommended to take charge of the same for the future, and by whom was the new contractor recommended?

6. Were tenders asked for before granting this contract, and what price will be paid for carrying it on?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Oscar Seguin.

2. On 19th March next.

3. No, it will terminate as above mentioned in virtue of one of its clauses. Mr. Joseph Morin has asked that the contract should be annulled.

4. Mr. Morin has represented that the contractor, Oscar Seguin, was an offensive partisan.

5. The first part of this question is answered above. The new contractor, who is recommended by Mr. Morin, is Mederic Lebeau.

6. It is not necessary to ask tenders, as contract is under $200. The Post Office Department will not pay more to the new contractor than it paid to the last.

POSTMASTER ODILON DOUCET.

Mr. PACAUD:

1. Was Odilon Doucet dismissed from the position of postmaster at Notre Dame de Lourdes, county of Megantic? If so, when was such dismissal made?

2. For what reasons and on whose recommendation was he dismissed?

3. If dismissed, who was appointed to fill his place, and on whose recommendation was such successor appointed?

4. Was there any investigation held? If so, by whom?

5. Were there any charges made against him? If so, by whom, and what were they?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. (a) Yes. (This office is called Lourdes, not Notre Dame de Lourdes).

(b) On the 13th November last.

2. For being an active political partisan. On recommendation of D. H. Pennington, M.P.P.

3. Mr. C. Faucher was appointed his successor on recommendation of D. H. Pennington, M.P.P.

4. No investigation was held. The postmaster was asked by the department what he had to say to the charge of political partisanship, but he replied evasively and in such a way as to show that the charge was well-founded.

5. See answers to Nos. 2 and 4.

Mr. SEGUIN.

INLAND REVENUE OFFICER COURCHESNE.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Has Mr. P. E. C. Courchesne been dismissed from his duties in the Inland Revenue Department?

2. If so, when was he dismissed, for what reason, by whom and what was his salary?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes, from his position as deputy collector of Inland Revenue (Class 'B') at Rimouski, in the Quebec division.

2. Dismissed from the 1st October, 1910, for the reason that the excise business at Rimouski had ceased and there was no work to be done there. He was dismissed by order in council of the 26th September, 1910. His salary was $200 per annum.

IMMIGRATION AGENT DUPONT.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. When was Mr. Rene Dupont dismissed from his duties as immigration agent?

2. What was his annual salary, and what were the contingent expenses of his office?

3. Since what time was he employed as immigration agent?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Mr. Dupont was not dismissed, but resigned, and his resignation was accepted December 31, 1911.

2. Salary $1,800; average annual expenses $1,321.31.

3. 1st February, 1907.

PREVENTIVE OFFICER LEBEL.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

Has Mr. Wenceslas Lebel, of Kamouraska, been dismissed by the Customs Department from his duties as preventive officer? If so, for what reason, and by whom has he been replaced?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The services of Mr. Wenceslas Lebel, acting officer of customs at Kamouraska, have been dispensed with, he being a temporary officer whose services were not considered necessary at that place. He has not been replaced.

POSTMASTER MICHAUD.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has Mr. Julien Michaud, postmaster at St. Moise Station, P.Q., county of Rimouski, been dismissed?

2. If so, why and who asked for his dismissal?

3. Has he received notice that his mail contract, which expires only in three years, would be cancelled on the 1st April?

4. If so, what reason is given for such cancellation of the contract?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. Active political partisanship. Mr. H. Boulay, M.P.

3. This contract may be terminated after three months' notice and this notice has been given.

4. The Postmaster General has done this in the public interest.

ART GALLERY PICTURES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have any paintings been purchased by the Minister of Public Works?

2. If so, have such paintings been placed in the Government Museum?

3. From whom have such paintings been purchased, and what is the cost in each case?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Pictures purchased by the Advisory Arts Council since October, 1911.

Madonna and Child, by Marco Bello, Wallis & Son, London, $300; St. Paul's Cathedral, by J. Kerr Lawson, Canadian, $1,750; Still Life, by De Heem 1600-1675, Wallis & Son, London, $225; Bacchante, (Study), by J. M. Swan, R.A., 1842-1910 Colnaghi & Obach, London, $350; Death of Wolfe, Ivory Carving, Wells, England, $162; Etchings, by Mr. and Mrs. Armington, Canadian, $62; Drawings, by J. M. Barnsley, Canadian, $50; Evening Cloud of the Northland, J. W. Beatty, Canadian, $300; Western Sunlight, C. W. Jefferys, Canadian, $500; The Saviour, Cima de Conegliano Blakeslee, 15th and 16th Centuries, New York, $2,500; Mists and Glaciers of the Selkirks, F. M. Bell-Smith, Canadian, $100; Etchings, 6, J. W. Thomson, Canadian, $87; Rose and Pink, The Mothers Sleep, J. Mc. N. Whistler, Wallis & Son, London, $300; Total, $6,686.

'LABOUR GAZETTE' CORRESPONDENTS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. By whom have the following names been replaced as correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette': Gustave Audet, Montreal, Quebec; Geo. Bartly, Vancouver, B.C.; J. A. Chenevert, Sorel, Quebec; E. E. Cinq-Mars, Hull, Quebec; F. A. Derman, Sault Ste. Marie; J. R. Falconer, Newcastle, N.B.; N. C. Franklin, Brockville, Ontario; J. F. Girard, Montreal, Quebec; R. E. Gofton, Berlin, Ontario; Jos. Hanley, Belleville, Ontario; E. Little, Quebec; D. Mitchell, Windsor, Ontario; F. J. Nash, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; A. D. Pepin, St. John, Quebec; A. D. Ross, Amherst, N.S.; J. A. Wiley, St. Catharines, Ontario?

2. What are their occupations, and what amount is allowed to each of them respectively, to perform said work?

Mr. CROTHERS:

	Salary per annum.
* A. M. Edington, Montreal, Quebec, Newspaper writer..	$325
Appointment not yet made at Vancouver, B.C.	
A. P. Vanasse, Sorel, Que. Occupation not known	$ 125
L. Cousineau, Sr., Hull, Que. Occupation not known..	125
John C. Richardson, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., Newspaper writer...	125
John Clark, Newcastle, N.B. Occupation not known..	125
Herbert Burnham, Brockville, Ont. Occupation not known..	125
* A. M. Edington, Montreal, Que. Newspaper writer.	
Appointment not yet made at Berlin, Ont.	
Philip Harrison, Belleville, Ont. Newspaper writer..	125
Two correspondents have acted in the past for Quebec, E. Little and P. J. Jobin. The services of Mr. Jobin have been continued and are regarded as sufficient for the present.	
R. G. Thompson, Windsor, Ont. Occupation not known..	125
James McIsaac, Charlottetown, P.E.I. Newspaper writer..	125
Correspondent for St. Johns, Que. not yet appointed.	
James Forsythe, Amherst, N.S. Carpenter..	125
Edward A. Day, St. Catharines, Ont. Occupation not known.. ..	125

* In the case of Montreal one correspondent has been appointed in place of two.

PATRONAGE COMMITTEE IN MONTREAL.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Is the Prime Minister aware that there is a patronage committee in Montreal?

2. Does the government act upon the recommendations made by such committee?

3. Of whom is said committee composed?

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN. (Prime Minister).

1. The Prime Minister has no information on the subject beyond that which is available to every member of the House.

2. The government exercises its own judgment in every case.

3. The government has no information.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY ACT—COMMISSIONERS.

On motion of Mr. Cochrane Bill (No. 76) to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act, was read a second time and the House went into committee thereon.

On section (1).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would expect the minister to give some information on the Bill, as to the extent of the work done, what mileage is under contract, what has not yet been undertaken and how much remains to be done?

I understand, from what the hon. gentleman said a few days ago, that the work is so far advanced that the services of the three commissioners can be dispensed with. But we have no statement showing in what condition the work is, and we ought to have such a statement before putting through this Bill. The House is interested in knowing what amount of work remains to be done, how far the railway is completed, how much remains to be completed, how much is under contract, and how many miles more are not contracted for.

Mr. COCHRANE. I will be very glad to have a statement prepared when the estimates come up, if that will suit my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It must be obvious to my hon. friend that when he asks parliament to reduce the commission to one member alone, on the ground that one can do all the work remaining to be done—and I am not contradicting that statement—the proper time to give the information I have asked is when this Bill is before us. I would suggest that he let it stand until to-morrow.

Mr. COCHRANE. The chairman, Mr. Leonard, whom I would like to consult is out of the city, and I would prefer going over the statement with him so as to have it as accurate as possible before submitting it to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps my hon. friend could have that done on the third reading, but I think we should have this information before this Bill is finally disposed of.

Mr. COCHRANE. Very well.

Mr. KYTE. Have the resignations of the three commissioners been received?

Mr. COCHRANE. They have all sent in their resignations. Mr. Young asks —on the ground of having had no holidays, but one out of the seven years he has been in office —for six months salary. Mr. McIsaac asks for three months, and Mr. Calvert resigns without any condition. The matter has not been dealt with yet.

Mr. KYTE. It appears to me but reasonable that inasmuch as the resignations were demanded of the commissioners on such short notice, some compensation should be allowed them, and also because these commissioners were appointed for the period during which the transcontinental would be under construction. These men, on the strength of that appointment, became residents of Ottawa, and purchased property, which so far as residential purposes are concerned, will be entirely useless to them, as it is their intention, I believe, to leave Ottawa at an early date, and resume their residences where they formerly lived. Under all the circumstances, I think some compensation should be allowed them—say three months salary, so that these gentlemen might be considered as having been fairly treated, particularly in view of the fact that, on their resignations being asked for by the minister, these resignations were handed in.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to correct my hon. friend in one respect. These gentlemen were appointed to office during the pleasure of the government, and not during any specific time. I have not had an opportunity of bringing the matter before council so cannot give any definite information at present.

Mr. KYTE. I would suggest that the words 'during pleasure' mean during the time the commissioners are satisfactorily discharging their duties. I am not aware of any different interpretation ever having been given tenure of office based on such language, and I would not like to think that the Minister of Railways is putting a more restricted interpretation on these words than that which is so well understood.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps another consideration which ought to influence my hon. friend the Minister of Railways is that it is proposed to abolish these offices by this Bill, so that there will be only one commissioner in the future. I think it has always been the rule, without exception, that where by reason of the abolition of an office, resignation is necessarily involved an allowance is made. Take for instance the case of the lecturers under the Annuity System. I understood the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) to say a few days ago that he intended making provision to allow these lecturers three months' salary because their offices had been abolished. Am I right in that?

Mr. FOSTER. What I think I did say was that owing to the offices having been abolished, I had decided to grant these lecturers a gratuity of one month's pay for each year of service. That is what I propose to ask the House for and that is because I am very humane.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is in accord with the principle which has almost always been recognized, namely, that where an official is dismissed by reason of the abolition of his office the humane side of the government is necessarily appealed to. If the Minister of Railways would exhibit his humane side in the same way—and he has certainly the reputation of having a humane side, just as much as the Minister of Trade and Commerce—he would probably accede to the request of my hon. friend who has brought this matter up.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether, if the work were completed, he would propose giving a gratuity?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, in that case I would think differently. These gentlemen would then cease to be commissioners and there would be no need to abolish the office. But they were appointed on the implied understanding that, if they discharged their duties satisfactorily, they would continue until the end of the term, but you are abolishing their office while there is yet considerable work to be done and before the completion of the term for which they were appointed. I think their case is exactly analogous to that of the lecturers under the Annuities Act.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not remember the precise date fixed for the completion of the road when these gentlemen were appointed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not remember that there was any specific time. They were appointed during pleasure.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not speaking of that, but of the date fixed for the completion of the road.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 1913, I think.

Mr. BORDEN. I think it was earlier, but eventually extended to the first of December, 1911. These gentlemen have, therefore, been longer in office than the period originally contemplated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not my right hon. friend speaking of the time fixed as between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the government for the completion of the portion of the line between Winnipeg and the Pacific coast? I think so. My impression is that with regard to the government portion of the road, all that is provided is that the construction shall be carried on as speedily as possible.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not absolutely certain, but that was my impression.

Mr. NESBITT. I think the Minister of Railways should make some statement to show the House just how far advanced the road is before these commissioners are discharged, and I endorse what the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has said, that the position which these men occupy was supposed to continue during the time of the construction of the road, and if they are to be discharged now, some small remuneration should be given them to repay them for the expense which they will necessarily incur in removing from Ottawa. I think that would be only decent on the part of the government. It is not expected by the people to be narrow in such matters.

Mr. EMMERSON. The view that appeals to me in this matter is that a certain policy was adopted in 1903, with respect to the construction of the railway from Winnipeg to the seaboard. In the wisdom of parliament, the construction of that section of the railway was entrusted to a board of commissioners comprising four men. Admittedly the work is not completed; the object of their appointment has not been fully carried out. It seems to me that the hon. Minister of Railways should give detailed information as to the progress that has been made with that work before we entrust its completion to a commission consisting of only one man. I assume that parliament would have hesitated to commit this work to the care of only one commissioner in the first instance, and there seems to be no good reason yet presented why there should be a departure from the policy then adopted. It seems to me we should have that information before further progress is made with this matter.

Mr. COCHRANE. I promised the right hon. leader of the opposition that I would have a statement before the third reading, which he accepted.

Mr. MEIGHEN. From present information I would oppose any such proposition as that made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), and the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). If these offices are being abolished, it appears to the ordinary mind that they must be abolished because the extent of their usefulness to the public is not proportionate to the expense—in other words, that the work can be done, and could have been done, with a smaller number of commissioners. In this regard there is a very general public sentiment adverse to the conduct of the Transcontinental railway work under the commissioners heretofore in charge, and to go beyond the strict terms of their appointment, which was at pleasure, would appear to me to be a defiance of that public sentiment. I think parliament would be better representing public opinion and better serving the public if at this time we started out on a new policy instead of this extra compensation for services which appear to me to be largely visionary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If there is, as stated by my hon. friend, a very large and widespread sentiment that the commissioners have not been equal to the task with which they have been entrusted, I believe there is a larger and more wide spread sentiment that they have been up to the mark, and have discharged their duties very well. The change proposed by the minister in charge of the Bill is not based

upon any allegation that the commissioners have not been up to the mark and have not properly discharged their duties, but, on account of the smaller amount of work to be done four men were not required, but one would be sufficient. Upon that statement we do not object to the Bill going through, but we put it to the hon. gentleman that it would be only fair and right on this occasion, as on others when an office is abolished, that the holder of the office should receive some temporary remuneration My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has abolished an office in his department, that of lecturer, but being a kind and humane man he decided to give to those who were deprived of their positions a gratuity equal to one month's salary for each year they were in office. I would hope that my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie would be as humane as the minister in whom he has confidence.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I want to put a little rider to what my hon. friend has said—that in no case should it exceed three months.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think I should without protest, allow the hon. member for Portage la Prairie to say that there is a general public opinion in Canada that the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway have not performed their duties. I do not think any such public opinion exists. Those gentlemen have done a splendid work. I know of no expenditure in Canada that has been conducted on such strict business principles, or as to which such care has been taken, as the expenditure made in connection with the Transcontinental railway. They did their work well, and whether they are dismissed or not, I would not feel that I was doing my duty as a representative if I did not protest against any insinuation of that kind being made in this House. On more than one occasion this matter was before a committee of this House for investigation, and nothing was proven to cast the slightest reflection on the conduct of the commission or on their management of the public funds under their control. Very searching investigations were made, the result of which were altogether in favour of the commission.

That proved to the people of this country that they did their work well, that they were careful, that the expenditures were properly made, and the investigation failed altogether to discredit them in the slightest degree. I think that the people of Canada are under a great debt to these gentlemen for the way they have discharged their very important duties during the last few years and they will go out today with a good record. I do not think my hon. friend has any evidence at all on which to base the insinuation which I understood him to make a moment ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I stated in as plain language as I could that I believed there was a considerable body of puplic sentiment of the opinion that the work of the commissioners had not been well done, or in the public interest. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), appears to be still labouring under the same incapacity as when he was on this side of the House, he is unable to distinguish between a frank, open statement, and an insinuation, and twice referred to my remarks as of an insinuatory character. I did not consider that the occasion was opportune to bring any detailed or particular facts in support of my observations, but possibly, after the statements of my hon. friend, I should do so. I need not refer to the debates which, time after time, have occurred in this House in which the conduct of the commissioners, particularly in the matter of the payment of contractors, and the distinction between the various kinds of material paid for, was under fire. I shall give one instance which was peculiarly under my cognizance, and I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair), if he thinks it bears out the claim that the work of the commission was well done and the public money at all times cared for sedulously.

During the session before last there appeared in the Auditor General's report an item of several thousand dollars paid by the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners to a lawyer in Winnipeg who was a leading member of the Liberal opposition in the local House, Mr. Johnston. Mr. Johnston was summoned before the Public Accounts Committee, and it appeared from his evidence that he had been paid by the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners a minimum fee of $30 for passing Torrens titles to lands purchased by the Commission. Not only had he been paid a minimum fee of $30 and all disbursements, but he had been allowed to divide up certain certificates of title into 2, 3, 4 and more divisions in order that he might at the same time multiply his fees, charging $30 for each division. The commissioners approved of that, it passed under their eyes year after year for at least two years, and they passed all his accounts. The total amount of taxation on the accounts did not reach one per cent of all the charges. Furthermore in two cases where the value of parcels of land purchased was more than usual there were fees of $600 and $400, and to show the sedulous care of the commissioners, one member wrote to Mr. Johnston and modestly expressed the fear that his stenographer had made a misprint, and that $600 was meant to be $60. Mr. Johnston replied that no such error had occurred, but, notwithstanding the fact that in the

opinion of the commission $60 was an ample charge for the work, he himself was a consenting party to the payment of $600. To that extent he guarded the public treasury, and the public interest.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I was a member of that committee and was present when Mr. Johnston gave his evidence. My recollection is that Mr. Johnston made the statement, and there was ample corroboration for it, that that was the usual charge in the west for the searching of titles and the responsibility that a lawyer has in certifying a title, that it was a charge that would have been made to a private individual or another railway company for similar work. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) ought to know whether that is the case or not. I have had a little experience in the west, and I know that the lawyers there do not work for nothing. If it is true that the charge made by Mr. Johnston was the usual charge for similar work done by other lawyers in the west, I do not think we have much reason to complain about that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. His minimum fee was six times the usual charge.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The charge, since my hon. friend objects to the word 'insinuation,' which has been made against the commissioners, is certainly a very great compliment to them. The hon. member makes a broad statement that the commissioners have not been worthy of confidence, that they have not discharged their office properly and he gives as an instance that they have perhaps overpaid a few hundreds or thousands of dollars, I do not know which, the amount specified was $600, when they have expended over $40,000,000. Out of all that expenditure the hon. member finds fault with a few thousand dollars and one specific amount of $600. What is that amount? It is a charge of a lawyer for having searched a title. He states that one of the commissioners was startled by the fact that $600 was charged and thought it should only have been $60. That commissioner evidently was not a lawyer, because (I was in the profession at one time myself, and I know they are not so modest as that in their fees) $600 would not shock any lawyer in the House, not even my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen).

Mr. NESBITT. I also would like to protest against the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Meighen). My section of the country must be left out when he makes the assertion that there is a widespread feeling against the commission. I have never heard a word expressed against the Transcontinental Commission so that there is no such sentiment as my hon. friend says in my section of the country.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I listened with some surprise to the remarks of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). He was dealing with a specific statement by one member of the House, my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), and he thought fit to include in his denunciation of that hon. member the other members on this side of the House, and said we seemed to persist in certain habits which attached to us when we were on that side of the House. As I have stated, I am not fond of the 'tu quoque' argument, but it is a great temptation to use it. My hon. friend certainly seems to have kept up a habit which was the stock-in-trade of the Conservative party when in opposition, which was to look out petty scandals and base a general charge of administrative incompetence upon some petty and local aspect of a case. My hon. friend in his first statement said that there was a widespread sentiment to this effect.

In his amended statement he showed that he was amenable to criticism by altering 'widespread' to 'considerable.' Now with regard to the statement that there was a 'widespread' sentiment, I should like to make one or two comments. The first is that perhaps the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) is hardly in a position to speak for all of us on this particular question. Some one has said that no one of us knows everything, not even the youngest of us. Certainly my hon. friend has given us a very small matter upon which to base such a widespread charge against members on this side of the House, that they have been neglecting to find out this kind of thing. It would ill become a mere layman like myself to speak about lawyers' fees. But I do not expect that one will ever be able to satisfy a Conservative lawyer from Portage la Prairie with regard to the kind of fees that go to a Liberal lawyer in Winnipeg. It is not in Conservative human nature, and especially Conservative legal human nature, to get satisfaction of that kind. I think it is a waste of the time of the committee that we have to deal with these extraneous defences of the Cabinet. It seems to me that in this case my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has a very good example which he might well follow. We on this side of the House know how much he is indebted to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), as I think the whole Cabinet are more or less, for the guidance of his and their infant footsteps in the pathway of Cabinet duties. I think the fact that this guidance is so readily and so profusely given, where it is so very much needed, should meet with some gratitude in the way of following the example of my hon. friend. Now I want to say this, in all seriousness, that I com-

mend the example of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to handling the public money, because he has a well deserved reputation of having inherited the best traditions of British finance in not being ashamed to look vigorously after the public money, and in never fearing the charge that he saves the public money by looking after even the cheese parings and candle ends, within his own department at least. But even he tells us that he has found it in accordance with simple humanity to give consideration to the gentlemen that, in the course of policy, and in that particular case, I think, a very good policy, he has found it his duty to follow. I would respectfully urge upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce to follow that example. I may point out to him that if he does not, he really rests under a very serious imputation. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that he acted from the principles of humanity, I presume he means common humanity. Well, the imputation is that if the Minister of Railways does not follow his example, he needs to have the Minister of Trade and Commerce bring home to him the full meaning of these oft quoted lines of Robbie Burns:

Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn.

Mr. BURNHAM. On behalf of the farmers whom I represent, I wish to state that we cannot agree with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). He evidently thinks that it is the exception that proves the rule; and that in order to prove the absolute honesty of the gentlemen who compose the commission, all he has to do is to prove that in one material instance they were neither honest nor circumspect. I assure you that the cloud of words with which he, and some other gentlemen in opposition, endeavour to cover up their retreat with regard to the National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, will deceive no one. His sentiments will not meet with the sympathy of my constituents. We want all these candle ends, of which the hon. gentleman speaks, saved to the farmer, because it is by financial care of that description that the farmer of this country is kept prosperous, and not by the bogus trade policies that the late government tried to impose upon this country in the name of economic truth.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not have the good fortune to hear the expressions of the Minister of Railways when he was speaking, but I think from what has been said by those who are supporting the government it would be only right and fair for the minister, if he has not yet done so, to say here and now whether the reasons or the excuses that have been offered by his supporters are the reasons for this Bill. If they are, let us know it on his responsibility; if they are not, in all fairness let us know it also on his responsibility.

Mr. McKENZIE. As a member of that committee that had to deal with the cases pointed out I think I ought to make some reference to them. I remember the Johnston case very distinctly, it was one of two that came before us with respect to the operations of the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission has been in office now for several years, and has handled millions of money, and dealt with many great works; and I think it is much to their credit that while there was a competent court to judge any accusations that might be brought against them, there were only one or two, and no discredit came to either of the commissioners by reason of such inquiries. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie is a very keen lawyer, I have learned that from my experience with him in the Public Accounts Committee, he is a bright, intellectual gentleman. He had charge of this Johnston case. It was a case that happened within his own experience and capacity as a lawyer, the taxation of costs, and the performance of certain work in searching into facts. He examined Mr. Johnston, and made Mr. Johnston produce his books, every item of work was gone over, and when Mr. Johnston had given his evidence, my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie dropped the case. He did not ask for any resolution or motion in committee, there was no division asked for in the committee. I take the responsibility of saying that whatever politics I may have, I never did anything in the Public Accounts Committee other than endeavour to reach the truth, particularly when it was the conduct of a lawyer that was at stake. There was nothing asked for by my hon friend in the way of censure on Mr. Johnston in any way whatever. He moved no resolution. The record of that transaction is on the books with the doings of that committee. I think it would be well for my hon. friend to bring that record before the House and have it examined. Two years at all events have passed since the record was given, and since the investigation took place, and my hon. friend, with all his honesty, has been content to say nothing about it, and to let Mr. Johnston enjoy his ill-gotten gains, if so they were. I think the hon. gentleman should have brought it to the notice of this House long before now, if any money was paid improperly to Mr. Johnston. But he dropped the case, and we were all satisfied. Under the rules and regulations governing the payment of the services of solicitors in the city of

Winnipeg, he was given none too much. I think indeed when this agreement was made with him, as it was made, that the fees paid to lawyers in that city far exceed the amount of money he received for the amount of work he performed. If they had been taxed before the taxing officer of the city of Winnipeg the amount would have been much larger. The evidence satisfied us on that point as I remember, there were quite a large number of lawyers on the committee and it was allowed to drop. The hon. member, with his parliamentary knowledge, could have brought that evidence before this House. He could have had the report, if report there was, brought up and threshed out. He did nothing of the kind, while I did not tax my memory very particularly with the details, my recollection is that nothing in regard to it was brought before the House. As the Prime Minister sent for the law with regard to the tenure of office of the commissioners, perhaps he will be good enough to tell us what it says.

Mr. BORDEN. Apparently the section of the statute which I had in my mind relates to the western division as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has stated. It is provided by the first contract that the road should be finished on the 1st December, 1908, and by the second contract that it should be finished by the 1st December, 1911.

Mr. McKENZIE. I read the Act a few days ago, and my recollection of the part which deals with the commissioners is that it says that they shall hold office, during the construction of the road but it does not say for how long. It says that a commission shall be appointed, and that the commission shall continue in existence during the construction, and the operation of the road or such parts as may be fit for operation until it is finally passed over to the company. The fact that the statute says that they shall hold office during pleasure is no notice to the commissioners that they may be dismissed or put out of office before the work is concluded, because the entity created by the law shall have charge of that work for an indefinite time, or until it is finished. The Prime Minister says that there was no time fixed for the completion of the road, and I think it will appeal to the Minister of Railways that a man taking the office of commissioner could well understand that if he did his work well he would stay there until he finished that work. For some good reason, I presume, the Minister of Railways decided to put an end to the commission and release the commissioners from work that would have kept them in office for a couple of years yet, I believe. Therefore, I think that the government ought to give them some consideration. I think it is good policy, if men are in office when large amounts of money are to be handled, and when the honesty of the officers handling money is a great safeguard to the country, that they should always understand that they will be generously dealt with by their country, and by parliament when they cease their work, or when they are improperly turned out. Otherwise, the Minister of Railways may find that some men will be making friends with the mammon of unrighteousness, and will, like the unjust steward, who was to be turned out, have another way of making money. He does not know whether men placed in that position will take other ways of providing for themselves. I think it is good public policy that officials should be generously dealt with under conditions such as these.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the present administration is satisfying the Canadian public generally, but it does not seem to be satisfying the opposition. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), coming into his department, looked for some places where he could save public money, and at once saw that we had more commissioners for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific than were necessary. He found three men having a salary of $7,000 a year each. The payment of $21,000 per annum in salaries the minister considered absolutely unnecessary at this advanced stage of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Minister of Railways comes forward frankly and states that these men were asked to retire from office, not for any special offence, but simply because their services were not required by the government, and because he desired to make some saving in his department. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied with that, they insist that this amount shall not only be paid for their services, but that the country shall pay them after they have ceased to be in the employment of the government. I appeal to my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and I am sure that if he is going to commence in that way the country will not feel that he is leading a very economical opposition in this House. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of this matter very fully, but simply to say that I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, in the inauguration of a saving such as I have referred to, will receive the support of the people of Canada on both sides of politics if he does not receive the support of the opposition in this House.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) who has just taken his seat, has stated that by the action of this government there will be saved to the coun-

try in salaries $21,000 because the services of three commissioners are dispensed with. I would like to know of the Minister of Railways if there has not been created a new office, not even authorized or recognized under the Act, since he came into power. They appointed, as I understand it—I make this statement subject to correction—an assistant chairman with a salary of $7,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. They took the assistant engineer and appointed him assistant to the chairman at the same salary.

Mr. MURPHY. Appointed him assistant chairman?

Mr. COCHRANE. No, assistant to the chairman.

Mr. MURPHY. What is the difference?

Mr. COCHRANE. He gets the same salary that he got when assistant engineer; we are adding to his duties at the same money.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend say that no additional salary was allowed him?

Mr. COCHRANE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. EMMERSON. My information then is not correct if my hon. friend states that such is not the fact. I would ask my hon. friend by what authority this appointment was made. Was it done by the order of the board or by the action of the chairman himself? It is a material point, because the question is: Did the board create that new office? There is little distinction between assistant chairman and assistant to the chairman. I cannot see where, in the Act, there is any authority provided for the creation of such an office, and if there is not, I think it is due to the House that my hon. friend should state on what authority it is done. Was there an order of the board creating this office, or was it simply the act of the chairman of the commission in bringing to his assistance an officer to be styled assistant to the chairman?

Mr. COCHRANE. He was appointed by order in council.

Mr. EMMERSON. Under the authority of the Act? My memory of the Act is that there are only five officials (the commissioners and the chief engineer) who can be appointed by the Governor in Council and that all other officials or servants are to be appointed by the board which is created; that is to say that the Governor in Council can appoint the commissioners and the chief engineer, there his authority stops and if the Governor in Council has attempted to create another office, certainly it has been done outside of the provisions of the Transcontinental Railway Act.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I have a distinct recollection of there being a great deal of dissatisfaction with the management by this commission of the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer, resigned his position voluntarily because under the classification in vogue, with the consent and approval of the commissioners, he claimed that on one section $2,700,000 was paid out of the treasury of the Dominion to the contractors by reason of over-classification. An investigation took place in this House which we say was not conducted in a proper manner, but I want to point out that Mr. Lumsden's charges were afterwards investigated by Mr. Gordon Grant who succeeded him. Mr. Gordon Grant went over the work to ascertain whether or not the charges made by Mr. Lumsden were true, and when he investigated the classification of section 'F', Mr. J. D. McArthur, the contractor, voluntarily reduced the amount he was claiming by $360,000. And remember the commissioners approved of this large sum against the consent of their chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden. In view of that single fact alone, how can any person come here to-day and ask us to give these men not only what they are legally entitled to, but three months salary in addition.

Mr. MACDONALD. The House understood the Minister of Railways to say that he was submitting the Bill because the Transcontinental railway was nearing completion, and the full board of four commissioners was no longer required.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not make the statement just in that way. I said that the policy had been adopted, that the location, and so forth had been done.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is in effect what I said.

Mr. COCHRANE. You said the building was largely done.

Mr. MACDONALD. I certainly understood the minister to say that the road was nearing completion, and that as a consequence he could get along with fewer commissioners. At all events the minister has not stated as the reason for this legislation that there was anything wrong with the personality of the gentlemen who composed the board, and it has been left for the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) to put in the minister's mouth reasons in justification of this measure. My hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) has mixed up the story in regard to Mr. Lumsden in a most delightful way, and his statement is characteristic of to what ex-

tent the facts with regard to expenditures on the Grand Trunk Pacific have been mixed and muddled. The whole trouble with Mr. Lumsden was that every other person, every engineer, and all the counsel to which the matter was submitted, held that Mr. Lumsden was not correct in his interpretation of the definition of solid rock which he himself had put in the specification.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I can admit all that, and yet it does not affect my point, which is that Mr. Lumsden said there had been over-classification, that the commission said there was not, and that when they appointed their own engineer subsequently to go over the road he reported that there had been over-classification, and the contractors voluntarily reduced their estimate $360,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is another sample of the mixing, and the muddling. The hon. gentleman ought to know that in railway construction there must be difference of opinion as to the classification of the work, and the original Act provided that these difficulties should be determined by a board consisting of the chief engineer of the government, the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and a third person to be selected. Mr. Gordon Grant took an entirely different view from Mr. Lumsden as to the interpretation of the words in the specification, and when it came before the board, provided for in the Act, they simply determined that in these particular cases there had been over-classification, within the meaning of the language in the specification, and that could not in any way reflect upon the commissioners. My hon. friend cannot dispute that Mr. Gordon Grant, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, every engineer, every counsel who gave opinion upon the question stated that Mr. Lumsden was wrong in his interpretation of that clause. Every member of the arbitration board held that Mr. Lumsden was wrong in his view. But, this discussion is outside the question—the minister is proposing to remove Mr. McIsaac, Mr. Young, and Mr. Calvert because they have not performed their duties properly, or he is not. If he is imputing improper conduct to them the House should know it when considering this measure. Speaking of Mr. McIsaac, whom we in Nova Scotia have known all our lives, we know it is impossible for any man to make any imputation against his honour, or his personal character.

Why then should any hon. gentleman drag in questions gratuitously which are not involved in this matter and which the government will not say had any weight with them in coming to the decision they did? The government are asking this House to pass this Bill because they say that the construction of the road has reached such a stage that they can go on with only one commissioner. We ought to be informed exactly how the case stands. There are rumours that there are many gentlemen desirous of public office and anxious to serve their country for a consideration, but none willing to take a position that is to be so transitory because, in other words, there is not enough in it. Therefore, the government having failed to find any gentleman willing to take the position with the responsibility attached to this office, the Minister of Railways decided to dispense altogether with all the commissioners save one. I would like the hon. minister to tell us whether there is anything in this rumour which is current in many quarters. We ought to know what are the facts. We ought to know why he is asking us to depart from the settled policy practically approved by both parties eight years ago. I am assuming that the minister's only reason for doing so is because he considers that one man can handle the work for the future. If that be the case, we ought to have the information on which the minister came to that conclusion. We ought to know what number of miles of railway have been completed, how many remain to be completed, and when it is expected the road will be completed.

Mr. COCHRANE. I promised the right hon. the leader of the opposition that I would bring that information down on the third reading. The reason why I do not give it now is because the chairman of the commission is not in the city and will not be here until next week, when I will go into the case with him and obtain all the information required. I would have no hesitation in giving every information at present, but I want to be accurate.

Mr. MACDONALD. Why not let the Bill stand until to-morrow?

Mr. COCHRANE. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition was willing to accept the statement on the third reading.

Mr. MACDONALD. The information asked by him was of a more detailed and complete character than that which I am now asking. All I ask is how many miles now are completed, how many remain to be completed, and when the road will be finished.

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to give authentic information, obtained from the right quarter.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Does it not strike the hon. minister that he can hardly deal

intelligently with this Bill without that information?

Mr. COCHRANE. Why?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Because it is the basis of the Bill. According to the hon. minister, there is only sufficient work to be done on that railway to occupy the time and attention of one man.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say that.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Words to that effect.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Might I ask what then is the object of the Bill?

Mr COCHRANE I said that the policy of the road had been carried out to that extent. I did not say anything about the construction of the road. I think that my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will bear me out in that. He put a question fairly, and I answered it fairly.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I did not suggest that the hon. gentleman made a misleading statement, but the difficulty is this: From anything the minister has said, the impression obtains, on this side at all events, that at present there is no necessity for a full board of the commission as heretofore existed in order to complete this railway.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That one man can now satisfactorily perform the services which were formerly performed by the whole board. But to decide that matter, the House should know what work has been done, how much remains to be done, and how long it will take to complete the road. I, for one, believe that a larger board than one consisting of a single member would be in the interests of the country generally. I believe there is a large quantity of work to be done, a large amount of money to be expended, and it is very doubtful whether it is proper, under these circumstances, to appoint a single individual to transact the whole business. According to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) the object of the Bill is entirely to save expenditure. Three commissioners are to be cut off. What does the government propose to fix as the remuneration of the single commissioner?

Mr. COCHRANE. The same as before.

Mr. GUTHRIE. How much is that?

Mr. COCHRANE. I think it is eight thousand dollars.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Can the minister not give us, without going to his department, a general idea of the miles completed and still to be completed——

Mr. COCHRANE. I cannot.

Mr. GUTHRIE. And the length of time to complete?

Mr. COCHRANE. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that would only be a guess anyway from even the most practical standpoint, because unforeseen conditions, such as delayed the road in the past, may arise again. Without making a precise statement, I think at least two years will be required.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I would prefer not to depend on a guess in an important matter of this kind. I would suggest that the minister should allow this Bill to stand a day or two until he can give us the information we require. I, for one, do not feel inclined to deal with the Bill as it stands on the scanty information we have. It will not prejudice the Bill if he lets it stand and will give the House a better opportunity to consider it with full information.

Mr. EMMERSON. Apparently when the hon. minister determined on the policy of having but one minister he must have had some information or he must have made a guess as to the amount of work necessary to complete the railway. Surely he either had information or he made a guess; and, if he cannot give the information, he ought to favour the House by giving us the guess. The information asked for by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), we are certainly entitled to. I think my hon. friend should also furnish the House with a copy of the order in council creating an official not contemplated by the Act.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have no objection.

Mr. EMMERSON. We should have that. Is this another way of having two commissioners instead of four? Is this a process whereby there would be nominally one commissioner in the person of the gentleman who now holds the position and an additional sub or assistant commissioner in the person of the gentleman who was appointed under this order in council? That is information which is due the committee. No very great harm need occur if my hon. friend would defer further consideration of this matter until he can furnish the information which we have reasonably asked for, which it is fair we should have, and which my hon. friend can have no valid objection to furnishing. The right hon. leader of the opposition has asked for certain very full information which he is content to have before the third reading of this Bill; but there are

certain details which the members of this committee should have before they can give that comprehensive consideration to this measure that it should have.

Mr. BORDEN. As far as information is concerned, if hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to have it in an exceedingly accurate form up to date, I presume that there is no particular reason why the Bill should not stand for a day or two in order that it may be afforded. But as a matter of fact it is not many months since the House was furnished with information under the late administration as to how far the construction of the railway had advanced at that time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That was during the last parliament, and there are many new members in the House.

Mr. BORDEN. Quite so; but the information is available to any hon. member who desires to examine it. Everybody knows that it was expected that the road would be completed on the 1st of December last. It is not completed. I suppose it would be impossible to determine definitely the date at which the road will be opened for traffic. That would be a matter of estimate at the best, though it might be based on pretty reasonable considerations. The hon. member for Westmorland has referred to a gentleman who was appointed to assist the commission or the chairman of the commission. Under the statute any such officer could be appointed by the commissioners; I do not know whether he would necessarily be appointed by order in council or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend misapprehended my statement. I said under the Act the commissioners had power, but the Governor in Council had not power to appoint other than certain named officials.

Mr. COCHRANE. If recommended by the commission.

Mr. BORDEN. As a matter of fact, it would not make it either better or worse if an order in council were passed. I was speaking of the power of the commissioners to appoint persons under the conditions mentioned. It was a mere matter of convenience, and according to my recollection the gentleman appointed to the position received no additional salary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is of course within the knowledge of every member of this House how far the road has advanced. Everybody knows that it is almost completed from Moncton to Quebec, and I think it is common knowledge that from Quebec to Abitibi all the contracts have been let; but we have no information as far as I know as to the gap between Lake Superior Junction and Lake Abitibi. I think that section is under contract, but whether work has been commenced on it or not I do not know.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, work has been commenced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For my part I was quite satisfied when my hon. friend in charge of the Bill told us that he would give us detailed information on the third reading; but some of my hon. friends have asked him to give a summary of the information he had as to the condition of the road, and he did not comply. If my hon. friend will not comply with this very moderate and reasonable request, he gives the impression that he went into this Bill upon imperfect knowledge. With that I am not so much concerned, but I come back to the question to which I think my hon. friend should give us an answer today. as to whether these men are going to have the usual compensation which is given to any officer of the government when the functions he has performed are abolished. In this case the office in the nature of things was not permanent, but it was reasonable to expect that the incumbents of it would occupy it as long as the work was not completed. In fact, the very wording of the section makes that evident. All we say is that if these gentlemen are removed from office without any reason of want of confidence, they are entitled to some compensation on the part of the government. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has appealed to me in favour of economy. Well, Sir, I have been in favour of economy all my life, especially during the past 15 years, though I am sorry to say my efforts have not been very much appreciated. But what is economy from the point of view of my hon. friend from Peel? He says we are going to abolish offices which cost $7,000 a year each. We are going to save $7,000 a year at a cost of $1,750, three months' salary, which would be the amount of compensation, or a total of $21,000 a year by spending $5,250.

It seems to me that is very good and very substantial economy, and my hon. friend will do well, so long as he administers the Department of Railways, to be so economical as that.

Mr. CROTHERS. Hon. gentlemen opposite object to the passage of this Bill on two grounds.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We do not object to its passage at all.

Mr. CROTHERS. The right hon. gentleman, if I understood him, objects to the passing of this Bill whereby three of the commissioners will be removed from office without making an allowance on the ground that they have had no notice, that the Bill is passed without notice to them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The office is abolished, that is all.

Mr. CROTHERS. The effect is to remove them from office, and my right hon. friend objects to their being removed without giving them retiring allowances, in the nature of six months' salary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Three months.

Mr. CROTHERS. Or three months. It seems to me that these gentlemen who will be removed by the passage of this Bill have had notice for nine or ten years, and hon. gentlemen opposite who have been sitting in this House during that time, had notice that when the Conservative party got into power they would remove these gentlemen. Why? Because they contended when this board was first created that men should be appointed to it having some qualifications and some expert knowledge of the work they were expected to do. That I have heard repeated session after session in this House during the last three years at least. These men, knowing that that was the position of the Conservative party, that we insisted that men occupying that position ought to be qualified for the discharge of the duties of the position, that they should have some expert knowledge of the work they were expected to direct and oversee, have had reasonable notice that when the Conservatives came into power they would put into effect what they had been contending for and see that the men having charge of the construction of this road should have some special qualifications and some expert knowledge. I remember that argument being repeated many times by the present leader of the government (Mr. Borden), who pointed out as a contrast the character and qualifications of the men appointed by the President of the United States to construct the Panama canal. It was pointed out by the right hon. the leader of the government, (Mr. Borden), at that time that on a great work like this men should be appointed having special qualifications for the work, he objected to the appointing of paper-box manufacturers to construct the National Transcontinental railway, and it seems to me that the position taken by my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden), at that time has been fully warranted by the history of this road. We were told seven or eight years ago that this road could be constructed from Winnipeg to Moncton for $51,300,000. That estimate has varied from year to year, the board being unable at any time to give us anything like a definite statement as to what it would cost to construct or to complete this road. It is now generally admitted, I believe, that instead of $51,300,000 it will cost $200,000,000.

Mr. LENNOX. More than that.

Mr. CROTHERS. More than that I am told. We never got within $10,000,000, of the same estimate from year to year, one year it would likely be $150,000,000, and the next year probably $175,000,000, and the next year $200,000,000, although it was stated by the leader of the opposition that the cost to the government in cash would not be more than $13,000,000; of course he never contended that the road could be built for $13,000,000. The people of Canada have reached the conclusion that there is something wrong about the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, and while we have had for seven or eight years four or five members on that board none of whom possessed expert knowledge, any special qualifications for the job, and the people see that the time has come when we had better appoint to that commission a man who does know something about the work he is expected to oversee.

Personally had I been in the House in 1903 or 1904, I should have objected to there ever having been more than one commissioner. My experience is that if you appoint a qualified and competent man who has to bear the responsibility you will get better service and satisfaction in the completion of any job, than you will where the responsibility is divided among three or four people.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You had better amend your own commission then.

Mr. CROTHERS. We have for seven or eight years tried four commissioners, none of whom possessed any qualification for the position they held. We are proposing now to appoint one man who we think is qualified, who has expert knowledge, who will take the responsibility of the work from this time forward, and I think will give this House and the people of Canada better satisfaction than a board composed of four or five members.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the Commission of Inquiry?

Mr. CROTHERS. The Commission of Inquiry is a different matter altogether. That was fully discussed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the Tariff Commission?

Mr. CROTHERS. That is also a different matter altogether.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What about the Waterways Commission?

Mr. CROTHERS. Do not give us too much at once, the late government fixed the number of that. We discussed the Investigation Commission and I do not propose to discuss them all on this occasion. I am better satisfied with one commissioner than I would be with four. I have no objection to the Bill standing, but if this Bill

passes we will have one man who knows something about the business, and who is willing to take the responsibility. Then we can locate exactly the man who is inefficient if he proves inefficient. It has been said that for years the chairman of the board was doing all the work. He did not seem to have very much confidence in the character of the work because I believe he sent in his resignation on September 22.

Mr. McKENZIE. What about the expert knowledge that his leader obtained in the appointment of a Minister of Railways? Is he an engineer?

Mr. CROTHERS. Oh, that is very clever.

Mr. MURPHY. At an earlier stage of this session a gentleman on this side of the House, in tendering some advice to the right hon. leader of the House (Mr. Borden), suggested it might be well for him to keep in mind an incident that happened in England when a certain Prime Minister there put his back against the door of the council chamber and said to his colleagues before they left the House of Commons: 'Gentlemen, let us make up our minds to act together, and let us all say the same thing.' With all respect, I venture to offer that suggestion again, because this afternoon, when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House asked the reason underlying this Bill, the Minister of Railways, with a good deal of reluctance, stated that the Bill had been introduced and that this commission was to be appointed because the policy of the commission had been settled.

He had given a somewhat similar answer to a question on a former occasion, and we understood him to say that the commission was to be abolished because the work of construction had so far advanced that it was not necessary to continue the four commissioners in office. Now the Minister of Labour gets up and says that the reason for abolishing this commission is that the commissioners have had notice for eight or nine years that as soon as the Conservatives came into office they would be dismissed, and the commission abolished.

Mr. CROTHERS. I did not say anything of that character.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, I am within the judgment of the House. I may tell the Minister of Labour that his attitude for getting up and endeavouring to crawl out of an awkward position after he has got into it, is not to be repeated, at least in my case. He is too fond of doing it. I am well within the judgment of the House, that the Minister of Labour did make that statement. Now I am thankful to my right hon. friend the leader of the government that he has promised to extend to this side of the House the measure of courtesy which the Minister of Railways and Canals, by reason of his experience in another sphere, does not seem to think we are entitled to.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say anything of the kind. When the right hon. leader of the opposition asked me for the information, I at once agreed to it, and said I would bring it down fully; and he accepted my word.

Mr. MURPHY. I had reference to a question that was asked by my hon. friend from Edmonton, and which the Minister of Railways, after a manner which he affects in this House, ignored, later on going out of the chamber and paying no attention to it. All I have to say is that the business of this House will be very much expedited if the reasonable requests made by members on this side are complied with. We are not asking for anything unreasonable, and do not desire to do so. But there is information that we desire before this Bill can be proceeded with; that information has been specified by my hon. friend and I need not repeat it. I say again that I am grateful to the leader of the government that he has promised to have that information for us, and will have the Bill stand a day or two until it is obtained. I may say further that it would expedite matters still more rapidly if the right hon. leader of the House would see that we are provided with a copy of the order in council appointing this gentleman as assistant to the chairman of the commission, before the Bill is taken up again.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I cannot see that it will make any difference with the construction or completion of this road whether these commissioners are asked for their resignation or not. I know that in my constituency the people think that the Minister of Railways never made a more popular move in his history as administrator than when he resolved to reorganize this commission and ask for the resignation of the commissioners. The mere personnel of the commission would justify their removal, and the placing of an expert man in their place, as the Minister of Railways has done. Mr. Parent, who was chairman of the commission, was an estimable gentleman, a good lawyer from Quebec, but he knew apparently nothing about the construction of railways. Mr. McIsaac, another lawyer, and very estimable gentleman, knew nothing about railways, though he may be well qualified in his legal profession. Then we had Mr. Reid, a corset manufacturer, placed in a position to spend millions and millions of the country's money because he happened to be a favourite with the Liberal party. Then there is Mr. Young, an estimable gentleman, no doubt, and well experienced in farming lands in Manitoba, a grain dealer, who

knew nothing about the construction of railways. The Minister of Railways immediately, on taking office, comes forward and asks for the resignation of those gentlemen, and appoints a man who is well qualified as a civil engineer, and has experience in railway construction, to take charge of this business. I say that in the section of the country from which I come the people think that the Minister of Railways never did a more popular act in his life than in removing these men. It is a most extraordinary thing for hon. gentlemen in opposition to condemn the removal of these men. They know that charges were repeatedly made against them. As the Minister of Railways said, we know that charges were being repeatedly made against these men of extravagance, of riotous speculation in lands. We know what happened at the Moncton terminal, how their party friends made fortunes out of speculation in lands where the terminals were to be erected. We know in connection with the Transcontinental at Winnipeg, their party friends made hundreds of thousands of dollars out of a speculation, and of course the commissioners winked at it, and allowed the extravagance to go on. We had civil engineers coming forward, and over their own signatures specifying charges that there was over-classification. And what was done? I say that the removal of these commissioners can be justified in this House, and on any platform, justified on the ground of efficiency and on the ground of economy; and the Minister of Railways is to be commended for making this change.

I have discussed this matter on platforms throughout the country, and I find that the people, irrespective of politics, are well satisfied with the change. What do we want with two lawyers, a corset manufacturer, a grocer, and a farmer, spending hundreds of millions of money in the construction of a national railway? The onus is overwhelmingly on the commissioners. The original estimate was $51,000,000, and the road has already cost over $200,000,000. There is something prima facie wrong in the administration of that road. Now the Minister of Railways appoints a man who has no claim upon the Conservative party, to take charge of that road, and he appoints a man who is technically well qualified by reason of his experience and his special qualifications to oversee that important work. I say that hon. gentlemen on the left should no longer occupy the time of the House in criticising these dismissals, and objecting to a change in the personnel of the commission. One competent man will certainly do better than four incompetent men, and will give the country better service.

Mr. EMMERSON. I wish to correct the statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario). He has said that the commissioners purchased land at Moncton. I wish to say there were no lands purchased at Moncton. He says that lands were purchased, and speculators got control of the lands. There were no lands purchased at Moncton. The Transcontinental Commissioners only wanted land for the right of way to the city of Moncton, and that was all taken by expropriation.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I said that the commissioners permitted speculations in lands where the terminals were going to be placed. That is what I intended to say.

Mr. FOWLER. I think perhaps the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) is confusing things. I quite understand that the hon. member for Westmorland is a little sensitive on the point of the purchase of lands in Moncton. The Intercolonial, I think, made some purchases in which my hon. friend is either directly, or indirectly, or very closely interested.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to tell my hon. friend that the Intercolonial has not purchased, nor has it required to purchase, any land in which I am either directly or indirectly interested, and has never needed to purchase lands.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, you cannot rest in any security upon the statements made by certain gentlemen, and, therefore, it is not well to cheer too soon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the hon. member for Westmorland has squarely denied that there has been any purchase of lands, or any lands required, by the Intercolonial for a certain change of track, a change that, when the matter comes to be discussed in this House, as it will be, will, I think, be shown to have been not desirable. It has been stated that the undesirable route which has been adopted by the Intercolonial railway runs very close to certain lands in which the hon. gentleman's family is interested by reason of a legacy from a certain estate. Surely, if it be true that any members of his family are interested, the hon. gentleman would be indirectly interested, at least, and that is what I said.

Mr. EMMERSON. With that courtesy and in that gentlemanly way which characterizes the hon. member from King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler), he has introduced a subject into this debate which is foreign to it, but, by reason of the fact that he does hold a position in this House I suppose I am called upon to make reply. There was, in the city of

Moncton, action taken by the Department of Railways and Canals with respect to a spur line. That spur line was passed through near Hall's Creek against my protest, against my judgment, and I came all the way to Ottawa to protest against it. They expropriated subsequently along that route lands belonging to an estaee of which I happened to be the trustee and I have no more financial interest in it than that fact. I was appointed executor and trustee of an estate. The legacies in my family are not in any way affected because, while it is true that legacies were bequeathed out of that estate, they were not in any way dependent upon the course taken by the Intercolonial railway or by anybody else. The hon. gentleman is put to it very hard indeed when he descends to bring in a matter of this kind, something that is in no way affected by the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners. I referred to the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), and I think I referred to him in a courteous way. I wished to correct a wrong impression that he had. He had stated that there had been a purchase made in the city of Moncton by the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners of land in which speculators were interested, or words to that effect.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). There were lands in which Mr. Lodge was interested.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was years ago in connection with the Intercolonial railway, and it was in no sense connected with the Transcontinental railway. Mr. Lodge is not a relative, and he is in no way connected with me except that he is a citizen of Moncton, a gentleman for whom I entertain the highest respect and regard and a gentleman who possesses the confidence of the citizens of Moncton. There were lands purchased for the Intercolonial railway. That is one subject, but we have had under discussion the action of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. They made no purchase of land excepting for the right of way in the city of Moncton, and I do not know the individuals from whom they obtained the land. I do know that the lands acquired for the right of way were acquired under the provisions of the Act which entitled them to acquire them by expropriation. I am sure that my hon. friend in making that statement was entirely wrong or that he had been misinformed. I do not say that he made the statement intentionally.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) exactly confirms my statement that his family were interested directly, in that he was the trustee of the estate and that his family were the legatees of the estate. The gentleman who had charge of the expropriation was very close to the hon. member for Westmorland, was his particular counsel, lawyer, solicitor, or attorney, and he was the gentleman in whose hands, during the time the hon. gentleman was Minister of Railways, he placed all the business he possibly could to the exclusion of his other legal friends of the same persuasion as himself in the county. I leave the general public to judge for themselves as to the version given to the House by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was nobody connected with me who had anything to do with the acquisition of any of these lands, or with the expropriation.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I used to be reasonably familiar with matters connected with the Transcontinental railway, but I do not desire to branch out very much this afternoon. I want merely to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) upon his determination to dispense with the services of the commissioners referred to. I do not have to go into the question of whether the railway is nearly completed or not. I take a broader ground, founded upon statements that the then First Minister made at the time it was contemplated appointing these commissioners to construct that road. He told us, as a reason why he should assign fairly large salaries to the commissioners, that he proposed to engage the services of men of special fitness and competence, that they would have to be a special class of men, that it would require men of great judgment and experience. In that view we agreed that it was right that reasonably large salaries should be assigned. What did the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) do in carrying out that promise? So far as the chairman of the commission was concerned I will not say anything by way of criticism.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You ought to say that he was a very good man.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not say that he was a very good man, but I might say that he was a passably good man as compared with the others. He had some characteristics of fitness, he was lacking in some others and when I have said that I have said all that can can be said in favour of that gentleman. In so far as honesty is concerned, I am not attacking him, nor am I giving him any certificate. But, as to the others, I do say that they never did possess the characteristics that would entitle the right hon. gentleman to place them in the positions in which he did place them, and that they never did, and never could earn their salaries. They were utterly unfit for the positions to which they were

appointed. Not only is that evident from the character of the men before they engaged upon the work, but the subsequent conduct of these men in carrying on the Transcontinental railway abundantly proved what we could anticipate as soon as they were appointed. Nothing more is required to justify the attitude of the minister, if it were necessary to be invoked, than the fact that these men should never have been appointed, were never fit for the positions, and that their administration of the Transcontinental railway from first to last has shown that, even if they had the characteristic honesty that has been suggested this afternoon, and as to which I shall say nothing, they were lacking in that capacity, and that fitness for the position which would enable them to make this a successful work. As regards the cutting down of the personnel of the commission, I do not think it is necessary to discuss that. What the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) suggested is very interesting. He could not understand the advisability of cutting down the number if there was any greedy follower of the government who wanted a position. I could quite understand that from a gentleman of the opposition.

They cannot conceive of a case where, if any of their followers want a position, that for motives of economy or commonsense, or utility, that position would be abolished. The hon. member for Pictou is sorry because we have not kept up the number of commissioners for the purpose of giving some political pap to our followers, but he will discover, if he has not discovered it already, that a new order of things has been inaugurated, and that this government will not fill positions merely for the purpose of giving some very deserving persons a lucrative office, and that the public service, and the public interests will be the first consideration. I endorse the minister in calling for the resignation of these gentlemen from positions to which they were never entitled. And Sir, I do not think we should pay them a bonus for retiring. I am ready to vote reasonable amounts of public money in recognition of great public service, but I am not prepared to pay out one dollar of the hard-earned money of the people of Canada in order to award men for retiring from positions to which they should never have been appointed.

Mr. KYTE. The friends of the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) may congratulate themselves that the government have not shown any lack of industry in providing government pap for their supporters considering the short time they have been in office. We have commissions throughout the country for the purpose of investigating the holders of public offices who are paid at from $35 a year up. The friends of the government, it would seem to most people, are pretty well looked after. Now, I want to say a word of protest on the criticism which has been made of the gentlemen who have constituted the Transcontinental Railway Commission. The hon. member from North Ontario emphasized that these commissioners were not possessed of any special knowledge to qualify them to undertake the construction of railways. I would remind him that in the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway men of no greater expert knowledge were selected to carry on that grand undertaking. What would be the use of appointing engineers to instruct a commission on technical questions, if the commissioners were ipso facto obliged to have that knowledge themselves? I imagine that the fitness for membership of such a board would be that they should be men of character, of integrity, and of business sense. The members of the Transcontinental Commission are most certainly qualified as men of honesty and integrity and business ability, and notwithstanding the insinuation made by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) no charge of dishonesty or even of wasteful extravagance has ever been made against any one of them.

Mr. LENNOX. I made it absolutely distinct that I made no charge whatever of dishonesty. If need be I shall do that when the proper time comes. For the present, I am saying that these gentlemen should never have been appointed because they were not fit for the position.

Mr. KYTE. I agree that my hon. friend made no charge of dishonesty, but I can see he would not hesitate to make such a charge if he felt there was any justification for his doing so.

Mr. LENNOX. That's quite right.

Mr. KYTE. I say that these commissioners possess qualifications which demonstrated that the government showed the highest judgment in selecting them for the office. They were not presumed to be engineers, and they were not expected to have experience in the actual construction of railways, and the advice in these matters was to be obtained by them from the highly salaried officers on the staff of the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that we should appoint people as ignorant as possible to construct railways in order that we may appoint competent engineers to instruct them?

Mr. KYTE. I do not know what the hon. gentleman understands, but I may say that his object in putting such a question is not intelligible to me. I was pointing out that the special qualifications required were honesty and business ability, and that the technical knowledge was to

be found in the trained corps of engineers in the service. I think it but fair to the members of the Transcontinental Railway Commission to protest against the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite that these gentlemen had not the necessary qualifications to carry out the work which has been committed to them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is one thing to allow these Transcontinental Railway Commissioners to retire quietly and quite another thing to be asked to vote them a sum of money because they give up office. If we should do that, we would be giving them a certificate of character which if they are not worthy of they should not get. On that point, I believe that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie was well within the mark when he said that there is a very widespread feeling throughout Canada that the people have been robbed in the building of this road, and that feeling has prevailed amongst the people, not only during this year or last, but for many years. Let these gentlemen opposite read the speeches made by them when the Transcontinental Railway Bill was introduced to parliament in 1903, and let them examine the figures and estimates they then presented when they inveigled this country into the scheme and let them compare these estimates with the results, and then, if they are honest and reasonable men they must conclude that something has gone wrong somewhere. We were told then that the road could be built for fifty one million dollars, but it has run up a bill of two hundred millions. Are the people of the west ever going to get relief from railway rates in view of this over-capitalization in the building of the road? Somebody must pay the cost. As a business man I firmly believe that this commission in charge of the building of this railway has in many cases paid two dollars where they should only have paid one dollar. I arrived at that conclusion from a study of the question, and it is borne out by the Hodgins charges and the Lumsden charges, and remember that these charges were made not by Conservatives but by the very men who were appointed by the Liberal government. And, Sir, that Transcontinental railway that should have been a monument to the ability of the Laurier government, will when its history is written, be a tale of the incompetency of that government and a monument to the flagrant extravagance that characterized it during its fifteen years of power. These are strong words, but gentlemen opposite invite them when they ask a vote of the public money to reward these commissioners for retiring from office, when they should be very thankful to escape. Let me tell those gentlemen opposite that I would rather have one man like Major Leonard than twenty-five or fifty, yes or a hundred such men as formerly composed that commission. Some of these gentlemen were in the Quebec Bridge Company, and what happened to that undertaking? In my judgment there has never been in Canada a great work undertaken that has been so mismanaged and in connection with which so much money has been wilfully diverted from the purpose for which it had been voted, as this very Transcontinental railway. In view of all that, why should we whitewash these commissioners and give them a clean bill of health? The feeling in Ontario is that the road has not been properly administered, that the funds have been diverted from the purpose for which they were intended, that many miles of that road have cost twice and thrice what the first estimate was, and why should we give the men in charge of it a bonus such as suggested? The result of that mismanagement will be that when the Grand Trunk Pacific comes to pay three per cent on this immense capitalization caused by extravagance, it will be difficult to give cheap railway rates to the west. I would not be surprised if the Grand Trunk Pacific would some day hesitate to take the road off the hands of the government at the cost which is alleged to have been incurred for its construction. We had to advance that money; three per cent has to be paid on it, and if the company does not pay the interest the country will have to. It is not unreasonable to expect that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company having agreed to pay three per cent. on the cost of the road, will object and say: the money has not been properly expended, the road has cost twice or thrice what it should have cost, and that means that instead of paying three per cent as we undertook to pay we will actually have to pay six per cent or nine per cent because of this wasteful extravagance. I believe, Sir, that the Minister of Railways has not acted one minute too soon in making a change in this Transcontinental Railway Commission. I can speak from personal knowledge of the high character and the high attainments as a railway builder of Major Leonard, who has been appointed to take charge of the construction of that road. I can say that if all the appointees of the government were men like Major Leonard, then the country would have reason to congratulate itself and the results obtained in the management of public affairs would be far different from what they have been in the past. I feel it my duty to protest

against the payment of any money to these commissioners when they retire, and I can say that the people of Ontario are very far from appreciating the kind of services they have rendered.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the government have reached the conclusion that it will not pay the retiring commissioners any money, if that be their policy, I do not think there will be any very great opposition from this side. But some hon. gentlemen opposite outside the Cabinet, sitting on the back benches, have undertaken to give reasons why the government is not going to pay these men anything. That alters the case. As a question of policy, the government must decide for itself whether it will give these gentlemen any compensation. All we can do is make our protest, and the people will have to decide which side was right. But when supporters of the government take the ground that the government are refusing this simple act of justice to those commissioners because of their incapacity or dishonesty, because they diverted money from the proper channels into improper ones, it is the duty of friends of the commissioners, politically or otherwise, to have the government take the responsibility of these statements or deny them. For my part I know nothing about any money having been improperly expended. If anything of the kind occurred, the Minister of Railways should lay that information before this House and have it investigated. The hon. minister did not give any such reasons. What he said was that he had reached the conclusion that the work had become so advanced, that we need only have one commissioner instead of four. As regards the gentleman appointed, no one on this side has any fault to find. I know Mr. Leonard very well, and in my opinion the government could not get a better man for the work I have no fault to find with the appointment, but what I do find fault with is the imputation cast on the commissioners by hon. gentlemen opposite, and what I do insist upon knowing is whether the government endorse these imputations and criticisms or not. This is the time when we should come to a definite understanding and not wait until a few years later to be told that the commissioners were boodlers and scoundrels. If any charge to that effect be made against them, then let it be made now or let the government repudiate any such charge.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I wish to express my entire concurrence in the remarks which have just been made by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). I am not much interested as to whether these commissioners are to receive some gratuity or not at this stage of the Bill. I shall be pleased to hear that they shall receive fair treatment in that respect, but beyond that I am interested very slightly. This is not an important part of the Bill. As the discussion proceeded this afternoon, it was quite evident that the reason why several members of the commission are being dispensed with is that they are looked upon by the hon. gentlemen opposite, not only as political opponents, but as incompetent and unworthy of the positions they filled. The government should be frank. If the present board are to be eliminated because of incompetence or improper conduct, as some hon. gentlemen opposite say, they should be dismissed upon these grounds, and the reasons for this proposed dismissal should be plainly stated to the committee.

Some hon. gentlemen have urged that these commissioners could not have been competent by reason of the fact that their former occupations were not along the line of railway construction. I submit that that is not a good reason. If the Minister of Finance were appointed as the sole member of the Transcontinental Commission, I am sure he would fulfil the duties of that position as satisfactorily as the gentleman who has recently been appointed. I dare say there are several gentlemen opposite me who could administer the affairs of that commission just as well as Major Leonard, who I know is an excellent man, and I congratulate the Minister of Railways upon his appointment. In the modern business world to-day the greatest measure of industrial efficiency is obtainable, not by men who are brought up in the particular occupation in which they are engaged. A Canadian banker was placed at the head of the Dominion Iron & Steel Company, the biggest iron-producing plant in Canada, and the most successful operators of railways in the world are men who have been taken from law offices. I might cite other instances in which the greatest industrial success has been attained under men of no special training but of great business capacity, who could surround themselves with such technical advisers as they might require. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not been so careful in making appointments to some commissions since they came into office. Almost every hon. gentleman opposite, we are told on the authority of a gentleman from Toronto, was an applicant for a seat in the ministry. Well, if a great number of the gentlemen opposite are capable of administering a department, I suppose it is fair to say that a great many of them are not and never will be competent for such a position. The other day the government appointed a commission to investigate the operations of the various departments of the public service and to make suggestions for a reorganization of the de-

partments. They selected three gentlemen against whom I have nothing to say personally, but not one of whom has any special qualifications for discharging the duties assigned to them, having had practically no experience in the civil service. The deputy ministers of the several departments would certainly have been better qualified. Yet the members of this commission may perform very valuable service to the country; they may have a capacity for work of this character which we cannot to-day perceive. But if some of the members of the Transcontinental Railway Commission were not competent men, the Minister of Railways should frankly say so and dismiss them and put in their places men whom he thinks are competent. The numerical strength of that commission should be maintained; there is no good reason for the reduction of its membership to one, and I am surprised that Major Leonard, now the chairman of the commission, consents to that reduction. A vast sum of money, probably over $100,000,000, will yet be expended by that commission, and I would imagine that the chairman would have been glad to have the services of the other commissioners or of some persons who might be substituted for them. The members of the commission have been associated with the work for a number of years, and I assume that they take a certain amount of pride in it. It does seem unfair treatment to remove them from office a year and a half or two years before the completion of the work, unless the minister takes the ground that they were not competent. There must necessarily be many fragments and tail ends of the work of the commission of which the present chairman cannot very well have much knowledge, and these commissioners must surely have gained some knowledge and experience during the years they were members of the commission which could not but be of value to the chairman. If the commission was a weak one in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, one might very well say that it has been very much strengthened by the appointment of the chairman, and that it was very well able to discharge its duties in a manner satisfactory to the Canadian public. I protest altogether against the passing of this Bill. The matter of the members of the commission is not important just at present. But that question is not involved in the Bill, and I do not think the Minister of Railways has so far given us any reason for the introduction of this measure, or hon. gentlemen sitting behind him are not discussing the measure in the manner in which it should be discussed.

Mr. BORDEN. As far as the three commissioners are concerned, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, as I understand him, has not come here either to commend or to censure them. He has simply come with this Bill proposing in the public interest that the work on the railway still to be completed should be performed under a single commissioner. That is the whole question. Now, certain information has been asked for. We have already said that we are perfectly willing to let the Bill stand in order that the information may be furnished. I, therefore, move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE RAILWAY SITUATION.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Railway Commission has now on hand a number of very important issues, in connection with transportation problems, both in respect to the rates charged and to the service given by the railways, I intend to discuss in this House the general question of railway rates and railway service. While it is sometimes urged when matters of this kind are brought before the House that we have assigned certain duties to the Railway Commission I contend that this House still has full jurisdiction over the whole railway question of Canada, and I wish to vindicate the right of this House to discuss such questions notwithstanding the creation of the Railway Commission. We have also the right in this parliament to establish principles which may be followed by the commission in the discharge of their duty.

I propose to discuss first what I would call the territorial incidence of the railway tariffs. The Railway Commission acting under the Railway Act has made what it calls discrimination of rates in regard to locality, one set of rates being made applicable to eastern territory, a second to western territory and a third to the coast or mountain section of the country. I contend that that is not just or right and that there should be no variation in the territorial incidence of the railway tariffs in Canada but on the contrary that there should be absolute equality in this respect over the whole of Canada. These roads were built for national purposes, they were incorporated by the national legislature, they were aided in many ways, by grants of land and money and franchises in order to serve the people of Canada generally. Therefore, when the railway charges come to be apportioned, my contention is that there should be no variation in those charges and that what is a fair charge in the east should be a fair charge in the west or in the coast or mountain section. If there is to be any variation it ought to be rather in favour of

the newer country where the conditions of life are more severe.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the law upon this point?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The law as far as I can see leaves it absolutely to the judgment of the Railway Commission; there is no definition but there is a practice. The question of tolls is dealt with in the section 304 and the following sections of the Railway Act. The Railway Commission on assuming office, found higher rates in existence in the west and on the coast and that practice is being continued. Many complaints and protests against this practice have been made by the people of the west and the question is soon to be threshed out before the Railway Commission at Ottawa and in western cities. If we can decide in this House that uniformity of tolls ought to prevail all over the country that will save a great deal of inquiry, and the people will be sure that for the future there will be no discrimination based on territory or locality. I do not know that this House could be better occupied than in trying to settle a principle which would give equality in railway rates to the people of the west who are trying to settle that country under great difficulties. They are hampered by a severe climate, and still more by these excessive railway tariffs that tax them more than the people of the east are taxed. One contention is that it costs more to build railways in the west.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is not true.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I do not accept that doctrine, I say that railways can be built for small sums in the west. First of all there is no right of way to pay for, and many of the railways have built cheap lines which have been very profitable so that they should really give lower rates. The railways in the west have monopolies of the express business the telegraph business and they had the elevator business in their hands or in the hands of their friends. They have also the cartage and storage business, all monopolies out of which they get large profits, and they have no more reason for these higher charges in the west than in the east.

And they are the great land owners of the west, they have enormous lands in that country which are increasing in value. They own town sites, they are all well off, they are all doing large business, and we in this House allow these unfair discriminations to continue, of charging higher rates to the people of the west than are charged in the east, although these companies were chartered, were franchised, were bonused with land and money, and given everything they asked for, on the condition that they should serve the nation at large. They are not serving the nation at large, but they are making an unfair discrimination against the people of the west, and I want parliament to declare that that discrimination should not continue, but that equality should prevail. But if the discrimination is great in the west what is it in the mountains and on the coast? And while greater distances occur there, and it cost more money to build in the mountains, it was not so much to serve the people who live in the mountains, as it was to serve the nation, and get from ocean to ocean. Will the people of British Columbia forever be compelled to pay a higher rate for railway service, for telegraph and passenger rates, and for all the other services associated with railways? Are they forever to be compelled to pay higher railway rates, because they happen to live in a portion of the country where, for national reasons, a road was built, and in the building of that road great expense had to be incurred? I repudiate that idea. When the matter of railway charges was brought up some years ago in this House, and when I had something to do in bringing it up, after some trouble we got a standard passenger rate extended to the boundary of British Columbia. So we have come to the conclusion in this House in regard to one thing, or the Railway Commission has come to the conclusion, that there must be equality in regard to passenger rates from the east to the extreme western boundary of Alberta. The arrangement should have gone to the Pacific coast, and it must go to the Pacific coast if there is to be equality in this country. British Columbia is paying her share of all the cost of that railway insofar as the cost of all the railways is assessed upon the people; Alberta is paying her share, Saskatchewan is paying her share, and so is Manitoba and the northern portions of Ontario on to the east—all are paying their portion of it. Now if they have all had a hand in making these roads, and if the roads are national, nay more if they are imperial, why should there be an unfair apportionment of railway rates in different portions of the country for the reason that the road cost more in one section than in another? Now, I propose to test the opinion of the House on this question. I am not going to propose a vote of want of confidence, but before I conclude my speech I shall submit to the House that we shall declare for an equality of railway rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Before the hon. gentleman proceeds further, may I ask him a question? I do not wish to appear as opposing his idea, but I would like him to discuss the matter from the point of view of some who urge that such a principle would retard the extension of railways in

the west, because it costs more to operate them.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Then I will come to the question of operation. If it does cost more to operate, inasmuch as the railway is giving a national service, there should not be this discrimination. It may cost more. Then what you do is this, you put all your receipts in the treasury and out of the treasury you pay all the expenses, those of investment, those of building, and of other things, before making an equitable distribution of railway charges. So I say it will be equitably borne by every individual in the community. We can improve the railway situation, as I said, in two ways. We can improve it by discussing it in this House, and reaching principles, and introducing those principles in specific statutes in the Railway Act; and it will be quite competent for the Minister of Railways, or any member of this House to come down with a Bill amending the Railway Act on the line of equality of charges across the whole face of the country. Another, and a better way, I think—and I have been studying this question carefully for quite a number of years—would probably be for parliament, from time to time, to declare its belief in, and its adherence to, a certain principle. It would be more easy for the Railway Commission to accord equality in this matter if parliament expressed its opinion that equality of rates should prevail all over the country, that there should be no territorial incidence in regard to the tariff, no incidence based on locality, as stated in the Railway Act.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like, at this stage, to ask the hon. gentleman to give us some concrete cases showing a difference in freight rates.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I am going to leave that to the members from the west, and I hope they will be here and take part in the debate. All the authority I will give now is that of the 'Manitoba Free Press,' which has gone fully into this question, and of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and some other boards of trade, which have given details of these charges, showing a wide divergence as between charges in the east and charges in the west. The British Columbia Boards of Trade have also given instances, so there is no doubt that there is variation in the charges.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was developing my argument that there should be an equality all over this country in the matter of railway rates. There might be a reason for a difference in railway rates if we had railway companies operating exclusively in any one single district. Many railway companies in the United States operate in only one State and they come under the State Railway Act. If we had the same thing in this country, if we had one company operating in Manitoba, another in Ontario and another in British Columbia, and if these companies were able to say that it cost more to build and operate a road in one province than in another, a good reason would be given why they might be allowed to charge higher rates in one province than in another; in fact, they could not make both ends meet unless there was some such difference. But, here in Canada, all our railways have been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, all have been bonused with large sums of cash and land grants and given franchises to go into the telegraph, express, hotel, land and a great many other profitable businesses. They carry on these operations all over the country. We have even guaranteed the bonds for the construction of the railways. Therefore, when we have given them all these things nationally, when they get them from all the people, they, in return, should treat the people in the different provinces exactly alike in the matter of railway charges. They put all their receipts in their treasury and out of that treasury they pay all their charges. My contention is that they make up what it costs them to build the road, and what is a fair return on that cost, they make up what it costs to run the railway all over the country, on these two items they base what they consider a fair profit and then they make their charge.

Mr. BURNHAM. How do they manage to evade sections 77 or 315 of the Railway Act?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I will have to look at that.

Mr. BURNHAM. The whole question was up in the case of the Regina Board of Trade vs. Canadian Pacific railway and Canadian Northern railway in the city of Winnipeg in November of last year. It was carried to the Supreme Court.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The way I make out that they impose these different charges is that before we had the Railway Commission the railways made the pretence that it cost more to build and operate in these new countries. That was, to my mind, a mere assumption, but it was an assumption that was taken for granted by the Railway Commission. It has not been settled yet whether that assumption is justifiable or whether, even if it can be justified, the conditions resulting from it ought to be continued. All these unfair things are hap-

pening because we have not established the principles which ought to underlie the application of th raeilway law of this country to the regulation of railway charges. There have been all these unfair discriminations and it is to try and discover a principle and to have that principle declared in parliament, either as an opinion or as a clause in the Railway Act, that I am speaking here to-night. Even if it can be shown that it costs more to build, maintain and operate a railway in the west by reason of physical disability or otherwise than in the east my contention still is that the same rates should obtain all over the country. There might be an allowance here and there for special cases which I would leave to the Railway Commission to settle, but I want to get the general principle decided with reference to an equality of rates all over the country. The man in the west has to pay higher rates because the goods that go to him go farther. I have no objection to that. If he lives a thousand miles away from where the goods are manufactured, or from where they are sent, he has to pay the thousand mile rate and it is twice as much as the man in the east has to pay. But, if he is hampered by distance he ought not also to be hampered by a higher rate by reason of geographical, territorial or physical causes or because it costs a little more to build and operate a railway in this country. Does that farmer in the west get any more for his goods because of the physical conditions there? Does he get any more for his grain? He has to pay for the long haul and he is handicapped to that extent. You handicap him by distance, which may be justified, but you must not handicap him by territory which cannot be justified in the west by a railway which was created for the general advantage of Canada. Are we to say to people in Europe and the United States, and to those who are now coming to locate in our west that we are going to ask them to come to a country where our Railway Commission is in the fixing of rates, acting on the mere assumption of the railways in the old days that it cost them more to build and operate a road in the east than in the west? Are we to forever handicap the western country and to say to the people that we invite to come and settle that we invite them to come to a country where there is to be a perpetual handicap, territorial and discriminatory, in the application of railway rates? That is the position, the people of the west have found this out and they are practically in rebellion to-day. They have invited the attention of the Railway Committee to these things, and I am told that there is to be an investigation. It may be that there will be an investigation but parliament, I contend, is the place where the question ought to be settled. If you settle the law and these principles at the first go off, then it is very easy for the Railway Commission to apply them. Instead of trying to find principles they should devote their energy to their application. I cannot see a single reason—and I am here to-night to be converted if there is anybody who can enlighten me—why there has been this perpetual stigma put upon the people of the west that they are to have railway companies discriminating against them. I want somebody to tell me why the people of British Columbia, because they live in the mountains and because a railway had to be built at great expense over the mountains or through the mountains by tunnels, should have to pay what are called coast and mountain rates under a system that is a national system designed to serve all the people and generously bonused by all the people. Does it cost any more to build a telegraph line in the Canadian west than in Ontario? Yet, when you go to the west, and get off at a station to send a telegram, you pay almost double rates as compared with those charged in Ontario.

And, if you want to send an express parcel in the west you have to pay a largely increased rate over the rate in the east. Can we justly say to the people: come to the west where the telegraph rates and the express rates are double what they are in the east. I am waiting to see somebody justify this unfair discrimination against the people of the west. Parliament is the place to settle these things, and parliament can pass an Act to settle them or it can declare that the opinion of parliament is against them and then the remedy will follow. To-night we propose to test the opinion of parliament on the question of unfair discrimination between the east and the west. I shall now speak of the discrimination of the tariff as applied to the various services that the railways give. These railways are franchised to give passenger, freight, express, and telegraph services, and it never has been settled what should be the distribution of the tariff as between these various services. It may be that the man who sends a telegram is paying two hundred per cent more than the service costs the company and is thus helping to pay the freight rates or the passenger rate of the man who is travelling on a flyer, or else he is giving enormous profits to the company which will be used for dividends or to increase their reserves. The Railway Commission has never charged itself with the settlement of that question, and it would be a great thing if it could be determined how much of the gross charges the railway collects from the public should be apportioned between the different services rendered by the company. My contention is that these services are charged for altogether higher than the cost to the company would justify, always allowing the company a fair profit. I do

not propose that to-night or in the near future we should try to settle that question, but I am prepared to say that the time has come when the passenger tolls in Canada should be two cents a mile, and I am prepared to show that the companies would make more money by giving the people a two-cent passenger rate than they do now at the three-cent rate. We have been told that the people of the west don't want cheap travel, but if we can give them cheap travel and at the same time give the railways the same revenue as now, it is an object worth striving for. There are in the United States a number of what are called 'two-cent states,' and the returns published this year show that in every one of the states where there is a two cent railway rate the revenue from passenger travel has been greater and the profits higher than ever before. In view of that evidence is it not the duty of parliament, and not the Railway Commission, to declare that the people of Canada shall have a two-cent rate? They do give reduced rates if you travel both ways by their railway, but I believe that the man at Edmonton who wishes to come east on the Grand Trunk Pacific should be able to return by the Canadian Pacific railway if he chooses without paying the two single fares. I have studied this question for years and believe that what the people of Canada want is a fixed maximum rate per mile, in which the concession is made rather than in the return fare rate when you have to travel by the same road. If this parliament were to declare in favour of a uniform freight rate and a uniform passenger rate for all the country it would relieve the Railway Commission of many difficulties and I believe it will so adjust matters that the railways would still get a fair profit. In the interest of promoting settlement in the west, in the interest of encouraging the pioneer who goes into this hyperborean country, as some say it is, relief should be granted in this direction. We are told of the enormous cost of operating our railroads in winter, but if the winter is so severe, think of the pioneer settler who goes in there, and if anybody gets a preference he should.

I pass from that to another capital grievance on the people of this country in connection with the railways. This parliament has still retained its right to control the Canadian Pacific railway rates as provided in the agreement for that original deal with the Canadian Pacific railway. There was in that agreement a ten per cent clause which roughly speaking, says: that the company cannot take tolls in excess of ten per cent on what was actually spent in the construction of the railway. We have never ascertained that fact in this country, and to-day the Canadian Pacific railway is charging excessive tolls especially to the people of the west and especially on the line of what was the original Pacific railway. Do you know that to-day the Canadian Pacific railway, to the best of my judgment, has $100,000,000 in its treasury of the lands of this country which it got from the people? Do you know that it has another $100,000,000 which it can cash in to-morrow in the way of town sites and town lots which it got from our people? And further it has to-day, to the best of my judgment $100,000,000 more in cash in its treasury.

Let this parliament then have the courage to approach that question and say what shall be done with that $300,000,000 in the treasury of that company. Let this parliament order that that money must be used either in the reduction of tolls or the extension of the railway without issuing new stock, as the company might want to do. There has been for the last four or five years an effort to in some way switch that $300,000,000 now in the treasury of the company into the pockets of the shareholders. That money does not belong to the shareholders but to the undertaking, for the purposes of the undertaking, and should be applied, as the original agreement provided, to the reduction of tolls and the furnishing of a better service to the people. But instead of applying those enormous reserves to the reduction of the tolls or the extension of the system, that money is being used to pay dividends on stock which should not have been issued, and which, when issued, was not sold for what it would bring in the market. In other words it was a melon cut for the benefit of the shareholders, most of whom live out of the Dominion and who really are the masters of the Canadian Pacific railway. Should then this parliament allow the company to continue this practice and take those enormous reserves, which have been accumulated, and use them for the benefit of the shareholders instead of for the reduction of tolls and the extension of the service all over the country?

What is the cry in the Northwest? It is that the service is not equal to the demand. It is that there are not sufficient trucks or elevators, cars and engines. And yet here is this treasury overflowing. Do you think the Railway Commission can settle that question? It must be settled in this House, and, therefore, I call the attention of this House to the present condition of affairs. Whose fault is it that the people of the west have not a better service? The railway company cannot complain that it has not the money. All it has to do is to take its lands given by this country for the purposes of the undertaking and issue bonds on these lands. It can bond its town sites and other real estate and can

get $100,000,000 to-morrow on these bonds on which it would only have to pay four per cent. But instead of doing this it will issue new stock on which it will distribute dividends of 10, 12 or 15 per cent, if parliament does not assert its supremacy and require that this money be devoted to the purposes of the undertaking. This parliament must see that that money is used to remove these disabilities that exist in the west. The company should be double tracking with that money and most of all should go into these sections where the farmers are crying for railway accommodation. The farmer of the west has to pay the freight rates on his grain. Why should he pay excessive rates to a company which has this enormous surplus in its treasury, which is being held for the benefit of its shareholders, many of whom acquired their stock at $25 to $50 per $100, and that stock is quoted away above $200 to-day. But as long as that is permitted, as long as the men of the west sit here in parliament and do nothing, no interference will take place.

There has to be somebody who will regulate the issue of securities by railway corporations. The money they require can be raised on bonds or debenture stock carrying 4, 5, and sometimes 6 per cent. If the necessary money for construction purposes and extension of the lines can be raised on bonds which only carry this low interest, why should it not be raised that way, and why should not this parliament, or some one nominated by this parliament, see that the capitalization of railway companies is controlled in this country. True, there was a commission in the United States which entered into the question of the capitalization of railways, and other companies, and they made a report, and the substance of that report was that it would be such a sweeping change that the commission did not see their way just at present to recommend it. But the American laws regulate the issue of securities by railways there, and we shall have to do that here. We have to tell our railway companies that they may only issue securities in such a way as to entail the least burden of interest, and only for the legitimate purpose of railway extension and improvement. That question has to be settled in parliament. We cannot send it to any Railway Commission without giving that commission special instructions. I would be well satisfied to have the capitalization of railway companies and the character of the securities they may issue sent to a board like that of the Railway Commission. Take the city of New York. In that city there is a great undertaking in connection with its underground system. That undertaking issued a lot of securities and, as there was no one to regulate that issue, the local traction system of that city, which was in the hands of grafters, was able to issue

over $500,000,000 of watered securities, not 70 per cent of which went into the undertaking. As a consequence the underground system became bankrupt, and went into liquidation. Then the Public Service Commission was created, and not one security of any kind now is issued in the state of New York except with the approval of this commission. When they want more capital, they are asked by the commission: how can you raise this money, and in what way will the money that is being raised put the least charge on the traffic which you carry and for which the public pay toll? So there is an absolute regulation of the securities now issued in the State of New York. If you look at the issue of yesterday in connection with the surface traction line, you will find that most of it consisted of bonds at 4 per cent, that there was a higher traffic bond at 6 per cent and a certain amount of common stock; but every share of that common stock had to be sold on the public market and paid for in cash, and every dollar obtained for it had to go into the undertaking. Have we anything of that kind in Canada? Has the common stock of any of our railways gone for the purposes of the undertaking or into the pockets of some one who originated the railway? We are making millionaires, but are we giving service, and is the money obtained from the sale of railway securities going to provide railway service or a reduction of rates for the people? We have to deal with that question in this country, and we have to deal with it in this parliament.

I want to refer to another most peculiar thing that is happening in this country in our efforts to secure better railway accommodation. We started to build more railway lines. The cry from the west has been, we want more railways; the cry in the east has been, we want more railways. And so we started two more railways in this country—the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, and they are both needed. There is more business in this country than the three roads can do. But this peculiar outcome is now beginning to develop. When the Canadian Pacific railway, which was said to have been a monopoly, is treating the people to exorbitant charges, and when, with an overflowing treasury, it is ready for the axe of some one who will reduce its rates, the cry goes forth, if you reduce the rates on the Canadian Pacific railway look what you are going to do to the two other roads that you created for the purpose of giving competition. The people of the west and the people of the east are now being treated to this new swan song, that it is not a good thing to reduce

the rates on the Canadian Pacific railway because the other roads that are just coming into existence cannot stand the reduced rates. Well, what is to be the cure? It would be better to pay the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern something in the way of a cash bonus; but that is a queer thing to do in order to get competition. And yet we are up against it, and I want to tell this House what may be the outcome of this guaranteeing of stock. If your Railway Commission or if parliament ever undertakes to reduce railway rates, and to give the farmers of the west relief, we will default, and you will have to assume the liability of paying the interest on the bonds which you guaranteed. Are we going on with that line of business which will land us in that result? What is the railway situation in another aspect, probably the broadest in which it can be presented to the people of this country? The people of this country are absolutely dissatisfied with the railway rates that they are paying. They do not think that they are getting a square deal, and they are not; and the only way in which they will get it will be by the action of this parliament. The Railway Commission cannot settle the question whether a reduction of rates is to be enforced, because the Canadian Pacific railway can stand it while the other railways cannot stand it. That is a matter of policy which must be settled by the government or by this parliament. We are to have investigations in the west by the commission, but they will not settle it. They may get at some facts for the edification and instruction of this House; but these questions have to be settled in this House. They are becoming greater and more insistent every day, and we are putting them off; we are building more railways in order to put off the day when the Canadian Pacific railway rates must come down. How many of the people of this country know that we have landed or are about to land in that situation, that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, which have cost us so much money, are actually to be a bar to a reduction of rates?

Now, there has to be an adjustment, and men able to handle questions like this must come forth and come into this House and find a solution. The greatest grievances of the people of the west to-day are excessive railway charges and unfair discrimination—in telegraph rates, passenger rates and express rates; and the cry of the west is for better service. The cry of the west is, if the money in the treasury of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is consecrated to the undertaking, why does not parliament see that it is used for that purpose, and that lines are built in the west where the people need them?

There is another question. If we have guaranteed the bonds of these railways or given great subsidies to them, now that branches are being built for the Grand Trunk Pacific which somebody must finance, why do we not see that the section of country most needing the service gets the railway? There is no oversight. Although we are paying the piper, either by guarantees or by land grants or by money subsidies, nobody is saying, in an authoritative way and after consultation with the people interested, where the railway is to go. The result is that in the west there are in some cases three railways where there ought to be one, which with a double track could give three times the service, and some of these tracks could be moved into a new country. But nobody is looking after the matter. We are going on in a careless way without regulation by one central authority and without the voice of parliament being expressed vigorously and along a definite line of policy.

So I say that the railway situation in this country to-day is not satisfactory to the people, especially the people of the west, if I read the papers rightly and from what I hear in regard to the efforts of the people to get relief. The relief to my mind must come from parliament rather than from the Railway Commission, either in the way of an expression of opinion in this House or in the way of an explicit clause put in the Railway Act which will bring some kind of betterment in the way of service and a reduction of charges. It is up to this parliament to deal with these questions, and we must try to find the underlying principles.

The first underlying principle that I wish to see settled is the principle of equality of treatment in the way of rates by our national railways, of all the people all over this country, that there shall be no discrimination in the way of territory. I intend to move an amendment but I do not present my motion as a vote of want of confidence in the government; I am presenting it in order to get an expression of opinion and to get action. It takes some courage and some fixity of purpose to come here and make a direct proposal that will bring the House to take consideration of a question of this kind. It is easy to let it go by and put it over to the commission waiting for the commission to make a report. I have brought up this railway question year after year and by persistent fighting I have succeeded in having a number of definitions inserted in the Railway Act and the duties of the Railway Board have been widened and their service to the country improved by reason of the discussion of the principles underlying transport-

ation in this House. These questions have all been threshed out in the United States and the State legislatures have appointed State commissions and Congress has appointed the Interstate Commission. But Congress and the legislatures have steadily interfered and laid down the principles which ought to govern the commission.

The outstanding thing about the administration of the Railway Act in the United States is that Congress has given the commission money to pay for the best counsel they can get and to employ all kinds of experts, competent railway men, who can give them advice and collect information. The counsel thus employed institute on behalf of the people suits to secure the rights of the people. We in Canada should have counsel for the commission with power to take up suits in the investigation of railway charges, &c. Is it not high time that parliament insisted on the very best lawyer we can get in the country being counsel for our Railway Commisssion to see that justice is done to the people. We are gradually coming to it, we started without any legal advice for our Railway Commission but now we employ special counsel in special cases. The late government employed special counsel in the telephone and telegraph investigation, but that is not what I want, I want an expert legal department associated with the Railway Commission which will collect all the information, will become trained in the matter of railway rates and will take the side of the people as against the high-priced, clever and expert lawyers in the service of the railway companies. Are the people of this country not entitled to that?

I shall revert to many of these questions at other stages in the session, but to-night I wish to lay before the House a concrete motion dealing with this one question of territorial discrimination and I beg to move:

That the said motion do not now pass but that this House hereby declares that it is against the general interest of Canada to have any territorial variation in the application of tariff charges by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

If the House will express that opinion, then half of this inquiry in the west will be done away with and it will be proclaimed all over this continent and all over the world that Canada, through its parliament, has asserted the doctrine of perfect equality, as far as territory is concerned, in railway rates. The railway companies will not suffer by the passage of this Act, at least the onus will be on them to show that they are entitled to apply discriminatory rates in the west. They have never yet been able to show that this discrimination is justified, it costs as much to build 100 miles of railway in one province as in another and about as much to handle it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York).

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, South York) has made a very interesting speech with a very large portion of which I entirely agree, particularly the concluding portion of it in which he sets forth the importance of having the Board of Railway Commissioners supplied with a throughly effective organization. In connection with the approaching investigation or inquiry by that Board of Railway Commissioners into the rates in the western part of Canada, I may say for his information and for the information of the House that the government propose to employ counsel to protect the interests of the people of this country upon that inquiry. It is perfectly true that the great railway companies in this country go before the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, upon any inquiry of this kind, with a thoroughly equipped staff, a staff of experts, and able counsel as well, who very thoroughly protect the interests of the great railway corporations on all such inquiries. It is equally the duty of the government and of parliament to see that the interests of the people are protected just as efficiently and as thoroughly upon every such inquiry; and it is not only our duty but our purpose to see that this is carried out upon the approaching inquiry.

Now, my hon. friend has very properly asked parliament to discuss the question of railway tolls throughout this country. As far as we are concerned, we are very glad to welcome that discussion. It is perfectly plain to all of us that the Board of Railway Commissioners have been established for a certain purpose. The Board was first established under legislation of this parliament passed in the year 1903, when we were sitting on the other side of the House. Hon. gentlemen who were then members of the House will remember that the opposition of that day thoroughly concurred in the proposals of the government, and that we did everything in our power to assist in making that Act a good Act. It has been amended in many respects since, its jurisdiction has been greatly extended, and I have always supported the extension of that jurisdiction. Indeed, at one time I took the ground that its name had better be changed, and that it ought to be called the Public Utilities Commission of Canada; and that it should be given power to control and supervise, not only the railways of Canada and their operations, but every public utility in Canada. That has very largely been carried out since. The jurisdiction of the Railway Commission has been extended to telegraphs, to telephones, to express companies, and to other public utilities. It is apparent I think to every one who has surveyed the development of the powers of the Railway Commissioners in that regard, that those powers and that juris-

diction are likely to be extended still further from time to time, and every such extension has seemed to me to be in the public interest.

Then my hon. friend has spoken of the ten per cent clause in the charter of the Canadian Pacific railway. So far as that clause is concerned we all know that practically it is not to-day, and has not been for some time, in existence. A case was to have been stated for the opinion of the Supreme Court some years ago under the late administration. By that case the question to be presented for the determination of the court was whether the time had arrived, under the statute incorporating the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when it could no longer insist that its rates should be free from the control of the Railway Commission. The case was prepared and was about to engage the attention of the court, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, seeing the magnitude of the inquiry, and the government as well seeing the magnitude of the inquiry which would be involved and the long time that it would require, reached a conclusion by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to waive their right, if they had any right, to claim that their tolls should be exempt from the control of the Railway Commission; and from that time up to the present the tolls and charges of that company have been inquired into by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Did the public waive their right, and is it not the right of the public to have their tolls reviewed in the light of the original charter, which is still in force?

Mr. BORDEN. As I understand, they are reviewed in the light of the original charter. As I recollect it, speaking from memory it provided that the company should not be subject to any control of its rates until it should be in a position to pay a dividend of ten per cent. Well, the time came when the government thought that question ought to be determined, and it was about to be determined when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company said: We will not further press our claim based upon that statute. From that day to this, the rates and tolls of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been inquired into just as freely and as fully as the rates and tolls of the Grand Trunk railway, or any other railway in this country. That is the condition, as I understand it.

Now, so far as the regulation of the issue of securities is concerned, what my hon. friend for South York has said has a great deal of force and a great deal of cogency. I can only say at the present time that it is a subject to which we have not been able to give attention so far; but it is a subject that is well worth the attention of the government. I have taken note of what my hon. friend has said in regard to the progress of legislation on this subject in the United States. We will examine that legislation, and we will endeavour to give to that question the earnest and careful consideration which its importance undoubtedly deserves.

Now, my hon. friend has asked very urgently that there should be an exact uniformity of rates, and he has proposed a motion to that end. In the first place, the particular subject to which he invites attention is one that has been placed by this parliament under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. I entirely agree with my hon. friend that parliament has not waived its own jurisdiction. That goes without saying, because parliament to-morrow could repeal the Railway Act which was passed in 1903, and resume complete jurisdiction, or confer its jurisdiction upon the Governor in Council, or upon the Railway Committee of the Privy Council of Canada, in which that jurisdiction existed before this Act came into operation. But parliament has confided that power of dealing with railway rates in Canada to a body of men who are supposed to be capable of dealing with the subject which is entrusted to them and who up to the present time, I think, have fairly well done so; I will go further than that, and say they have thoroughly well discharged their duties which have been imposed upon them under the law. I have said that when I was sitting on the other side of the House, and I am prepared to affirm that again. Now, my hon. friend has proposed a resolution, of which I will quote merely the operative part.

It is against the general interest of Canada to have any territorial variation in the regulation of tariff charges by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

If we take the literal meaning of this resolution I would suggest to my hon. friend that it seems to go further than I would be prepared to go. I have alluded to the fact that this is a resolution which deals with a subject which has been confided to the regulation and direction of a board created by the laws of this country as enacted by parliament, a subject that the men appointed for that purpose have been studying for a number of years, and who, it seems to me, must be more thoroughly familiar with it than any one in this House can possibly be. After all, the regulation of railway rates, when you take into consideration the question of the long haul, the question of the short haul, of competitive points, of the different conditions which confront those who are operating railways in various parts of the country, and the competition as well

that we have on the other side of the line, is undoubtedly a somewhat difficult subject, and one which I think would be increasingly difficult to any one who had not had an opportunity of studying it, and becoming thoroughly familiar with it.

Now, my hon. friend proposes to deal with it by the affirmation of the principle to which he has called attention, and which principle is set out in his resolution. I am not positively certain as to the exact construction which my hon. friend might place upon the words which he has presented to the House as embodying the principle that he desires to have affirmed, but it seems to me that it would mean that, without regard to conditions, to the cost of operation, to the cost of construction, to the density of traffic, or to the length of haul, one must have a uniform rate, both for passenger and freight traffic throughout the length and breadth of this country; in other words, that you must apply exactly the same rates to a railway operating in the Yukon as you would apply to a railway operating in a country as fertile and densely populated as the province of Ontario. If the resolution of my hon. friend means that, and it seems to me to mean that, I can only say that I do not feel it to be wise to lay that down as a principle for the guidance of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Density of traffic, population, cost of construction, length of haul, and expense of operating vary in different localities on account of many considerations to which I need only allude, and which I need not specially detail.

Then there is a further consideration. Take the case of the province of Manitoba, where a particular concession or advantage was given to a railway company in return for certain advantages in freight rates; the terms of my hon. friend's resolution would apparently prevent any province such as Manitoba from giving to its people the advantages arrived at by a direct concession by that province for a particular purpose. Some hon. gentlemen who have been in this House for a number of years will recollect the measure which was passed by the legislature of Manitoba and which had to be confirmed by legislation of this parliament. If there is to be no territorial variation in rates it will be impossible for any province—it would be impossible for Manitoba, for example—to have carried out by the Railway Commission the terms of any such arrangement under a proposal such as that to which I have alluded.

There are some other considerations. If any rule or principle of this kind were laid down it ought to be laid down by statute and not by a resolution of one branch of the legislature. The Board of Railway Commissioners is constituted under the statute of Canada and that statute lays down certain principles and imposes certain jurisdiction, power and duties upon the Railway Commission. If these are to be varied, because it would seem to me that this resolution is designed in effect to accomplish the amendment of the statute, it ought to be done in the regular way and it ought not to be done just in this way.

I do not know exactly what effect this resolution would have upon the principle which is generally adopted with regard to the long and short haul. I understand that in some parts of the world you have railway rates which are applied mile for mile—20 miles, so much per mile; 50 miles, so much per mile; 200 miles, so much per mile, without any variation whatever. One can readily see that if a principle of that kind were to be applied to the transportation of grain from Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba to Montreal, Halifax or St. John, instead of the interests of the western farmers being improved those farmers would very likely be paying higher prices for the carriage of their grain than they are paying at the present time.

It seems to me that there must necessarily be some variation according to the territory, the density of traffic and the cost of construction and operation in Canada. For example, I have already given the illustration of a road operating in the Yukon, built at very great expense, and a road built in Ontario or Quebec in a very fertile and densely populated part of the country. If you are to say that we are to have absolutely uniform rates, what rate are you to apply? The Board of Railway Commissioners must apply some uniform rate. Is it to take the higher rate, or is it to take the lower rate, or what rate is it to take? For example, no one would suggest, I suppose, that rates which might be very reasonable in respect to a road operating in the Yukon and built at enormous cost would be applicable to a road operating in some of the more fertile and thickly populated districts of Ontario or Quebec. It does not seem to me that the resolution which my hon. friend has proposed is one that it would be safe to adopt as a guide to the Board of Railway Commissioners. They are about to engage upon what, I have no doubt, will prove to be a very exhaustive and thorough inquiry into the whole question of rates and tolls in the western part of this country. I have confidence that the inquiry will be thorough and exhaustive and I can assure my hon. friend and every hon. member of this House that in so far as it is within the power of this government to make that inquiry thorough and exhaustive no effort will be spared for that purpose.

I would like to refer to what I said before, that council will be engaged, and I will bear in mind also what my hon. friend

from South York has said in regard to the importance of having counsel permanently attached to the Railway Commission who will be trained up as experts in the law of railways and the regulation of railway rates. In respect to the necessity of that I do not think there will be any two opinions in this House. I am not prepared to state at the moment how well equipped the Board of Railway Commissioners may be in that regard at the present time. I have not had an opportunity to investigate that question, but if the board is not equipped as it ought to be in that regard I can only say to my hon. friend that it will be one of the first duties of this government to take such steps as may be necessary to equip it thoroughly for that purpose. Under these circumstances and with these assurances perhaps my hon. friend from South York will be good enough not to press his motion although I am perfectly willing that there should be every possible opportunity afforded for discussing the very important subject which he has brought to the attention of the House in a speech that has dealt very ably and very thoroughly with the question and to which I have listened with the greatest interest and attention.

J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). Although I intended to bring this matter to the attention of parliament this session I did not come prepared to speak on it to-night, and were it not that some members from the west who wished to speak happen not to be present just now I would have deferred my observations until later. The hon. member (Mr. Maclean, South York), has correctly represented to the House the conditions in the west, and I was glad to have an opportunity of seconding his motion. The Prime Minister told us it would not be fair to apply the same rules to the Yukon as to the east, but every one knows that, and if a general principle were laid down that there should not be discrimination between different parts of the country the Railway Commission could readily decide that the Yukon was an exception. Our crying grievance is that the farmer and business man of the west pays from twenty-five to fifty per cent more than is exacted from the man in the east for the same service on the railways, and they have been compelled to do so for the last twenty-five years.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). And they will do it for twenty-five years more if you let them.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the Railway Commission were to say that for the next twenty-five years the people in Ontario or Quebec and the lower provinces should pay from twenty-five to fifty per cent higher railway rates than the people of the west are paying that would only even matters up, but we do not want that and we do not think it would be fair, although for twenty-five years we in the west have been living under the most outrageous unfairness that has ever existed in any civilized country under the sun. We are simply asking now that in the future the railways shall make no discrimination against the west. Why should passenger rates be the same in the west as in the east when the freight rates are much higher on the prairies than in the east? It has been said that it costs more to operate railways in the west than in the east, but that statement is absolutely untrue. To commence with, it is well known that you can build railways in the three prairie provinces at from fifty to sixty per cent of the cost of construction in Ontario and Quebec. As to the cost of hauling freight I will give you the very best evidence from the mouth of the Canadian Pacific railway itself. The Railway Commission ordered the Canadian Pacific railway to furnish the cost of carrying freight in different parts of Canada, and the statement furnished by the Canadian Pacific railway shows that the actual cost of hauling one thousand tons of freight one mile (exclusive of interest or fixed charges) is as follows for each division of the Canadian Pacific railway:

Eastern division—Montreal to Chalk River, Ont..	$5 45
Lake Superior division, Chalk River to Port Arthur..	3 70
Central division—Port Arthur to Swift Current, and branches..	3 73
Western division—Swift Current to Field and branches..	4 71

It, therefore, costs only two-thirds to carry one thousand tons of freight one mile between Chalk River and Calgary of what it costs to carry one thousand tons of freight per mile from Montreal to Toronto. And in view of that is it reasonable that for twenty-five years we in the west have been paying fifty per cent higher rates than are charged in the east? Surely that is a matter for parliament to deal with and not for the Railway Commission. Last September the Railway Commission issued an order allowing the express companies to charge one dollar for one hundred pounds from Montreal three hundred miles out, and from the city of Winnipeg, represented by the Minister of the Interior, that same commission allows them to charge $1.66 for the same weight. Is that fair? Is the west to be trampled on forever? If this House passes the amendment offered by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) it will be a direction to the Railway Commission to do what is reasonable and fair and that is all we are asking, and after twenty-five years of injustice some measure of relief may be obtained. I was pleased to

hear the Prime Minister say that he would supply counsel for the Railway Commission in the interests of the people and as this investigation is to take place three weeks hence I trust the Prime Minister will act at once. The railways will have the very best counsel that money can buy in the Dominion, men that have devoted years to this business, and even if counsel were appointed for the people to-morrow he would only have three weeks to prepare. I believe there ought to be a first-class corps of counsel appointed in this connection. But, the commission does not have to wait for complaints because the Act gives them authority to move themselves without complaints being received. The railways have always kept the commission deluged with little trivial level crossing cases and one thing and another like that and they have deliberately kept the commission from getting at the railway rates for a number of years. There ought to be two sections of the Railway Commission. I do not say that there should be a western section and an eastern section, but there should be one section devoted to dealing with freight rates and nothing else and first-class counsel should be placed at their disposal, and then they will have more than they will be able to attend to.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I do not clearly catch my hon. friend's demonstration of the fact he alleges, that it does not cost more to move freight in the west than in the east. He gave the cost of moving one thousand tons per mile over portions of the west, but I did not hear the comparison carried out to demonstrate the difference between the east and the west in the cost of carriage.

Mr. TURRIFF. I cannot guarantee this evidence, but it is supplied by the Canadian Pacific railway themselves.

Mr. BORDEN. Where can it be found?

Mr. TURRIFF. It is quoted in the 'Manitoba Free Press' from the records of the Railway Commission.

Mr. CURRIE. Does that apply simply to the charges of operation or does it include the interest charges?

Mr. TURRIFF. I have stated that it is exclusive of interest or fixed charges, but as a railway in the west costs for construction from fifty to sixty per cent less per mile than a railway in the east, the fixed charges would be less in the west than they are in the east.

Yet although the interest and fixed charges must be a third less in the west than in the east, the company charges 25 to 50 per cent higher freight rates. That is what we want to do away with. As my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) says, let us pass this resolution and show the company that the parliament of Canada wants this outrageous discrimination done away with, and you will find that the Railway Commission will then take action. I am not going to criticise that commission. In my opinion its chairman is the best man in Canada for the job, but it is swamped with work.

Mr. FOSTER. This is interesting to me and that is why I am asking for information. But what my hon. friend has said does not seem to me to prove the case. I am not saying that it cannot be proved; but when the general assertion is made that you can carry cheaper in the west than in the east, I would like to have more figures than he has given. Has he the figures of the cost of carriage in different parts of the east—from Montreal to Toronto, Toronto to Detroit, or anything of that kind? He has confined himself to a certain portion of one line of railway, and certainly has given an interesting statement, but that is not the whole statement.

Mr. TURRIFF. In answer I might say that it certainly would not cost the Canadian Pacific railway any more to haul 1,000 tons of freight one mile on their line between Montreal and Toronto or Montreal and Windsor, than between Montreal and Chalk River. I understand that the eastern or Montreal section takes in all the Canadian Pacific railway lines between Montreal and Chalk River, and therefore includes the lines to Windsor, Toronto and other branch lines.

Mr. FOSTER. So that my hon. friend thinks that $5.45 would be a fair rate to spread over the Ontario section as well as on the main line.

Mr. TURRIFF. That would be a great deal better than we in the west are made to pay, but if it only costs $3.75 a mile to carry a thousand tons from Chalk River to Calgary, I do not see why we should have to pay the higher rate that the Canadian Pacific railway exacts in the west.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you sure about those figures around Lake Superior from Chalk River to Port Arthur? It seems remarkable that the cost should be greater in the older portions of Ontario than in that rough country.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am only taking the figures supplied by the Canadian Pacific railway and have every reason to believe they are right. The explanation is this, that in the Montreal division there are many branch lines and a good deal is short haul. Whereas from Chalk River to Port Arthur it is practically all through haul, and that accounts for the cost rate being

low even in that rough country with heavy grades and curves. But when you get west on the prairies, the cost includes all the branch lines as well, and branch lines add to the cost of operation; but there, the grades being so easy it is cheaper to operate, so that even with the branch lines all included, the cost of operating is only two-thirds what it is in the Montreal division.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver). As this question vitally affects the trade of British Columbia, I desire to say a few words on it. I regret that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), has seen fit to introduce this motion in this particular way, and at this time. It is a question of very great importance and one which is entirely technical in its character. It is a question we have been studying in the west for a great many years, and, I might say that the Board of Trade of Vancouver—the constituency I have the honour to represent—have had some of the most eminent counsel in that province working on it for a couple of years, and on three or four different occasions they argued their case very fully before the Railway Commission. Had I known that this question was coming up to-day, I would certainly have availed myself of the mass of material these gentlemen had on hand when they appeared before the commission. I do not think that any member of this House can be prepared on the spur of the moment to discuss a question of this kind. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), may have had some time in which to prepare himself, but I think it would have been much better if he had given notice of his motion on the order paper, and thus given the members an opportunity to prepare for the debate and discuss the question more fully. But as far as I am concerned, personally, I am quite prepared to go on record as stating that the freight rates in the west are an unfair discrimination against the business men of that country. I am not prepared, however, to say that we should now pass a resolution calling for a general levelling of freight rates throughout Canada. I shall not attempt to discuss the question, as I have not the necessary data and information at hand, but it is, however, a question which I have closely followed, and to which eminent counsel on both sides have applied their best abilities in order to arrive at a solution, and found themselves in a most difficult position. I know too that the Railway Commission, which I have always regarded as one of the finest institutions in this Dominion, have applied themselves to the solution of this problem and have found it a most difficult one to solve. This being the case, I think it would be exceedingly unwise for this House, on the spur of the moment, to pass a resolution such as the one offered by the hon. member for South York. I take it to be nothing more nor less than a vote of want of confidence, not in the Government, but in the Railway Commission. No member of this House, I think, will stand in his place and say that this is not something that the Railway Commission should deal with. If that is the case, we have no right to take it out of their hands. The counsel of the Board of Trade of Vancouver, and of other western cities, have prepared elaborate briefs on this question, and I understand that there is to be a full investigation by a commission, which is to sit within a month, into this whole question, when it will be threshed out on its merits fairly and equitably to all concerned.

The right hon. leader of the government referred to the fact that the Manitoba government had given some special concessions to a local railway in return for a reduction of rates. The British Columbia government has made a similar arrangement with the Canadian Northern, and I believe it is endeavouring to make similar arrangements with other companies seeking railway charters in British Columbia. It is easy to condemn the railway companies for excessive rates; it is easy to say that there should be a levelling of rates; but it is a different matter when you study carefully the exact conditions that obtain throughout the Dominion. It may cost only a certain amount to haul a thousand tons of freight a given distance; but if there is only a very limited amount of freight originating on a particular line, whereas on another line there may be a very large amount of freight originating, it is evident that the volume of business would have something to do with the rates charged. I am not for a moment supporting the position that the railway companies have assumed for years; but I do say that before a resolution like this is adopted by this House, we should be seized of all the facts of the case. Some hon. members may in the future use the vote I shall give against this resolution to say that I have gone back upon the principles of the constituency I represent. I wish to repudiate that contention. As far as I am concerned, the position is simply this: the question is now in the hands of a commission in which I have the fullest confidence and I wish to say that I highly commend the action of the late administration in the creation of that commission. It has sat in Vancouver on many occasions dealing with matters in which I have represented the interest of the city and others, and my experience of its actions has been that it has been fair and equitable to all concerned, one of the most level-headed courts in the Dominion. With such a commission, in which we all

on both sides of the House, have confidence, dealing with this problem, and having in its possessions all the facts which have been placed before it in the last two or three years, surely it is only right and fair that we should leave it with them to arrive at a conclusion, especially when such a conclusion will in all probability be arrived at within the next two or three months. It is impossible for me at this time to discuss this question on its merits and in its various phases, because I have not the data before me. I regret that the hon. member has brought such an important resolution before us with absolutely no notice. Even if it passes, it will accomplish nothing. What we should have before us, if we are going to accomplish anything, is a concrete resolution or a bill. While I am in favour of the general idea of seeking for a solution of this great problem, I am not in favour of this omnibus resolution.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). Mr. Speaker, as this question is one of the most vital importance to all the people west of Lake Superior, no matter what walk of life they may be in, I cannot let this opportunity go by without expressing my hearty approval of many of the things that have been said by the mover of the resolution (Mr. Maclean, South York) and by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) on the question of discrimination against the west by the railways in freight and passenger rates. During the last twelve months our western newspapers have been giving this question a great deal of prominence, and our boards of trade and the people generally are certainly alive to the fact that they are not getting a square deal from the railways. I think we in the west must congratulate ourselves on having such a splendid champion of our rights as the hon. member for South York. This is not the first time that he has taken occasion to discuss this question in the House. During last session and on a number of other occasions we have heard him discuss it, and from the amount of enthusiasm that he displays, one would think that his whole heart and soul were bound up in the prosperity and the welfare of the people living west of Lake Superior. They tell me, Sir, that there is a newspaper published in the city of Toronto which on the 22nd of September last, referring to the victory won by the Conservative party at the polls on the day before, had across its front page, in large, bold type, the words, 'Glory Hallelujah.' Surely my hon. friend from South York, who I understand is the owner and publisher of that newspaper, while he may understand the feeling of the people of the west on the question of excessive freight rates, on the morning on which he gave that remarkable expression of exultation, was not aware of the state of the sentiment of the people of the prairie provinces in favour of larger markets and of that agreement which they believed would have helped and relieved the railway situation, which certainly to them is an intolerable situation.

What is the situation? I was told on my trip west that during one week in December when the car shortage in the west was very serious, as it still is very serious, there were on the Soo line, a line running down into the United States of America, 1,600 empty cars that could not be used by the people simply because on the 21st of September, the people of Canada voted against being given the privilege of selling their goods on the United States market.

Mr. CURRIE. Did the hon. member say that these cars could not be used in Canada?

Mr. NEELY. Yes.

Mr. CURRIE. An American freight car is free to pass through Canada as freely as a Canadian. When the hon. gentleman makes that statement he is trying to insult the intelligence of this House

Mr. NEELY. My hon. friend (Mr. Currie) may, by his qualifications, be fitted for the position of Minister of Militia, but he has been chosen neither for that position nor yet for the position of Minister of Railways in the present government. His knowledge of the railway situation is not so great and comprehensive that it devolves upon him in any manner to try to correct my statement, a statement of absolute fact. These cars came over from across the line loaded with freight, coal and other things. The only possible freight that they could take back to any extent was through freight. The railways to which those cars belong wanted to get them back into their own service as quickly as possible, and I state as an actual fact that that condition of affairs existed, and yet our Canadian railways were and are still unable to cope with the situation in the west. The question of reciprocity having for the time being been settled by the electorate of Canada we have not that safety valve for the over-production of our western products, and it seems to me to be the duty and the responsibility of this House to take some steps to improve the situation in relation to freight and passenger rates, particularly in western Canada. As the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has said, this question was brought up somewhat unexpectedly. With the object of the resolution I am entirely in sympathy. The terms of the resolution might be justly and fairly criticised. The people of western Canada are not desirous of obtaining anything more than their fair, just rights. If it can be demonstrated before the Board

of Railway Commissioners that the cost of operation of a railway in the west is greater than the cost of operation in the east, there is not a man in western Canada who wants the railways to haul western freight at the expense of the people of the east; we are prepared to pay rightful and just charges. But notwithstanding the fact that we have always heard that the revision of railway rates is under the control and jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) as to the personnel of that commission, it does seem to me that it has taken that Board of Railway Commissioners a mighty long time to get around to the question of this unjust discrimination as against the people of the prairie provinces. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has given some explanation. He has said that the time of the members of that board has been taken up with a great many minor matters, and that is undoubtedly true to some extent. But, Sir, it does not appear to me that that is a sufficient excuse for the years of delay, since the creation of that Board of Railway Commissioners, in dealing with this question.

Mr. CURRIE. Why did not the hon. gentleman or some of his friends make a complaint to the commission?

Mr. NEELY. The people have been making those complaints continuously. Boards of Trade have been making them from time to time, and yet the commission never seemed to have the opportunity or the time to deal with the question. I do not know how this House can give directions to that board to deal with that question, but it seems to me that the board ought to take it immediately under their consideration. Let them consider the cost of operation, taking account of the actual operating expenses of the railways, let them take the fixed charges if they will, every feature and phase of the cost of operation of the railways, and then we in the west are absolutely satisfied and assured that there will be a great reduction of the freight rates west of Lake Superior, if not right through to the Pacific coast. I say that the people of the west do not want anything unfair. This resolution has come unexpectedly before us in this particular form. I do not know that the people whom I represent here would ask that the resolution in its present terms be passed by this House, and if my hon. friend presses his resolution to a vote, I reserve to myself the right to vote against the terms and the form of the resolution with the privilege of again bringing this question up at some future day before the House for its consideration. I say that with the objects of the resolution I am heartily in accord, namely, the amelioration of conditions in the west with reference to discrimination in freight rates. But I am not prepared at this moment to commit myself to a support of the resolution in the terms and in the form in which it has been submitted to us.

Mr. JAMES McKAY (Prince Albert). As this matter is of great importance to the west, and particularly that portion of it I have the honour to represent, I think it is incumbent on me to address to the House a few remarks on this question. I agree with what the hon. member from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), has said, that this is a question of such great importance that it is impossible for the House to deal intelligently with it unless it has more data before it on which to act. Particularly does that apply to myself. The argument made by the seconder of the amendment, would of itself, justify me in voting against the proposed amendment, in view of its wording. I desire in the first place to put myself on record as being against the unfair discrimination in freight rates in the west. In this connection, a letter has been read to the House by an hon. member, a letter written, I understand, by the Chairman of the Railway Commission, from whom we learn that although this commission has been in existence for a number of years, no formal complaint has ever been laid before it with regard to freight rates in the west. I desire on this occasion again to put that letter on record in 'Hansard.' The letter is apparently signed by the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners:

Ottawa, Nov. 24, 1911.

My dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of 20th inst., inclosing copy of resolution of the Winnipeg Board of Trade. This is the first complaint that has been directly made to the board regarding western rates generally. A good deal has appeared from time to time in the western papers, but no step was taken by anybody there for a general investigation regarding rates throughout the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

This letter, I understand, was addressed to the Minister of Railways. Now, Sir, we have this situation: The Railway Commission was appointed to look into these matters, and notwithstanding the existence of this grievance for the last twenty-five years, as stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), no formal complaint was made by him, or any other member of the House to the Railway Commission to deal with this matter.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman is wrong in one respect. It may be quite true, as the chairman of the commission says, that there is no formal complaint made. But I may say that I took the

matter up with one of his commissioners more than half a dozen times, and discussed freight rates with him, complained of them on behalf of the people I represent, although I did not do so in writing.

Mr. McKAY. I do not propose to discuss this matter from a party standpoint, I am discussing it from the national point of view, as that is the point of view which the amendment takes. Now, if the hon. member for Assiniboia was desirous, and possibly he was desirous, of doing good to his section of the country, he should have made a formal complaint to the Railway Commission in order that they might deal with it, and he should have got the government he then supported to take action in this matter. Now, it seems to me this is not the proper time to lay down a principle on this question. As the member for Assiniboia has stated, for the last twenty-five years the west has been unfavourably discriminated against with regard to freight rates. He has shown us by figures that the freight rates should have been reduced in the west to a lower point than they are in the east, whereas the opposite has been the case. Now, since the new government has come into office we find that, within a few months, it has formally placed this question of freight rates before the Railway Commission, and, according to the Prime Minister's statement, the government has employed counsel to act on these complaints. Now, I submit it is nothing but right that we should give the administration an opportunity of doing justice to the west. I do not know but that the constituents I represent would take me to task if I voted in favour of this amendment; because, according to the statements made by the mover, and more especially by the seconder of this amendment, if the Railway Commission does justice to the west in this matter, we will be entitled to a lower rate than the east; and if I voted in favour of this amendment my constituents might say to me: Why did you vote for that amendment when we were likely to be treated fairly as compared with the east in the matter of freight rates? The seconder of that motion placed figures before the House to show that the rates, to be fair to the west, would have to be made lower than those charged in the east. Consequently I think I am justified in voting against this amendment, and leaving the matter to be dealt with as the government is doing, taking it before the Railway Commission whose duty it is to investigate the complaint, and employing able counsel to conduct the case for the people. But I wish again to repeat that I am not in favour of the present freight rates that exist in the west. There is a further consideration I will mention. The amend-

ment states that it is detrimental to the whole of Canada to have any territorial discrimination in freight rates. The hon. member who moved this amendment said that there would be some reason for the present practice if there were different roads operating in different portions of Canada; he mentioned conditions in the United States. But the conditions of Canada are not such as those of the United States, where different roads operate in different states; but in Canada we have our railway companies operating all over the country. That may be true to a certain extent, but are there not a large number of railway companies now incorporated which propose to do business in certain portions of Canada, and not in other portions? It is not necessary for me to state the different railway companies that are incorporated to do business in the west only and in no other portion of Canada. But, apart from that feature of the case, do not the actual facts as they exist practically come down to this, that there are different railway companies operating in different parts of the west? I submit that in order to deal with this question intelligently we should have data to show us what the proper mileage is in the east, and what the proper mileage is in the west, of the different railway companies doing business, because we know that in so far as the Canadian Northern Railway Company is concerned by far the larger portion of its mileage is in the west, and it is doing comparatively little in the east. I submit that this data should first be submitted to us before we can intelligently deal with this question.

The mover of the amendment has been characterised as the champion of the west, and I am quite prepared to agree that on more than one occasion he has done very important service for the west. But let us remember that the effect of this amendment would tend to make him a greater champion of the east than of the west, because, as I have stated before, according to the figures that are given now, when the Railway Commission investigates this matter, and deals with it on its merits, we should get a lower rate in the west than people do in the east, whereas, if this principle is adopted by the House and followed by the Railway Commission then the hon. member who moved this amendment will be a greater champion of the east than of the west, because he would prevent that reduction in the rate which we would be entitled to and the east would get the benefit of what we should get.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Does my hon. friend have the least expectation that the Railway Commission will ever make any ruling which will give us better terms in the west? If so he is a very sanguine man

Mr. McKAY. The hon. member who has put that question to me apparently has lost faith in governments owing to the treatment that he received by the late administration.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Surely the Railway Commission is not a government?

Mr. McKAY. Certainly not but the members of the Railway Commission have put themselves on record that nobody ever made any formal complaint to give them an opportunity to deal with this question.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Act gives them authority to deal with it without a formal complaint

Mr. McKAY. Exactly. Perhaps I did not use the proper language, but it is very rarely that we find bodies of this nature taking action of their own motion, and I have sufficient confidence in the administration that I am supporting to leave the matter in their hands. I submit that I am justified in that confidence and the action that they have taken in this matter has given me greater confidence, if it were possible to have greater confidence, in them.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). It was within the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission from the day it started out to the present time to initiate this inquiry itself, and unless somebody calls its attention to it in parliament it will never undertake it.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) did nothing.

Mr. McKAY. I am perfectly willing to admit that I think that is the case, but, just as I stated in answer to the hon. member for Red Deer, it is very rarely you find bodies of this nature taking the initiative. When the late administration was in office and hon. members then supporting the government saw that the Railway Commission was not taking the initiative, why did they not take action and force them to do it? Why? The administration I am supporting had hardly been in office three months when they took the proper course. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), whose duty it is to act in these matters, sends a resolution of a board of trade and formally places it before the Railway Commission. In addition, the administration employs council to back up those who make these complaints and to thoroughly investigate the matter. When we have the question in that position and when, after these long years of discrimination against the west, the administration of the day is taking hold of it in a proper manner, are we to take a stand and say there are to be no territorial changes in regard to the tariff? I say we are not to take that stand but we should let the Railway Commission deal with it and not imply a vote of censure against it and against the government who are doing the best they can in regard to this matter. For these reasons I intend to put myself on record as against this amendment.

Mr. GEO. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon). Mr. Speaker, I wish to put myself on record in favour of the equalization of rates as between the east and the west. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) is not fully in touch with opinion in the west. He lays a great deal of emphasis on the agitation which is going on there in favour of the reduction in freight rates. He appparently has no idea that that is a very small agitation there as compared with the desire that the people of the west have to get into the markets of the south, which efforts he so strenuously opposed. I want to give my hon. friend credit, however, for having, personally and in his newspaper, brought the attention of the public to this question of discrimination. In the west the 'Winnipeg Free Press' has also done great service. A number of articles have appeared in that paper during the past year and they have been published in two pamphlets which are now no doubt in the hands of most hon. members. Members of this House. in so far as actual experience goes, know very little about freight rates either in the east or the west and I would suggest that the writer of these articles in the 'Free Press' be asked to appear at the sittings of the Railway Commission so that his figures may be discussed and verified if necessary. It is to the 'Free Press' that this agitation is due to a great extent and I am sure that the writer of these articles could give a good deal of very valuable information. This investigation will, I presume, deal with the whole question of the tariffs of railways in our country. It will deal not only with freight rates but passenger and express rates. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has told the House that it appears to be a principle adopted by the Railway Commission that express rates may be very much in excess in the west, of what they are in the east, that where the charge in the east is $1 for a certain distance, in the west that charge is, say $1.66. Some time ago the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), then Postmaster General, proposed that the parcel post system should be greatly extended. At that time I felt that it was going to be of more use to the departmental stores in our country than to the public in general and I was one of those who told him I would not support that proposition. I must say that I have changed my mind. I think I made a mistake, and those of us, and there were

enough of us to stop his good efforts, who voted in that way, did in my opinion make a mistake. I hope the Postmaster General will, unless we get better treatment from the Express Companies, extend the Parcel Post system.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Extend it first and then you will soon get better treatment.

Mr. McCRANEY. If we were getting better treatment from the express companies there would not be the same desire on the part of the public for the Parcel Post system.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Get the Parcel Post first and then you will have both services improved.

Mr. McCRANEY. If the Postmaster General introduces an extended parcel post system I will support him now because we have not had fair treatment from the express companies, and if the express companies want to head off an extended parcel post they will substantially and quickly reduce their rates. I would point out to my hon. friend from Prince Albert that it is not necessary to lay a complaint before the Railway Commission to move them to action. In 1907 there was an agitation in this House for the equalization of passenger rates between the east and the west, and that agitation was effective although no formal complaint was made to the Railway Commission. In December, 1906, the Canadian Northern railway came to us with a private Act authorizing it to take over the railway between Regina and Prince Albert, and I moved in amendment to that Bill that the rates on that line should not be more than three cents a mile. I would not say now that it would be better that that amendment should have carried because it would have discriminated between that particular piece of line and other western roads, and the three cent rate would not be general in its application, but the late Dr. McIntyre, who represented Strathcona then, was in charge of the Canadian Northern Railway Bill and he put a motion on the order paper declaring that the rates in the prairie provinces should be reduced to three cents a mile. Before that motion was discussed, on the 19th March, 1907, the Toronto 'Globe' announced that the Railway Commission would deal with the question and would reduce the rates east of the Rocky Mountains to three cents per mile. And yet, no formal complaint had been laid before the commission. I was very much interested because before the 1st of January, 1907, we in Saskatchewan and Alberta were paying four cents a mile and in order to head off the agitation in this House the railway companies reduced the rate to three and a half cents per mile. Then because of the announcement made in the 'Globe'—I do not say that the authority of the Railway Commission was had for its publication, but the statement appeared to be authoritative—the resolution was not discussed by the House. Parliament prorogued, the summer went by, we paid three and a half cents a mile, but within ten days of the 1st of November, the Railway Commission, apparently without investigation, ordered that the rate east of the Rockies should be reduced to three cents per mile, and they did that with the consent of the railway companies. This shows that the Railway Commission of its own motion did a very important thing and it shows that when the railway companies knew that trouble was coming, they came down. On the 30th of January, 1907, the present Prime Minister moved a resolution asking the Railway Commission to investigate the question as to whether two cents per passenger mile would be a fair rate and, no doubt the railways feared that if there was a general investigation the rate over all Canada might be made less than three cents. Parliament was to meet and it would never have suited the railways to leave the matter for discussion here. Now, why should the passenger rate be the same in the west as in the east if the cost of operation is more in the west than in the east? If the railways in the west are conducting their passenger business at a loss then it must be that the freight and express rates are making up that loss, but I do not think that the railways are losing anything on their passenger business in the west. I trust there will be a thorough investigation by the commission of express rates, freight rates and passenger rates. There is a phase further of this question which appeals to me. The hon. member for Vancouver spoke as though we are reflecting upon the Railway Commission when we move in this House towards equalization of rates and to give instructions to the commission. Well, parliament has very heavily bonused some of the railways in the west and parliament is interested. If counsel were to appear before the Railway Commission and state that the Canadian Pacific railway got one hundred and fifty millions in cash subsidies and in land bonuses, if you value the land at three dollars an acre, and gave that as a reason why the rates should be equalized, the Railway Commission might properly say that they knew nothing about that and that it was not a question they could consider.

I have some facts here which I have obtained in a return from the Department of

Railways within the last few days which I would like to put on record. They show the subsidies paid by this government to the various railways operating in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia:

Statement of Subsidies paid by Dominion Government to following Railways in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Canadian Pacific Railway.	
Main line, Prince Arthur to Coast, including Pembina branch (about)	$31,000,000
The above includes amount paid out by the Dominion government on construction and it is impossible to divide it into provinces. In addition to the amount of $31,000,000, about was expended on the Canada Central railway, rolling stock, telegraph lines, surveys, Fort Francis lock, Dawson route, inspecting engineers, works west of Red river, rails, &c.	7,000,000
Main line subsidy Callendar to Kamloops	25,000,000
	$63,000,000
Branches.	
British Columbia	$5,156,917
Saskatchewan	816,992
Manitoba	338,000
	$6,311,909
St. Mary's River Railway.	
Alberta	$148,094
Canadian Northern Railway.	
Alberta, Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific railway	$ 91,200
Saskatchewan and Manitoba	374,156
	$465,356

If any hon. member will take the railway statistical report for the year ending June 30, 1911, he will see what the land subsidies are, and I am going to trouble the House by quoting from this report. At page 15 will be found the statement as follows:

Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co. (formerly N. W. Coal and Navigation Co.)	1,114,368
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Co.	1,895,445
Canadian Northern Railway Co. (from point on C.P.R. to Hudson Bay) C. N. Ry. Co. (formerly Lake Manitoba and Canal Co.)	3,458,675
Canadian Pacific Railway (main line)	18,237,701
Canadian Pacific railway, Pipestone extension, Souris branch	278,818
C. P. R., Souris branch	1,422,966
Great Northwest Central Railway Company (formerly Central Northwest Railway Company)	320,000
Manitoba and North Western Railway Company	1,501,376
Manitoba, Southeastern Colonization railway	1,399,640
Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Company	682,412
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company	1,630,097
Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company	98,880
Total	32,040,378

As to the value of this land, this report goes on to say:

As has been said, it is quite impracticable to assign any money value to the above land grants. In the case of the province of Quebec it has been the policy of the government to present to grantees the option of taking the land or receiving a sum equal to 52 cents per acre in lieu thereof. In practically every instance the cash option has been taken; so that of the 13,324,950 acres primarily granted by that province, but a small number, if any, has been actually alienated. On the other hand, as indicating the value of land grants by the Dominion, last year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sold 975,036 acres of land at an average price of $14.84 per acre.

If any one will calculate the subsidy in cash and in lands paid the Canadian Pacific railway, he will get this result. In cash subsidy there has been given the Canadian Pacific railway, and this includes the completed line north of Lake Superior, a total of $69,460,000. The land grant given that company calculated at only $3 per acre will amount to $80,854,818, making a total of $150,314,818. Why were these subsidies given? Were they given to the promoters of the company in order that they might put them into their pockets? I would say no. But in some cases the promoters did put them into their pockets as in the case of the Qu'Appelle Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway. What parliament had in mind when it gave those cash subsidies was to meet the very difficulties which are now given us to-day as reasons why the rates should be greater in the west. The cost of production, the cost of operation, the greater cost of living, and so forth are the reasons given; and no doubt these cash grants were given as compensation for these drawbacks. No doubt the grants given at the time were intended to meet the very conditions which are quoted against us now, so that after paying for these drawbacks in the first place we are paying for them the second time. In the case of the Canadian Northern, I find that the cash subsidy amounts to $465,356 and the land grant to 5,088,772 acres, which at $3 per acre amounts to $15,266,316, or a total of $15,731,672. And to-day this parliament has a statute covering the Canadian Northern railway thorough that country which has not much local traffic. We have a guarantee of $35,000 a mile on 1,050 miles of that

road and the Ontario government has voted a bonus of 4,000 acres per mile on 500 miles of that road. Why did the Ontario legislature grant that amount? It was because of the conditions which exist there —because of the difficulty of building north of Lake Superior and because there was little local traffic, and also because of the higher cost of living. And a singular thing it is that the railway company give the higher cost of living in the west as a reason why the freight rate should be higher when a great deal of the higher cost of living is due to their freight rates.

This question was somewhat discussed during the last election campaign, and I was somewhat struck with a statement which appeared in the public press as having been made by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). My hon. friend is here and will correct me if I misquote him. That statement was that a director of the Canadian Pacific railway had told him that the Canadian Pacific railway would welcome a reduction of freight rates but that the company would not be permitted to do so by the Railway Commission. If that be the ruling of the Railway Commission——

Mr. BRADBURY. The hon. gentleman has not understood what I did say. Although he quoted correctly part of what I said. What I said was this:

In conversation with one of the directors of the Canadian Pacific railway on this question, he told me that they would welcome a reduction of freight rates. He did not say that they would not be permitted by the Railway Commission to reduce them. He said they would welcome a reduction if the Railway Commission wished to enforce it.

Mr. TURRIFF. Did you believe him?

Mr. McCRANEY. I am glad the hon. member has made his own statement, because the impression I gathered from the statement in the press was that they were willing to do it if they only had the chance. If there is anything in that theory, it is a good reason why the Hudson Bay railway should be built. We are going to build the Hudson Bay railway not only to get our wheat out by a short route, but in order to bring about a reduction in freight rates. It is going to give us a cheaper route to the old country, and we hope the advantage will be not only to those who will ship over that railway, but to every shipper in the Northwest, because a lower freight rate to Liverpool via the Hudson Bay railway will affect the rates of all the railways doing business between the west and the Liverpool market. If there is any ground whatever for the statement made by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), and for the inference which I think I may fairly draw from the statement made by my hon. friend from Selkirk, that work should be stopped at once. If that is the law it is no good. It is a reason why we should not go any further in making new routes if we are going to leave the old routes in possession of the rates which they are now getting. I do not know to what extent or whether I shall support the amendment of my hon. friend. I am entirely with him in spirit. I do not know whether the wording of his amendment is altogether right. The Prime Minister has pointed out some objections, but I hope he will deal with this question. He is in command of this House. I hope any declaration which this House may make will not be regarded as a criticism of the Railway Commission. I believe that the Railway Commission is not only efficient in its work, but has more work than it is able to do from the very fact of its efficiency. Because it has proved efficient it seems that we are overloading it. The last government found difficulty in filling a vacancy on that commission. I have no doubt that this government is to be sympathized with because there is great difficulty in getting the right kind of men for such a commission. They have to deal with the brightest minds that can be employed by the railway corporations. I hope no inefficient man will be appointed simply because he belongs to a certain class in the community. I hope we shall get the best man the government can find, and if the government will increase the commission so that it will do its work more effectively, I can assure them of my support.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to address the House at any great length, but as my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) intends to divide the House on the resolution, which involves some very important principles, I feel that I should not cast a silent vote upon it. I wish to draw your attention to the fact that ever since the Railway Commission of Canada was organized, it has met with great approval from the corporations and the public generally which have had dealings with it. The organization of that board was a satisfactory act. In settling disputes as to railway rates, dealing with railway companies, and generally, by an enlargement of the scope of the statute, questions relating to public utilities, it has been beneficial. Consequently the first question I would ask the hon. member for South York and you and this House to consider in connection with this important question is, that having constituted a Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, which is a very important, influential, and highly re

spected board, doing a great service of a public nature, why should parliament be asked to delegate the functions of that board to a commission to be constituted under or independent of it? To that Railway Board are entrusted by this country, with complete confidence, public questions of a most vital and comprehensive nature affecting the management of our railway interests of this country and of other public services. I fancy that I am not greatly exaggerating the importance to be attributed to the Railway Commission of Canada when I say that, possibly, with the sole exception of the United States Commerce Commission, it is the most powerful and influential body of its kind in the whole world. Can any instance be cited of the United States Commerce Commission delegating its functions in the way asked here? The whole object of the Railway Commission of Canada is to deal with questions such as this, and why should parliament be asked to declare that because the grievances referred to arise in the west as different from the east, the Railway Commission in its enlarged sphere of action, is not competent to deal with them and adjust them? There was recently relegated to the Supreme Court of Canada a decision of the Railway Commission known as the Regina rate case, in which such an inquiry as is involved in the motion before the House was dealt with.

The Board of Railway Commissioners ordered an inquiry, the matter was referred to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court having decided that the Railway Commission had correctly ruled that this matter came within its jurisdiction, full scope is given to that inquiry, the door is wide open and measures will be taken to give it the widest possible scope for the regulating of all grievances involved between the shippers and railway companies. The difficulties of a railway company are not to be minimized, they must be taken into consideration, and I fancy that it is in accordance with the judgment of this House, which is a reasonable, deliberative body, that in dealing with railway companies regard is to be had to the difficulties under which they are labouring, consistent with a desire to promote the industries of the country and to protect the people in every reasonable regard. It must be remembered that railway development and extension is possibly as great a factor in the development of the country, particularly in the west, as the agricultural development. Agricultural development necessarily follows the constructions of railways. In the adjustment of grievances of this description the whole subject must be thoroughly considered, and the Board of Railway Commissioners must not be in any way restricted

Mr. McCRANEY. Does the hon. gentleman think that the board will be justified in considering the question of subsidies, which had already been granted by the parliament of Canada, in fixing freight rates in any part of Canada?

Mr. BOYCE. I am not prepared to offer my hon. friend an answer to what is largely an academic question. I appreciate the broadness of his question, but I am not at liberty to offer an opinion on so large a question at the moment. Wherever it has been found since the constitution of the Railway Commission, that its powers have been limited or restricted, it has been the policy of parliament, irrespective of party, to so enlarge those powers as to permit the commission to make all these inquiries, and to deal with all these subjects. That is as far as I can go in answering the question. Therefore, if it be found that the Railway Commission is cabined, cribbed and confined by the scope of its authority, then I take it that it is the policy and the duty of this government to so broaden the functions of that board that it will have authority to deal with this question. If it be necessary to consider the scope of the commission with reference to such a question as this, it would be far better, if necessary, to enlarge the scope of the commission than to refer important matters to another tribunal not within or under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission should be comprehensive and should have relegated to it all these questions for final decision, subject to appeal.

In reference to the question of rates, my hon. friend will realize that the question of operation is of considerable importance. It is true that the gross income of railways has considerably increased but by reason of the increased cost of operation of these railways the net income derived from them has lately been considerably reduced. Only to-day, in the Railway Committee, in connection with a Bill to incorporate the Canadian Northern branch lines, it was stated that the extension of those branch lines undoubtedly meant greater employment for labour in the community, and, therefore, more demand for the produce raised in that neighbourhood. In connection with any adjustment of rates, it is necessary to consider the reasonableness of these rates as applied to the general operating expenses, and, in fixing rates, regard must be had to the conditions under which railway companies are being operated. If it is more expensive to operate in one particular sphere, if greater difficulties are met, these must be considered. If, on the other hand, there appears to be discrimination in one territory as against another irrespective of these different conditions, that is a question that can be pro-

perly dealt with by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Territorially speaking there is no difficulty. There has been some question about dividing the commission. I do not desire to express a view on the broad question whether it would be better to consolidate the Railway Commission into one body or to have separate bodies, but undoubtedly the question involved in these matters involves the question of interference with the functions and constitution of the Railway Board, and I do not feel at liberty at present to advocate such an interference, having the utmost confidence in the constitution of the Railway Board as it is at present.

It may be urged by my hon. friend that many of these roads are extravagantly managed, and that unreasonable expenditure is involved in their operation. That is a matter which we have not to deal with, and is not one which comes within the purview of the Railway Commission. So the question before us is whether parliament should constitutionally interfere with the functions of the Board of Railway Commissioners at the present time. Under all the circumstances, and for the reasons which I have endeavoured to condense as much as possible, I think the wiser course is to permit the Board to determine this question, and all other questions affecting similar matters, and of course to deal with grievances arising from rates fixed by the railway companies of Canada. For this reason I shall be obliged to vote against the amendment.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). I did not have an opportunity of reading the motion until a short time ago, and I must say that when I heard it read at first I misunderstood its purport. I understand it to declare the principle that there should be no discrimination in railway rates because of geographical location. As a principle, I think everybody must agree that it is correct. But as I read it, it does not provide against differences in railway rates because of other conditions, because of natural conditions increasing the cost of haul, or because of population, or traffic conditions which, by increasing the amount of haulage would make it economically possible to reduce the rates. Therefore, if the resolution declared, as I thought it did at first, that there should be no different rates under any conditions in any part of this country, I certainly would not be able to vote for it. But if it declares, as I now understand it, that there should not be discrimination in rates because of geographical location, then I think the principle is sound and one that everybody must agree to.

As to the propriety of leaving this question entirely to the discrimination of the Railway Commission, I would like to say that in my humble judgment it is within the authority of this House to set limits to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission, and that the Railway Commission is charged with the responsibility of working within those limits. I think it would be going too far to give to the Railway Commission the right to say, in practice, that in the province of Nova Scotia, for instance, all the railway rates might be doubled to-morrow, just as it would be improper to lay upon the Commission the responsibility of maintaining rates in western Canada at their present level. I am aware that under the letter of the law the commission has that authority; but the commission is composed of sane men, and they have not yet exercised that authority in an insane way; and I do not think they will. It is beyond question that railway rates in western Canada are considerably higher than they are in eastern Canada for a like service. That being so, and that condition having continued for many years, I say the Railway Commission would be justified, unless they received a mandate from parliament to the contrary, in not bringing the rates down to the general level of the rates of eastern Canada. They would be justified in assuming that the condition of higher rates existed because of some special conditions there, and that their duty would be discharged by making merely such adjustments between different localities in the west as in their judgment were called for.

Mr. BORDEN. I cannot see at the present moment why they would be justified in assuming any such thing.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not asking my hon. friend to see the matter as I see it.

Mr. BORDEN. I am asking purely for information.

Mr. OLIVER. I am only placing before the House my own views in the matter. I was going to say that when the question of express rates was under consideration by the Railway Commission quite recently, they took exactly that view. They did not bring down the express rates in western Canada to the level of those in eastern Canada. They left them at a considerably higher level, presuming, I take it for granted, that those rates being much higher as a general thing, there were conditions that justified the situation.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The railways of their own motion, when they first began to operate in the west, assumed that they were entitled to higher rates, and they enforced them. The commission came into operation, and it acknowledged that assumption, and that assumption will be

carried on unless parliament, or somebody else, declares that it is a wrong assumption and must be justified. My contention is that parliament should declare that it has not been justified and ought to cease. Then we will get equality.

Mr. BORDEN. I am endeavouring purely to get the view point of the hon. gentleman, and not speaking by way of criticism. I would suppose it to be the duty of the Railway Commission to assume nothing of the kind, but to look carefully into all the conditions, those that have been alluded to this evening, and to apply the principle of equality to east and west in so far as the conditions would justify, instead of going upon any assumption as to what had taken place in the past before the investigation was made. I am merely presenting that view as one that occurred to me.

Mr. OLIVER. I can quite appreciate my hon. friend's view, but I would like him to appreciate mine, that the Railway Commission, finding a condition existing, which had existed for many years, and which had been accepted by everybody as a proper condition, felt, very reasonably, and, I think, they were fairly warranted in so assuming, that there was merit in that condition and that they would not be justified in dealing with the question without recognition of a condition which had existed for so long. That is what actually occurred in regard to express rates in the west, and it seemed to me that it is on all fours with the question of railway rates. It is chiefly because the Railway Commission took that view with regard to express rates that I assume that they would take the same view with regard to the railway rate. At any rate I again say that it is the business and the responsibility of parliament to make a declaration of principle and to allow the Railway Commission to work out the details of that principle.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Without disputing the statement made by the hon. gentleman in connection with what the commission found when they went into the west to investigate freight rates, does he not think that it was the duty of the commission to go into the matter for themselves no matter how they found rates east or west, and not to be guided by conditions because those conditions happened to exist? I consider that it was the duty of the commission to make the rates in the west no higher than they were in the east, which is the very opposite to what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. OLIVER. I will willingly admit that my hon. friend is very likely justified in what he says. Theoretically he is correct, but in actual practice and, as a matter of fact in an instance, as I understand it, practically on all fours with the question of railway rates, the Railway Commission did not do that. From my point of view—I, of course admit that I may be wrong—the Railway Commission were fairly and reasonably warranted in doing exactly as they did, failing instruction from parliament to the contrary.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I understand my hon. friend to say that, as a matter of fact, the commission, in dealing with express rates, did finally come to their decision on the ground that there had hitherto been a difference? Now, does he know that, or does he know whether or not they came to their decision by looking into the actual conditions? The fact is that they reduced the rates, as I understand?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). The commission then will reduce them because of the work they did in another case, and because for a long time they have had higher rates there than in the east?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Yes, they have three grades.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Well, does my hon. friend know that that was the ground of their decision or is it not possible that they came to their decision not because they had regard to precedent but because they had regard to the facts of the case?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). It was because they had regard to precedent.

Mr. OLIVER. I must admit that I do not know. I cannot answer my hon. friend's question. All I can give is my own opinion and the reasons why I come to the conclusion to which I do come. We know that express rates in the west have been higher and we know that the Railway Commission were authorized by parliament to deal with express rates. They went out, they found the express rate as they were, they made certain reductions and readjustments, but a great outstanding difference between the east and the west they did not deal with, to bring down these rates to the level of the east. In my opinion, and I think I will not be contradicted on this point, the difference in actual material conditions in the matter of express rates between the east and the west is not as great in proportion as the difference in the rates as left by the Railway Commission. Therefore, I have assumed, if my hon. friend follows my reasoning, that the Railway Commission, finding a certain condition of rates, took for granted, and, in my judgment, were fairly justified in doing so, that the difference in geography between the east and west warranted that change of rates and they made their decision accordingly.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would it not be a fair and proper assumption that the commission were actuated entirely by a reasonable and proper way of arriving at it and not imagining that they went in an improper way about arriving at their conclusion? Would not that be a fair assumption if you do not know?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I have been trying to show the House how, in my humble judgment, I do arrive at my conclusion.

Mr. LANCASTER. But, when the hon. gentleman says that he does not know, is not that a fair guess?

Mr. OLIVER. My idea, and surely I will be allowed to hold my opinion—

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Oh, absolutely, I will warrant that you will hold it.

Mr. OLIVER. In my opinion the Railway Commission acted strictly and fairly and just as we might reasonably have expected the Railway Commission to have acted. If we want the Railway Commission to act differently from that we ought to take the responsibility of saying in parliament that they should take that action. I cannot understand how our friends in the House can think that they can possibly have the right to place upon a body of men, who are chosen by theemselves, the responsibility of making a difference of many millions in the earnings of these great enterprises in the west. If we have done that I think we ought not to have done it. I do not think that we should delegate such a stupendous power to any body of men. Those of us who have been elected to parliament are the only people who should properly undertake that tremendous responsibility.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was not the hon. gentleman a member of the government which deliberately delegated all these tremendous powers to that body?

Mr. OLIVER. Surely.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then the hon. gentleman has changed his mind most completely since the 21st September.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all; I am unfortunate in some parts of my audience.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Take them by sections.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. I said in the beginning of my remarks that the Railway Commission, in my judgment, had, according to the wording of the Act, all the authority that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, South York) says they have, or that the right hon. leader of the government (Mr. Borden) says they have. I admit that quite freely, but, as I have said, the Railway Commission being composed of sane men and appreciating to a reasonable degree their proper responsibility, have not undertaken to act to the limit of the letter of the law and, in my judgment they were perfectly justified in not going beyond a safe and sane and reasonable point in this matter of interfering with such stupendous investments of capital and with the traffic arrangements of the whole country. I would not have occupied so much time if I had not been so ably assisted by some of our hon. friends on the other side. But, to sum up, I am prepared to vote for the resolution on the understanding that it only declares the principle that there shall not be discrimination in rates because of geographical location.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). How is my hon. friend going to read that into a resolution which reads another way?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not read it another way. I think the resolution is unfortunately worded. I will read it to the House and give the effect of the words as I understand it.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). Then you are not going to vote for the resolution, but for your interpretation of it?

Mr. OLIVER. I will vote for the resolution, but my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) must give me the privilege of interpreting the words. The resolution says:

> The House hereby declares that it will be against the general interests of Canada to have any territorial variation in the application of tariff charges by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

I think the mover of the resolution will bear me out when I say—although I think its wording could be improved—that it means that there shall be no variation in charges because of territorial or geographical location, but it does not mean that there shall not be variation in charges because of other reasonable conditions.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. I accept the resolution understanding it to mean what I have said and I accept it as an assumption of a proper responsibility of this House in giving a direction to the Railway Commission, on a matter that in my humble judgment the Railway Commission would not be justified in acting upon without a direction on the responsibility of this House.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I do not want my motion to be construed as one of want of confidence in the government or in the Railway Commission, but I have achieved my object in getting a full discussion

and I am quite willing now to withdraw the motion or rather to leave it in suspense with liberty to bring it up on a later occasion as I intend to.

Mr. LANCASTER. It must be dealt with now.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). It can be dropped; the hon. gentleman had a motion here the other night.

Mr. LANCASTER. And lots of fun.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). And he had some friends to help him through. This discussion has done a lot for the same cause. It will be heard of in the west, it will come back to the east, and it will not be long before the House will declare for equalization of rates.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter having been once dealt with this session, it would not be in order to bring it up again.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I can take care of myself under that rule.

Amendment (Mr. Maclean) withdrawn.

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

SUPPLY.

Ottawa examining warehouse, $300,000.

Mr. MONK. This building was applied for by Mr. McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, on December 20, and recommended by the minister. We have the offer of a site which seems to be approved by the officers and the price of it will be about $125,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Where is the site?

Mr. MONK. I can tell my hon. friend privately, but as the bargain has not been concluded it would be better not to disclose it. Plans are being prepared in a hurry because there is great necessity for the building. The plans are being prepared in the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It would be well for us to guard against building in a haphazard way in this city. The city may become a federal district, but anyway it will always be the capital of the Dominion and we should take special care about acquiring sites for these buildings. A committee of the late cabinet composed of Mr. Murphy and Mr. Pugsley and Mr. Fisher were looking into a general plan for the erection of public buildings, and it would be well for the present government to follow that example. If at confederation the government had purchased all the land in front of the parliament buildings how much better it would be now, and with the increased business and rapid growth of this country we should at this date endeavour to make provision for the future.

I would ask my hon. friend to look into the matter and follow the example which was set by the late administration.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend was probably not in the committee the other day when this matter was fully gone into. I explained that a committee of the Privy Council had been formed under this government composed of the Minister of Marine, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Customs and myself. I read then from the report I had on the possibility of utilizing the site which the late government bought on Sussex Street and the necessity of acquiring other sites for public buildings. This item is not for parliamentary public buildings generally but to supply a local want, in connection with the examining warehouse. There is great necessity for enlarging our examining warehouses in the different cities. In Ottawa that necessity is very urgent.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. the first minister to a resolution adopted the other day by the Ottawa Board of Trade concerning the making of Ottawa into a federal district. Have the government any policy on that question? I notice that the press of Ottawa is very much exercised over it.

Mr. BORDEN. We have no official information whatever of the passing of any by-law by the city of Ottawa, and until we receive some official information we cannot take that matter up. Of course we shall take it under consideration so soon as such information is received. I am not sure as to the terms of the resolution referred to. I think it would require the legislature of the province of Ontario to make the change. Certainly it would of this parliament.

Ottawa—Parliament Buildings, improvements, $10,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What improvements are contemplated in the library?

Mr. MONK. There are several plans but from the construction of the library it is very difficult to add to the library without spoiling the symmetry of the building. There is a plan of adding a story on one of the neighbouring branches of the buildings which would give accommodation to most of our old volumes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. On the Hill?

Mr. MONK. Yes, and another plan which has been fully prepared by the chief architect is to build out from the library to the cliff a sort of tunnel but that would hardly be acceptable.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am always hoping my hon. friend will find better accommo-

dation for His Majesty's loyal opposition. Some 15 or 16 of our members from Quebec are placed in one room up stairs and consequently cannot do their work with any comfort.

Mr. MONK. I have asked my hon. friend to meet me so that we might see what can be done, of course the disposition of the rooms here has been left—and I think very wisely— in the hands of His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. STANFIELD. Where is that room which has 15 members?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think it is number 53.

Mr. STANFIELD. We had 15 or 16 members in the last parliament in that same room.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No doubt you found there were too many.

Mr. STANFIELD. Fortunately I was not in it.

Mr. MONK. I may tell my hon. friend that most of the time that I was in opposition we had no room at all; but I do not want my hon. friend to be condemned to the same hardships that we had.

Mr. BORDEN. There is not all the accommodation that there should be, but let us realize that it is better than it used to be. I sat in this House for five sessions until I came to the front bench, and during that time I had not even a corner of a room. In that respect I fared no worse than a good many other members, because there was not at that time nearly the accommodation that there is at present. However, I realize that it is not all that we desire, and I hope at some day we shall be better off.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think that we should play the game fairly, and that both sides of the House should be provided with proper accommodation. When my hon. friend makes the improvements to this building, I would ask him to see that all the members are provided with good rooms.

Port Arthur—armoury, $49,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend no regret to find that under his new authority he is asking parliament to vote funds for an armoury? Is he in favour of militarism?

Mr. MONK. Not militarism, but I always have been in favour of proper military organization.

Mr. MACDONALD. Have the tenders been let?

Mr. MONK. We have so far paid $16,027 for the site, but there is still some land to be purchased. I think nothing has yet been done towards the building.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What has become of the vote of $30,000 for a public building at Sarnia which we passed prior to the holidays? Has the money been spent?

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It does not appear in the present estimates.

Mr. MONK. No, but, if I am not mistaken, it will be provided for in the supplementaries. I can let my hon. friend know to-morrow.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not see among the items for the province of Quebec anything for the pier at Gaspé. It is under contract. I suppose when the supplementaries come down there will be an amount to terminate the work?

Mr. MONK. I could not say positively as to that. I know there is a pier under construction in Gaspé and I had some talk about putting something in the supplementary estimates for it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Will the minister say whether items appearing in the estimates presented before the holidays but not in the estimates for this year will be in the supplementary estimates, and if it is not the usual practice to provide in the main estimates such appropriations as those to which I have referred? I find that practically every item for my county has been dropped. Will some of these appear in the supplementaries?

Mr. MONK. Many items which are in the estimates of last year are not in the estimates of this year. But many representations have been made, and the supplementary estimates will contain many of these items but not all. Some of the works did not seem to be necessary or to have been insisted on by anybody. In some cases our district engineer reported that the works were either unnecessary or had not been insisted on or were not found urgent, and as the estimates were already very heavy we did not put them in the main estimates for this year.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Is there a rule that repairs and additions appear in the main estimates and new work in the supplementaries?

Mr. MONK. That is generally the case, but it is by no means an absolute rule. My hon. friend will find many exceptions to that rule. Items which have been forgotten are often put in the supplementaries, although they refer to old works.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Reverting to the item of $4,000 for Lachine post office, it will be quite impossible to make the necessary repairs with this amount. The post-office is in a disgraceful condition, and it will take three times this amount to make

it at all suitable. The minister would be ashamed of it if he visited it. Of course the minister may have something further in the supplementaries.

Mr. MONK. I am obliged to the hon. member for his suggestion, and I will make a note of it for the supplementary estimates.

Renfrew public building, improvements,

Mr. LEMIEUX. I saw by one of the papers this morning that one of the employees of the hon. gentleman was actively engaged in the campaign in the county of Renfrew. I would like to know his policy with reference to his employees taking part in a campaign.

Mr. MONK. Any public servant who takes part actively in a campaign ought to be dismissed. If my hon. friend will give evidence of that we will attend to his complaint.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I saw it in the papers.

Mr. MONK. As my hon. friend said yesterday the newspapers do not always tell the truth.

Seaforth public building, $25,000.

Mr. MONK. This is to make provision for the erection of a public building in the town of Seaforth on a site on Main street. It is for post office and customs purposes, and also to provide armoury accommodation for 'C' Company, 33rd Huron Regiment. That is quite warlike, I am going in for gore.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I notice the minister is erecting these armouries in Ontario and the other provinces, but I do not see many of them in Quebec.

Sudbury public building, $20,000.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the committee votes that item for a post office at Sudbury, I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General, whom I regret not to see occupying his seat just now, to the manner in which the post office at that place is being managed from the point of view of the use of the French language. I have a knowledge of what is going on, having had myself occasion personally to complain of the management of that office. The population of Sudbury is in part French, and I noticed that in that office there is not a single French-speaking clerk, and besides very little attention is paid to the French-speaking population having to transact business there. Letters addressed in French are delayed two or three days and are delivered on the go-as-you-please plan.

I take no exception whatever to the amount applied for, but I hope that the hon. the Postmaster General will take cognizance of these facts, and when he appoints a new postmaster, will see to it that fair treatment is extended to the French-speaking people of that district, which makes up at least fifty per cent of the population. The hon. Minister of Railways represents the constituency in which Sudbury is situated and he knows that the remarks which I now make are warranted.

Hon. F. D. MONK. (Translation.) I note what my hon. friend says. Sudbury is well known to me. I have travelled extensively through Ontario, and I realize how important it is to provide post offices with clerks who can speak and understand French, in order to meet the needs of the people inhabiting that district. The hon Posmaster General is absent, but I will see that the statements just made by the hon. gentleman be laid before him, and I am sure they will bear fruit.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Rouville). (Translation.) I am glad that the hon. member for Rimouski has called the attention of the House to what is going on at Sudbury However, it may be well for him to bear in mind that the Postmaster General is quite in a position to remedy that state of things. I appointed two years ago for New Ontario a French-speaking inspector, Mr. Limoges, a true French Canadian and an honest man.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Is he a Conservative?

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) A former Conservative who a few years ago joined the ranks of the Liberal party. Moreover, his political leanings have nothing to do with the question; we are only concerned with his qualifications. Is Mr. Limoges no longer to be regarded as a good French Canadian, because he is a Liberal? I appeal then to the hon. gentleman to call the attention of his colleague the Postmaster General to the fact that in the district of New Ontario there is a French-speaking inspector and that will suffice, I trust, to induce him to appoint at Sudbury a man who understands and speaks French.

There is a considerable number of French-speaking people, not only at Sudbury, but in other towns of Ontario as well, and at times the complaint is heard that our fellow-people cannot make themselves understood in public offices. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works gill give orders towards doing away with such grievances.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) What strikes me in the first place, it is that the condition of things pointed out by the member for Rimouski cannot be easily remedied through the inspector who has been appointed by the hon. member for Rouville,

If I understand rightly the hon. member for Rimouski, he complains that people cannot make themselves understood when they speak French. That is not a grievance which the inspector can do away with. It is a rather grievous state of things which exists since the time when that post office was under the management of my hon. friend from Rouville himself. So that we are called upon to make amends for the wrong-doing of the former Postmaster General in person.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) My hon. friend loses sight of the fact that the Postmaster General whoever he may be, is not ubiquitous, and that, in any post office department, it is primarily to the inspector that the minister has recourse. When a complaint is made to my hon. friend, he refers it in the first place either to the architect, or to the inspector, according to circumstances. It is the first time that this grievance of the French Canadians in the vicinity of Sudbury is brought to my attention, and I am satisfied that were the case referred to Mr. Limoges, he would at once find a remedy. My hon. friend should bear in mind that there are about fifteen thousand post offices in the Dominion. Out of that number it may be found that there are some grievances which it is not possible to do away with at once.

My hon. friend, in spite of all the obloquy which has been heaped on them in the province of Quebec, has no right to insinuate that the former administration was unfriendly to our fellow-countrymen. It was my aim, while I was Postmaster General, as I suppose it is the aim of the Minister of Public Works to-day, to show a spirit of fairness for all, without distinction of race or religion.

However, did I wish to be personal in my reply to my hon. friend I might say that he showed neither liberality nor generosity in his dealing with his compatriots since he has become Minister of Public Works. What has he done since September 21st? He has dismissed ninety French Canadians as against ten of other nationalities.

In what manner did he deal wtih the employees of this House? Mercilessly, he dismissed poor labourers on the eve of Christmas and New Year's Day, most of them French Canadians, the heads of large families. Coldly, without regard to the welfare of their families, he thanked them for their services. One of these victims is to be seen just now, a piteous sight, going through the lobbies of the House of Commons. What was his crime? He threw the cloak of charity over a man who occupies a high position. And the hon. Minister of Public Works insinuates that I have neglected and ill-treated my compatriots of the province of Quebec! I think my hon. friend should show more caution, for walls have ears.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I very much regret that unwarrantable outburst of my hon friend's temper. What I contended was that whenever some old-time grievance is brought to the attention of the government, these hon. gentlemen opposite invariably suggest a remedy, which they claim is easy of employment. I think it is a fair answer to say: if those remedies are so easy of use, why did you not have recourse to them when you were in power, seeing that those grievances have been standing for such a length of time. As regards the insinuations which the hon. member thinks fit to make against me just now, I may say that they are entirely without foundation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) I am not making any insinuations; I am replying to the hon. minister who is bringing charges against me.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Those statements are absolutely foundationless, and I am surprised that a man of his position should cast a slur such as that. What happened? A number of complaints have been made against men in my department. I insisted that these complaints should be specific, laid down in writing. When I found myself in possession of those complaints, made by responsible people, under conditions which have been approved of by both sides of the House, complaints made by members of this House, and on a par with those which brought about the dismissal of so many men in my constituency in 1896, what did I do? I appointed a commissioner known to be just, honest and fair, and instructed him to make inquiry into all such complaints. It is absolutely untrue to say that I dismissed any of my employees. All those complaints without exception are before that commissioner, and until I get his report, subsequently to an inquiry conducted with care and in accordance with the rules of justice, no one has a right to say that he is dismissed.

Is this hon. committee desirous that I should quote from the Hansard of 1896, the answers of the ministers themselves who, on being asked, why they had dismissed a public officer answered: We have dismissed him because that was recommended to us. 'By whom?' was the further question. We shall not say. We refuse to give the names of the informers. Is my hon. friend anxious that I should give names?

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) The hon. minister is putting a question, and I shall answer it. On several occasions the Minister of Public Works has stated in this House that the Laurier government

had dismissed in the county of Jacques-Cartier hundreds of men in 1896. I shall not ask for twenty-five names; I shall be content with twelve. As for me, I do say that the hon. minister has dismissed scores of them since he holds a portfolio. He instituted his commission of inquiry only after having mercilessly dismissed large numbers of my compatriots.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) That is incorrect. When that long list was handed to me, I notified a certain number of men of what was taking place and I told them: There will have to be held an inquest on every one of you without exception.

It only seems proper that in launching charges such as those, an effort should be made to clothe them with a semblance of truth. I stated that not one of those men would be dismissed without an inquiry.

My hon. friend from Rouville is not always here, and I do not complain about it

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Neither is the minister.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) However, that puts me under the necessity of repeating what I already stated here, that is to say, that not a single man has been dismissed without notification, without inquiry, and without a specific charge having been laid against him and put in the hands of the minister.

On the other hand, as I have already said, in my constituency, public officers have been dismissed without inquiry and without any specific charge having been forwarded to the minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Quote a single name.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I shall give several.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Name them.

Mr. MONK (Translation.) Here they are. On May 17, 1897, I put the following question:

Mr. GILLIES (for Mr. Monk) asked:

1. How long has Joseph Sauvé, lately bridgemaster No. 5 bridge, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, been in the employment of the government?

2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th April last?

3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?

4. Who was named bridgemaster in his place, and by whom was the new nominee recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS:

Joseph Sauvé, lately bridgemaster, bridge No. 5, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, has been employed during the season of navigation since the 1st May, 1878. His services were dispensed with at the request and on the representation of the members of parliament for Montreal districts; the department did not receive any written complaint against Sauvé. Joseph Archebierre was appointed bridgemaster in place of Joseph Sauvé.

That Mr. Sauvé had been appointed by the Hon. Rodolphe Laflamme, Minister of Justice in the Mackenzie adminstration. That book is full of similar dismissals

Conditions in the civil service are improving, but there still remains much to be done before it is in such a state as I would like to see it in.

There is also the case of Joseph Deschamps, who must have been appointed under the Mackenzie regime. On the same date, I put the following question:

Mr. Gillies (for Mr. Monk) asked:

1. How long has Joseph Deschamps, lately lockmaster No. 4 lock, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, been in the employment of the government?

2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th April last?

3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?

4. Has he been replaced by one Adolphe Fichaud, of St. Henri, brother-in-law of the member for Hochelaga?

5. Who recommended the new lockmaster for nomination?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS:

Joseph Deschamps, lately lockmaster at lock No. 4, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, has been employed during season of navigation since the 1st June, 1873. His services were dispensed with at the request and on the representation of the members of parliament for Montreal districts, no written complaint was lodged in the department. Adolphe Fichaud was appointed lockmaster in his place.

I do not intend taking up the time of the committee reading long lists of dismissals made in 1896, without any written complaint having been filed. And whenever the minister was asked why he had dismissed so and so, on the verbal complaint of whom, Mr. Blair over and over again would answer: I do not consider myself under any obligation to tell you. Is my hon. friend anxious that I should state his very words? I have them written down here, and shall quote them: Mr. Blair would say: I do not consider that the government is bound to give such information; that is going a little too far.

I repeat it, those dismissals effected from one end to the other of the Lachine canal were made without the names of the informers being known, without a single written complaint having been brought down. We were told: It has been done at the request of the members for the districts, indeed, some of them were discharged without the minister's knowledge.

There is also the case of Daoust of St. Anne, who was discharged after a mock inquiry had been held, and barring that case, no inquiries were held.

On finding that there were numerous complaints in Ottawa, complaints which appeared to me well grounded—to my mind the outside service in Ottawa has been in a large measure prostituted, if I may use such an expression, for political ends—I did not take action on these complaints, but I appointed a commissioner, and until his report has been received, there is absolutely nothing decided as to these men.

As to the reproach which has been hurled at me of having had recourse to measures too rigorous against the French Canadians, whether wisely or not, I shall abstain from answering the charge. All my life I have been devoted, without undue sycophancy, to that section of the Canadian people. I loved them, I tried to serve them without making a boast of it, and I would feel ashamed of myself were I to-day to show more than the requsite sternness against a section of the people which is dear to me. I never intended to do so, and never was guilty of such a fault.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) The hon. Minister of Public Works has himself brought this on himself by insinuating that the former administration had shown themselves rather hostile to the French Canadians of Ontario. He exhibited an intense love for our compatriots, when I recalled to him his dealings with the men in his department since taking the portfolio of Public Works. If his love for his compatriots is to be gauged by the number of dismissals effected by him, it must be admitted that it is a strange love indeed. If I compare his policy with that followed by his colleague, I cannot help saying that he has shown excessive harshness in his dealings with subordinate employees.

Now, as regards dismissals which are alleged to have been made in 1896, in the county of Jacques-Cartier, it is absolutely false to say that they were made by the score or by the half hundred. I challenge the hon. minister to name even ten people who have been dismissed without inquiry in the county of Jacques-Cartier.

He referred the other night to the case of Sauvé. He has just named two others, that makes three altogether, and I challenge him to name any others. It is all very well to talk with an eye to outsiders, but the hon. gentleman should stick to the facts; and let him name if he can fifty or one hundred French Canadians alleged to have been discharged in Jacques-Cartier in 1896. The hon. minister has overdone it in order to justify the odious dismissals which he effected just before Christmas and New Years, throwing out of employment hundreds of men. If my hon. friend had had more generosity he would, to say the least, have waited till the holidays were over before discharging these men in Ottawa and elsewhere.

What is going on just now? Three Montreal harbour commisioners are viciously taken to task because they are Liberals. They have made the port of Montreal what it is to-day and they have given satisfaction to every interest concerned. Indeed, the work they accomplished at Montreal has been eulogized even by foreigners. Delegations have represented to the government that these men should be maintained in office. But the hon. gentleman and his friends in the province of Quebec are just now giving a strange exhibition of themselves. They insist that these three commissioners should be dismissed, although their only fault is that they were appointed by the previous administration and are Liberals in politics. I must protest with all my might against such scandalous conduct. I state it to the shame of the minister, such things are done in the province of Quebec only. Our fellow countrymen are discharged mercilessly; nothing of the kind is seen in any of the eight other English-speaking provinces of the Dominion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Blondin). (Translation.) I beg to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we are drifting from the subject-matter of this debate, the estimates of the Department of Public Works and that this in out of order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Who has brought about this discussion, Mr. Chairman? It is the hon. Minister of Publice Works, who in answer to the member for Rimouski, insinuated that the former administration did not protect the French Canadians. I am anxious to defeat that attempt at making capital out of my countrymen's feelings in the province of Quebec, and I shall not let my hon. friend repeat such insinuations as long as I have a seat in this House. Let us return to the question.

The harbour commissioners of Montreal are three in number, Messrs. Stephen, Ballantyne, Geoffrion. These thoroughly qualified men, have through their efforts, their intelligence, made the port of Montreal what it is to-day. For some years past, they have given their whole energy to the carrying out of gigantic works. Their ability, their honesty has never been questioned. All the public corporations of Montreal, the board of trade, the shipping federation, the transportation companies, are anxious that the commissioners be main-

tained in office. Alone a few politicians who have no interest in the business development of the metropolis, demand that the commissioners be set aside. Public bodies, represented by delegates of the highest standing—most of them Conservatives—have interviewed the Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine. They have entreated them not to sacrifice the great interests of the metropolis to the selfish and grudging views of politicians. It is a secret for no one that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine will not give in. Indeed, they are going to resist the demands made on them by politicians. The Minister of Public Works, accustomed as he is to beheading my fellow-countrymen, would be quite ready to sacrifice the three commissioners; but he is confronted by the opposition of the great public bodies of the metropolis. I challenge him to dismiss the Montreal harbour commissioners. He expends all his courage in throwing out of employment, without inquiry, the poor labourers in his department.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I find it difficult to conceive what has prompted the statements which have just fallen from the lips of my friend, and that without any provocation whatever. It seems as if the hon. member would be glad to draw me into a discussion and ensnare me into dealing with the question of the Montreal harbour commissioners, and that I shall not do. I shall not answer his charges which he has repeated, in spite of my absolute denial that men in my department had been dismissed just before the holidays, a statement which is absolutely false. The hon. member must be aware of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) I can give names.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) If any have been dismissed, it is without my knowledge, and I alone have the right to discharge people in my department.

An inquiry is being carried on, and no decision will be taken previous to the report of the commissioners.

Now, the hon. member contends that I stated public employees had been dismissed by hundreds in my county; that is preposterous, there are not such large numbers of them. I stated that dismissals had been effected in 1896 from one end of the Lachine canal to the other without any complaints having been made, without these victims having had a chance to vindicate themselves.

Does my hon. friend insist that I should give him the names of all these discharged employees? Their names are in Hansard, and the facts are common knowledge throughout my constituency.

As regards the Montreal harbour commissioners, is it not known that, in 1896, the Liberal party did away with all the then commisioners, and Liberals have very bad grace to complain to-day because it is proposed to deal with them in the same way as they have dealt with our friends in 1896. Is it not a fact, that in 1896, the Liberal party did away with these commissioners, although there were no complaints laid against them, and simply because they had been appointed by the Conservative government? Is it to be wondered at, under the circumstances, if many are of opinion that a board such as that of the harbour of Montreal, should be made up of men whose views agree with those of the government?

Is that an untenable proposition? For instance, as regards the commissioners which I have in my department. I refer to the board of advisers in connection with the art museum, whom I found in office when I arrived here, a board made up of two English-speaking gentlemen and of the hon. Senator Boyer, an old-time opponent, could not the gentlemen making up that board be changed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) What remuneration do they get?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Should we not be left free to appoint others in their stead?

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) What is their remuneration?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Whatever the remuneration may be, that does not alter the question. The Montreal harbour commissioners are not employees in the sense referred to this evening. That they may be changed is an opinion which may very well be defended. Their position is not at all comparable with that of employees earning their livelihood in the service of the government. Let my hon. friend from Rouville cool down, there is no justification for that sympathy which even extends to the Montreal harbour commissioners. He and his friends had no pity whatever in 1896 for the then commissioners.

As regards the question which he has brought forward, it is under consideration, and he may rest assured that the government will not show that hastiness which was a feature of his friends' conduct in 1896.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Before closing this debate, I may state to my hon. friend that the comparison he makes between the Fine Arts commission and the Montreal harbour commission is misleading. My hon. friend would not dare to dismiss the Fine Arts commissioners.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I did not speak of dismissing them, but I stated that their position was similar to that of the Montreal harbour commissioners.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) There is no similarity whatever between these two commissions. and the hon minister will not make us believe that there is. The Fine Arts commissioners receive no remuneration, not one red cent; they give their services free to the country, and the hon. gentleman would be at a loss to find men as well qualified as the Hon. Mr. Boyer and Sir Edmund Byron Walker.

I challenge the hon. minister to dismiss them; should he do so, he would incur the censure not only of Liberals, but of his own political friends.

As regards the Montreal board of harbour commissioners, the minister says that that question is under consideration, and that these gentlemen should not complain were the government to deal with them as their predecessors were dealt with in 1896 by the former administration.

In 1896, the board was partially renewed; at least one half of the commissioners were maintained in office. Later on a change was effected, an Act was put through establishing a permanent board. That board fulfilled its duty not only towards Montreal, but towards the country as a whole, and once more I challenge the hon. gentleman to relieve them of office. He is not in a position to do so, his influence with the governement is not strong enough. He knows very well that all the public corporations in Montreal would be up in arms against such a proposition. As I stated a moment ago, his whole influence in the cabinet is expended in beheading French-speaking employees, by the hundreds in the Department of Public Works.

Toronto customs examining warehouse, $300,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I suppose this is near the central station in Toronto?

Mr. KEMP. The old examining warehouse will have to be partially done away with on account of railway improvements in that locality. It is altogether too small, and I believe it is the intention of the government to erect a new examining warehouse near that, if they can get land at a proper price.

Mr. BUREAU. Is it the intention to dispose of the old warehouse?

Mr. KEMP. Part of it, I think, for railway purposes.

Mr. MONK. The examining warehouse at Toronto is absolutely inadequate. I think it will have to be disposed of and a new site bought, and a new building erected.

Mr. NESBITT. I would ask the minister to let this item stand until the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is here. I know he would like to speak on these Toronto items.

Mr. MONK. We can discuss this one on any other item. I would like to get through these public buildings, so that I can bring the necessary officers with me to-morrow, and the necessary notes for others.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I suppose if we leave one item, the hon. member for St. John will have the privilege upon that item of speaking of the Toronto buildings generally?

Mr. MONK. Certainly.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the committee to pass one item, No. 351, on page 92, to provide for the purchase or construction of a new cruiser and for expenses of maintenance. We want a new cruiser down in the gulf. The Customs Department had a steamer there for a great many years, the 'Christine.' That was abandoned, and another one was purchased named the 'Laurentian.'

Mr. SINCLAIR. Where was this steamer built?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Marine and Fisheries Department prepares the plans and advertises for tenders. The Customs Department have nothing to do with building steamers.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is it the policy to build these small steamers in Canada or abroad?

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I say, that is a matter belonging to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Last year we chartered the 'Laurentian,' formerly called the 'King Edward.' It is the intention to charter another steamer this year until this one is built.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) asked what was the policy of the government in regard to the construction of the vessel. This is an interesting matter, and very few members are present. It is a matter of interest in a great part of the country, and many people are interested in the policy of the government regarding the construction of its vessels. There is a large public opinion that holds that it is desirable to encourage such construction in Canada. No doubt many members would like to hear the minister on the point.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I cannot say that it is absolutely urgent to pass the item to-night. So far as I am concerned, my view is that we should build in Canada all the vessels that we require. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is building two or three vessels, and he has not presented any of his items yet.

In the estimates there are votes for new steamers, one for British Columbia and one for the lighthouse service on the St. Lawrence, so that that question can be answered when these votes come up. If there is any objection however I have no desire to press these items.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not directly interested but there are very few members here at present and unless it is urgent I would ask my hon. friend to allow it to stand until we have had an opportunity of hearing from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to his policy with regard to the vessels that he wishes to construct.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the hon. gentleman wishes it to stand I will offer no objection.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item stands.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. MONK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask for the business of to-morrow?

Mr. MONK. Bills will be taken up and then we will continue supply.

Mr. BUREAU. What department?

Mr. MONK. Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.42 a.m. Friday

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1911-1912.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2° 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn ; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider' Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., Northwest Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp. Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ACHIM, Mr. H., *Labelle.*

C.N.R. and Carillon & Grenville Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 970 (i).

La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord (B. 45) 1°*, 970 (i).

AIKINS, Mr. J. A. M., *Brandon.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 94 (i).

Civil Service Increases since 1900 (M. for ret.*) 561 (i).

Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 855 (i).

Denny, James, Relief (B. 112) 1°*, 3630 (ii).

Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2186, 2318, 2773, 3795 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Copy of Cor. *re* Construction, &c. (M. for papers) 1213, 1264 (i).

Hudson Bay Ports, Surveys, &c. *re* Navigation (Ques.) 3943 (ii).

——— (M. for reps.*) 3756 (ii).

Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2124 (ii).

Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6029 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4313 (iii) ; in Com. 4605 ; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) 4663 (iii).

Methodist Church (B. 133) 1°*, 4975 (iii).

Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2722 ; in Com., 2949 (ii).

AIKINS, Mr. J. A. M.—*Con.*

Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6429 (iv).

Wadge, Thomas Patent Relief (B. 16) 1°*, 643 (i) ; in Com., 2859, 2983 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Canada-Australia Trade (M. for papers*) 582 (i).

Continental Can. Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5207 (iii).

Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3225 (ii).

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 940 (i).

Montreal Central Terminal Co.'s. (B. 49) 1°*, 970 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Retention of (Ques.) 2062 (ii).

N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3130 (ii).

Private Bills, Suspension of Rules (remarks) 5902 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., 6th Rep. : M. to conc., 6062 (iv).

Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6550 (iv).

Rambaut, Thos. D., Patent Relief (B. 84) 1°*, 970, 1862 (i) ; in Com., 2855, 2985, 3280, 3479 (ii).

——— Patent Relief B. 84, on Order for Com., 3332 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept., (Gazette) 1491 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2643; in Com., 2930, 2945, 3021 (ii).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1981 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5909 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. A., *North York.*
Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c. (M. for copies*) 561 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) 1319 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Cable Rates, Res. (M.) to withdraw, 3448 (ii).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing, &c., on M. (Mr. Edwards) to Com. of Sup., 5725 (i).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Power for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
Newspaper Postage, Opinion of P.M.G. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 2291 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2348, 2352 (ii).
Parcel Post, Rural Mail Delivery, &c.: on M. for Sup., 4082 (iii).
——— Reply to Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4109 (iii).
Postal Regulations, Commission *re* Investigation (prop. res.) 2251 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 2376 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3352 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals, Welland (surveys) 5790 (iv).

ARTHURS, Mr. J., *Parry Sound.*
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3432 (ii).
Powassan Postmaster, Change *re* (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Gazette (Gazette) 1486 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2934 (ii).

BAKER, Mr. G. H., *Brome.*
Central Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 44) 1°*, 970 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case by M. P., Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Ques.) 2072 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3949 (ii).

BAKER, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Trust and Loan Co. of Canada (B. 108) 1°*, 3449 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Dom. Guarantee Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 795 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com. (amt.) 6576 (iv).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 970 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1635 (i).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3070 (ii).
Ottawa and Lake McGregor Ry. incorp. (B. 192) 1° m., 6495 (iv).
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6550 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. (B. 114) 1°*, 3828 (ii); in Com., 5202 (iii).
Union Bank of Canada (B. 57) 1°*, 970 (i).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B. C.*
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2471 (ii).
Labour Conditions, Emplymt. of Orientals in B.C. (remarks) 177 (i).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co. (B. 73) 1°*, 1410 (i).

BARRETTE, Mr. J. A., *Berthier.*
Berthier-en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c. (M. for papers*) 1409 (i).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3149 (ii), 4240 (iii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration of (Ques.) 974 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*
Battlefields Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 817 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6262 (iv).
London Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1665 (i).
Petroleum, Crude, and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902 (Ques.) 730 (i).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 4457 (iii); in Com., 5198 (iii).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, 523 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (promotions) 6280 (iv).
Immigration (regulations) 3913 (ii).
Wells, Edna Relief (B. 102) 1°*, 3049 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Wills, Annie Greek Relief (B. 173) 1°*, 5680 (iv).

BELAND, Hon. H., *Beauce.*
Asbestos Importations, Total Value, &c. (M. for ret.) 1590, 1817 (i).
Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 975 (i).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6306 (iv).
Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce, 4984 (iii).
Civil Service (mail clerks) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 4784 (iii).
Dalaire, L. P., Dismissal of (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6057 (iv).
Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2579 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Assiniboine River Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6061 (iv).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Station (Ques.) 975 (i).
See 'Scott.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3727 (ii).
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5959 (iv).
Lacombe, J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastian P. O., Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 974 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Levis Dry Dock, Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 3°, 4925 (amt.) 4934; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4972 (iii).
—— on Voting *re* M. for 3°, 4984 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re* (Ques.) 4260 (iii).
—— (M. for reps., &c.*) 4263 (iii).
See 'Lewis.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6305 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6477; (census) 6462; (International Institute) 6479 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490 (iv).

BELAND, Hon. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies) 3915 (ii).
Inland Revenue (explosives apparatus) 6604 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6597 (iv).
Labour Dept. (conciliation boards) 1511 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5478 (iii).
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5342 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6289; (salaries, &c.) 6618 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1530 (i).
Thibodeau, George, Resignation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

BELLEMARE, Mr. A., *Maskinongé.*
Budget, The, 5146 (iii).
Election Expenses in Maskinongé, Settlement of (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in 'Le Devoir' (read) 2452, 2664 (ii).
Medical Director General, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel Ice Breaker (Ques.) 5680 (iv).
Statue erected on Federal Land in Quebec City by Prov. Govt. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. R. B., *Calgary.*
Address, The, in answer to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 14 (v).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5286 (iii).
Alberta Interurban Ry. Co. (B. 33) 1°*, 969 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5264 (iii).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2432 (ii).
Premier Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2522 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 127 (i).
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5904 (iv).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on Order for Com., 5903 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2846 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Ducharme, Mr., Apptmt. as Commissioner (remarks) *re* Attacks on, 2830 (ii).
Elevators, Control by Govt., ref. to in debate on Address, 137 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2404, 3529, 3781 (ii).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ques.) 539 (i).
Grain Shipments from Ports in Canada, Quantity, Grades, &c. (Ques.) 536 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3963 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, ref. to in debate on Address, 132 (i).
Magdalen Island News Service (remarks) 4162 (iii).
Navigable Waters Pollution (B. 107) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Minutes of Meetings, Amounts expended, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1588 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Ice Breaking and Dredging (personal explanation) 3331 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2° 3352; in Com., 3360 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Conservation on Commission (Chicago canal) 6582 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4720 (iii).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2826 (ii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5366 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Midland) 1855 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2977 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6421 (iv).

BEST, Mr. J. A., *Dufferin.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6094 (iv).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 22 (Mr. Jameson) in Com., 2011 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Remarks *re* Agricultural Com. Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2155 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5770 (iv).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
British Preference, Increase of (Ques.) 553 (i).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Abolition of (Ques.) 557 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1082 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 6202 (iv).
Educational Bills, Ques. of Order, *re* Jurisdiction of Dom. Govt., 3873 (ii).
See 'Queens.'
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6457 (iv).
Highlands Bridge, Contract *re* Construction (remarks) 1197 (i); 5790 (iv).
Immigrant Inspection before sailing for Canada (remarks) 618 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs. on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2091 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 12; 2° and in Com., 939 (i).
Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 643 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port (Ques.) 554 (i).
N.T. Ry., Branch Lines to Montreal, Construction of (Ques.) 554 (i).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2664 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3874 (ii), 4750 (iii).
Queen's University Bill, Ref. to Min. of Jus. (remarks) 3730 (ii).
See 'Educational.'
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6469; (live stock industry) 6469 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1082 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3918 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1479 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine) 1952 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 155) in Com., 5946 (iv).
Cigarettes, Quantity manufactured and imported in each Prov. for 1905, &c. (Ques.) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6099 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5882 (iv).
Davidson, David George, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Dominion-Gresham Casualty Co. Amalgamation (B. 176) 1°*, 5831 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).
Freight Rates, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Grain Amt. Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2537, 2775, 3167 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Freight Rates, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3979 (ii).
Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6006 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4498 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1878 (i), 3375, 3411 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5836 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6335 (iv).
Race Track Meets: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Railway Committee, 13th Rep. (presented) 5999 (iv).
Rural Mail: *See* 'Civil Service,' 'Parcel Post.'
Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices (Prop. res.) 2247 (ii).
—— (M.) to stand, 2460 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co's. (B. 172) 1°*, 5680 (iv).
Seely, Keitha Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Sterling Life Assurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 72) 1°* , 1410 (i); in Com., 2448 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2895, 3011, 3542 (ii).

BOIVIN, Mr. G. H., *Shefford.*
Address, The, 497 (i).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
Fenian Raid Vets. Land Grant, &c. (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6642 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4969 (iii).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. to Legalize (Ques.) 575 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6642 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5830 (iv).

BOIVIN, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Van Antwerp, C.B., Employment by Inland Rev. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L. (Prime Minister), (*Halifax*).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 50 (i).
—— Precedence *re* (M.) 9 (i).
—— (M.) to Present, 519 (i).
—— Reply from H.R.H. (presented) 932 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5563 (iv).
Agricultural 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) *re* 2375 (ii).
Archives (B. 66) (prop. res.) 1282; 1°*, 1283; 2° m., 1440 (i); in Com., 1494 (i).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for (M.) 3343 (ii).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 1362 (i).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Banking Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1820 (i).
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c., (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
B.C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington (remarks) 2755 (ii).
B.C. Provincial Boundary, Agreement *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 972 (i).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs. (Ans.) 573 (i).
Boundary Waters Treaty, Apptmt. of Commissioners, on Inquiry (Mr. Pugsley) for Ret., 2589 (ii).
See 'Waterways Commission.'
Business of the House, Morning Sittings (M.) 4980 (iii).
Cabinet, Constitution of (remarks) in debate on Address, 56 (i).
—— Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Choice of Min. of Public Works (Ans.) 545 (i).
—— Stmt. by Hon. Mr. Monk (Ans.) 526 (i).
Cable Rates to G. B., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 3238 (ii).
Cable Rates Reduction, Papers laid on Table, 931 (i).
Cable Rates with G.B., Res. on Order Paper, Withdrawal of (remarks) 3448 (ii).
See 'Postal.'
Canadian Missionaries in China, Relief *re* Dangers (remarks) 230; (stmnt.) 268 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co. Subsidy (M.) for Com. on Res., 5841 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 187, Res. prop., 5690; in Com. on Res., 6082; on M. for 2°, 6331; in Com., 6341; 3° m., 6495 (iv).
Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation, on M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Papers, 1400 (i).
Car Shortage *re* Grain Shipments (remarks) 803 (i).
Census Enumerators, Delays in Payment (remarks) 1971, 2156 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment (remarks) 703, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act, (additional commissioners) Amt. (B. 104) Res. prop., 2862; in Com. on Res., 3143; 2° m., 3347; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. (B. 60) Prop. Res., 1019; in Com. on Res. 1032; 2° and in Com., 1434 (i); in Com., 3343; on M. for Com., 3540 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., Ques. of Order, 4577 (iii).
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).
Civil Service, Competitive Examination, Extension *re* (Ans.) 533 (i).
—— Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Civil Service Reform and Outside Service (Ans.) 727 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Reinstatement as Sessional Messenger (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
Commisioners of Investigation appointed by Govt., Number &c., (remarks) re Question, 5680 (iv).
See 'Dismissals,' 'Marine.'
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 10 (i).
—— List (presented) 703 (i).
—— (M.) to present Rep., 794 (i).
—— (M.) to add Names, 1019 (i), 2217 (ii).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4396 (iii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2848 (ii).
See 'Hansard.'
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 888 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service, Apptmt. of Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3248 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
—— Ruling of Dep. Speaker on Objection (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3255 (ii).
—— *See* 'Marine,' 'Civil Service,' 'Commissioners.'
Dismissals from Ottawa Dept., on Inquiry for Ret., 3834 (ii).
—— House of Commons Dismissals, on Inquiry (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Ret., 6807 (iv).
See 'Sessional, &c.'
—— Post Office Dismissals, since Oct 1911, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1395 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1175 (i).
Dismissals: *See* 'Inquiries, B. 19.'
Distribution Office, Salaries (M.) to send Mess. to Senate *re* concurrence in Rep., 6660 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) amt. B. 8 (Mr. Burnham) on M. for 2°, 1018 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Limitations as to Tenders (remarks) 1820 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act, on Prop Res. (Mr. Perley) 5560 (iv).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt. (remarks) 2854 (ii).
External Affairs Dept. Amt. (B. 58) 1° m., 971; 2° m., 1434 (i).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursement for Losses (Ans.) 528, 714 (i), 3333 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Question, 3148 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Investigation, Aptmt. of Sir William Meredith (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Fast Atlantic SS. Service (remarks) 5696 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6514 (iv).
Fife, Duke of, Decease (remarks) 2154 (ii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Fish Reduction Works at Arichat, Tel. from Prime Minister (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5706, 6067 (iv).
French Translator, Apptmt. of Mr. C. E. Duckett (M.) 1969 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 1971, 3060 (ii).
Good Roads Bill: *See* 'Highways.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Elevators,' 'Public ownership.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2535 (ii); on Order for 3°, 4153 (iii).
Grain Shipments: *See* 'Car Shortage.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6749, 6766 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 712; on M. for 2°, 796 (i).
G. T. P. Ry., Assiniboine Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6060 (iv).
—— Subsidy Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. White) 2297 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Form of Question, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (remarks) 269 (i).
Health Dept., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 3639, 3643; in Com., 3668, 3948 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
Hindoo Immigration: *See* 'Sikhs'.
Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 165.'
House of Commons, Employees, Salaries Increases (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Speaker, 6660 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 751 (i).
Immigration in Ont., Promise of Premier *re* Assistance (Ans.) 546 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c.: *See* 'Sen. & H. of C.', &c.
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2°, 1024; in Com., 1285, 1425 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt. (Ans.) 566 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Acquisition (Ans.) 569 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1000 (i).
I.C.R. and Brotherhood Unions, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 793 (i).
I.C.R. Management Board, Abolition of (Ans.) 570 (i).
—— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Internal Economy Commission (presented) 11 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4241 (iii).
—— *See* 'Man. Boundaries Bill.'
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Legislation, Joint Com. (M.) 2217 (ii).
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director (Ans.) 1813 (i).
Library Committee (M.) 795 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Library of Parliament, Rep. (presented) 11 (i).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1790 (i).
Manitoba Boundary Extension (B. 115) (M.) for Com. on Res., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835; 1° m., 3898 (ii); 2° m., 4263, 4483; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4494; in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 4649; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4705; on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com.; in Com. (amts.) 4836 (iii); 3° m., 4838 (ii).
Man. Boundaries, Conference *re* Separate Schools (Ans.) 715 (i).
—— Discussion of School Question (Ans.) 534 (i).
See 'Separate Schools.'
—— Eastern Extension (Ans.) 3936-7 (ii).
—— Eastern and Western Line, &c. (Ans.) 971 (i).
—— Financial Terms, &c. (Ans.) 558, 716 (i).
—— on Inquiry for, 1820 (i).
—— on Inquiry for Papers, 3834 (ii).
—— Manitoba Questions, (remarks) *re* answers, 581 (i).
—— Memorial, Stmnt. *re* Finances, &c. (remarks) 3631 (ii).
—— Papers *re* (remarks) 3448 (ii).
—— Settlement *re*, Cor. with Man. and Ont. &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) 777 (i).
Man. Boundaries: *See* 'Ont. Boundaries.'
Marcil, Mr. Tancrede, Application *re* Govt. Position (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
Marine Hospital Ships, Establishment of *re* Fishermen (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1624; (M.) to adjn. debate, 1629; Agreed to (Y. 87; N. 61) 1706 (i).
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. to legalize (Ans.) 575 (i).
Marriage Law, Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation (Ans.) 529 (i).
—— Ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, (Ans.) 574 (i).
See 'Ne Temere.'
Miner, Bill, Escape &c. (remarks) 939 (i).
Monday Sittings, Precedence of Govt. Business (M.) 2376 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Res. from Corn Exchange Protesting *re* Removal (Ans.) 2070 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Montreal, Patronage Committee, Recommendations *re* (Ans.) 1866 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port (Ans.) 554 (i).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* (Mr. Carvell) as Public Service Commissioner, on M. for Sup., 6541 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
—— Objection *re* Candidate at Elections (Ans.) 6336 (iv).
Morning Sessions: *See* 'Business of the House.'
Mounted Police, Increase in Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
—— Report (presented) 971 (i).
Naval Bill, Discussion *re* (Ans.) 4240 (iii).
Naval Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 58 (v).
—— Interview with Hon. Geo. H. Perley, &c. (remarks) 1576 (i).
Naval Policy, Promise *re* Rereferendum (Ans.) 526 (i).
—— Repudiation by Nationalists (Ans.) 714 (i).
—— Speeches in Election Campaign, &c. (Ans.) 552 (i).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1869 (i); 3141, 3393, 3437 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Commission of Investigation *re* Construction (remarks) 2061 (ii).
See 'Gutelius.'
N. T. Ry. Station at Quebec City (remarks) 6786 (iv).
National Waterways Treaty, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3833 (ii).
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., 767, 771 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Power of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 798 (i).
—— Questions asked of late Govt., Concurrence by present Govt. (Ans.) 719 (i).
—— Stmnt. of member for Peterborough (Ans.) 731 (i).
See 'Marriage.'
Newspaper Articles *re* Dismissals, Ruling *re* Reading, 3058 (ii).
Notes: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, *pro forma*, 9 (i).
Old Age Pensions (M.) for Special Com., 2217 (ii).
Ontario Boundaries Extension (B. 152); (M.) for Com. on Res., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5270; 1°*, 5271 (iii); 2° m., 6155; in Com. 3°*, 6188 (iv).
See 'Manitoba Boundaries.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Ottawa City Federal District, Referendum *re* (Ans.) 1356 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Pets, &c., 979 (i).
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c. (remarks) 2447 (ii).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1396 (i).
Parliament, Limit of Session, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 557 (i).
—— Redistribution Bills, &c., Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor, 545, 715 (i).
Peace Memorial Monument, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5969 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 4460 (iii); (explanation) 4550 (iii).
Petroleum, Crude and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902 (Ans.) 730 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Dismissal from H. of C. (Ans.) 2066 (ii).
Postal Regulations, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2285 (ii).
—— on M. to take in Mondays (remarks) 2376 (ii).
See 'Cable.'
Preferential Trade within the Empire (remarks) in debate on Address, 55 (i).
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec (Ans.) 534 (i).
P. E. I., Better Terms, on M. for Sup., 5173 (iii).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6143 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry Service, Tel. sent to A. A. McLean (Ans.) 1578, 1581 (i).
Printing of Parliament, Com. (M.) 795 (i).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 6578 (iv).
—— Extension of Time (M.) 930 (i).
—— Refund of Fees (M.) 930 (i).
Private Secretaries: *See* 'Civil Service B. 60.'
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Sask. Legislature *re* Transfer of Resources (Ans.) 2578 (ii).
Provl. Boundaries: *See* 'B.C.', 'Man.' 'Ont.' 'P.E.I.', 'Ungava,' 'Que.'
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light, Co.) on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5833 (iv).
Provincial Control of Western Natural Resources, Promises *re* (Ans.) 553 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 657, 1916 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension (B. 151)—(M.) for Com. on Res., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5268 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 6160; 3° m., 6188, 6338 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Reconstruction, Plans, Tenders, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1402 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) 4757; on Order for Com., 4237 (iii).
Questions not answered (M.) *re*, 6732 (iv).
Race Tracks: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 165.'
Ry. Act (tariffs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1016; on M. to resume adjnd. debate, 1821 (i).
——— (remarks) 2499, 2531 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2501 (ii).
Ry. Bridges, N.B., Subsidies (prop. res.) 5691 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Railway Committee, 13th Rep., on M. (Mr. Blain) 5999 (iv).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4122 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies (B. 183) (prop. res.) 5681; in Com. on Res., 6060; 1°*, 6061 (iv).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1916 (i).
Reciprocity, ref. to in Debate on Address, 51 (i).
Red River Pollution, on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
Renfrew, S., Vacancy, Issue of Writ (remarks) 1576 (i), 1971, 2059, 2377 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2225 (ii).
Restaurant Committee (M.) for Com., 710 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 2377 (ii).
Revised Statutes, French Translation B. 65 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1439 (i).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonald) 3450 (ii).
St. Eustache Election Meetings, Stmnts. of Quebec Ministers (Ans.) 553 (i).
St. John Harbour Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities (Ans.) 567 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy (B. 188) 3° m., 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges.'
St. Lawrence River Water Power, Res. from Board of Trade, Montreal (Ans.) 2457 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Saturday's Sittings (M.) 6186 (iv).
——— (stmnt.) 5831 (iv).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) B. 75, in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills (remarks) 6493, 6577 (iv).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B. (Ans.) 541 (i).
Senate Vacancies in N.S. (remarks) 1576 (i).
——— Pet. *re* French Apptmt. (remarks) 2755 (ii).
Separate Schools, Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members (Ans.) 4247 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries.'
Sessional Employees, Number dismissed (Ans.) 569 (i), 2064 (ii).
Sikhs, in B.C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives (Ans.) 2457 (ii).
Solicitor General, Appmt. of (Ans.) 546, 1816 (i).
——— Payments to Min. of Jus., &c. (Ans.) 725 (i).
——— Vacancy (remarks) 1577 (i), 5162 (iii).
Speaker, Election of (M.) 2; Reply to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 5 (i).
Speaker, Deputy (M.) 519, 523 (i).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2462 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Archives (salaries) 6462 (iv).
Canals—Welland (surveys) 5789 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Archives (dep. minister) 6460 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 1035 (i).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries) 6460 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Fisheries (International Fishery Commission) conc., 6778 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (stenographers, &c.) 6461; Senate (sessional indemnity) 6460 (iv).
Militia (automobiles) 5520 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6485; (claim of Mrs. Wiley) 6489; (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486; (honorarias *re* Pelagic Sealing) 5810; (La Société Nationale Gymnastique) 5811; (Olympic games) 6486; (retiring allowance to Staff Sergeant Codd) 5811 (iv).
Mounted Police (pay, subsistence, &c.) 5175 (iii); (pensions) 6485 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5342 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings (Chatham, conc., 6804 (iv); Ottawa (examining warehouse) 1950; Ottawa (H. of C., addition) 1951 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (French River) conc., 6777 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 5597; (rolling stock) 6461 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Annuities Act) 701 (i).
Weights and Measures (inspection) 5828 (iv).
Supreme Court of Canada, Division of (Ans.) 547 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2160; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2615; in Com., 2942, 2866, 3024, 3564, (ii) 4081; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4146 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6667 (iv).
Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).
Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate (Ans.) 545 (i).
See 'Parlt.'
Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delay *re* Payments to Dep. Ret. Officer (remarks) 1708 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) (prop. res.) 5681; in Com., 6405 (iv).
——— Subsidy; in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iv).
Thompson, Dr., Dismissal, &c., (remarks) 6784 (iv).
Trade Commissioner to the Empire, Apptmt. *re* (Ans.) 5951 (iv).
Transportation Question: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2060 (ii).
Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. B., 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5941 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6180 (iv).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., &c., 983 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6692 (iv).
——— Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt. (Ans.) 533 (i).
See 'Boundary Waters.'
Wednesday Sittings, Govt. Business (M) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).
Winnipeg Military Property Sale: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Yukon Judges Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5405 (iii).

BOULAY, Mr. H., *Rimouski.*
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs (Ques.) 3151 (ii).
Bourque, Geoffrey, Accident on I.C.R., Inquiry *re* (M. for reps.*) 2459 (ii).
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c., (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue (Ques.) 1864 (i).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5807 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Dismissals in Rimouski County (remarks) 1276 (i).
Dupont, Rene, Dismissal as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 1864 (i).
I.C.R., Board of Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).
——— Fences, Number of Rods, &c., Campbellton Division, (Ques.) 6748 (iv).
Laurier, C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich. (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, R., Immigration Agent at Detroit (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Lemieux, Mr., Appointments to Govt. Service, List (read) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4916 (iii).
Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Roy, Wm., Complaint of H. Boulay *re* I.C.R. (Ques.) 934 (i).
——— (M. for papers, &c.,) 1391 (i).
St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse killed on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Sayabec Post Office, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).
Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).
SUPPLY—
Justice, Administration of (Montreal Circuit court) 6597 (iv).
Militia (properties) 5539 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6297 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Sudbury) 1953 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (highway crossing) 5601; (locomotives) 5655 (iv).
Sussex Street Property, Purchase by Govt., Total Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1359 (i).

BOULAY, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Temiskaming Lake Dam Construction, &c. (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).
Tourigny, Judge, Charges *re*, Govt. Action (Ques.) 3147 (ii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*
Algoma Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 969 (i).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Refusal of British Gunboat for Protection, Rep. *re* (remarks) 1198 (i).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Staples) in Com., 5201 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5199 (iii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissal &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 970 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Sudbury Post Office, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power, Name of Lessee (Ques.) 2293 (ii).
Cuillerier, Mr. Jos., Soulanges Canal, Electrician, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4457 (iii); 6183 (iv).
Dismissal of Conservative Postmaster *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 2295 (ii).
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
Isidore Chevrier, Charges *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
Lalonde, Damien, Rep. *re* Assault, &c. (Ques.) 4255 (iii).
Legault, Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 6183 (iv).
Methot, Denis, Apptmt. on Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 4255 (iii).
Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Mount Oscar Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier (Ques.) 4780 (iii).

BOYER, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Postmasters, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contracts, Expiration of (Ques.) 5951 (iv).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail, &c. (Ques.) 5260 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
——— Claims of Denis Martin for Damages (Ques.) 2292 (ii).
——— Employees, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4250 (iii).
——— Patronage, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (tobacco stamps) 5827 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5484 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6632 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5828 (iv).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
——— Date of Wm. Robert's Contract (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*
Quinze River and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 970 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 155) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation, &c. (M. for copies) 1396 (i).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6456 (iv).
Flags, Use of (B. 74) 1° m., 1410 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3990 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3680 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4353; in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4677 (iii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1069 (i).
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6494 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1939 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Railway Question: *See* 'Grain Shipments.'
Reciprocity Treaty with U.S., Cor. with British Ambassador (M. for copies*) 1817 (i).
——— Cor. between Can. Govt. and U.S. (M. for copies*) 1817 (i).
Red River Pollution, on M. for Sup., 5166 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6600 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1479 (i).
Militia, Ques. of Order, 5538 (iii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5991 (iv).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Budget, The, 5083 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255, 6456 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3169 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3979 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3672 (ii)
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can. (remarks) 2426 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6196 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4286 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3385 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 6464 (iv).

BROUILLARD, Mr. O., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
I. C. Ry., Change in Pay Day (Ques.) 3310 (ii).
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Budget, The, 5103 (iii).
Chateauguay Co., Inundated Lands, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 6660 (iv).
Customs Smuggling Case, Ques. of Priv., 2216 (ii).
Tomatoes, Prices in U.S. (remarks) in debate on Budget, 5103 (iv).

BUCHANAN, Mr. W. A., *Medicine Hat.*
Address, The, 403 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5557 (iv).
C. P. Ry. Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers (Ques.) 5262 (iii).

BUCHANAN, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Car Shortage in the West (remarks) 1709 (i).
——— Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1714 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1507 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement (Ques.) 571 (i).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal (Ques.) 552 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3498 (ii), 4077 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4004 (ii).
See 'Car,' &c.
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).
——— Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 728 (i).
Police Point Reserve Transfer (M. for papers*) 5557 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes investigation act) 1498 (i).
Public Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 2212 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2886 (ii).
United Gold Fields of B. C. (B. 93) 1°*, 2217 (ii).

BUREAU, Hon. J., *Three Rivers, St. Maurice.*
Asbestos Manufactures (remarks) *re* M. for Ret., 1591 (i).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political.'
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Dismissal for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6053 (iv).
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re* (Ques.) 1210 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) on Amt. (Mr. Proulx) to M. for 3°, 6064 (iv).
Lemieux Family, appointed by late Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Miner, Bill, Rumoured Presence in Ottawa (remarks) 939 (i).
Political Literature, Distribution *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6517 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals, General Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6305 (iv).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1210 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033; Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1077; Customs (salaries) 1040; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1040, 1061; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1056; Militia (salaries) 1038; Post Office (salaries) 1067 (i).
Mines (French reports) 6490; (ore deposits) 6490 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 6285 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Three Rivers, Inland Revenue Charges against Collector C. D. Hebert (Ques.) 1209 (i).

BURNHAM, Mr. J. H., *West Peterborough.*
Address, The, 318 (i).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Budget, The, 5101 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (deposit) Amt. (B. 8) 1°m., 337; 2°m., 1017 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 4068 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3704 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1636 (i).
Marriage Law, Par. in Toronto 'Star' (Ques.) 3941 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Owners of Paintings, &c. (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
——— Purchase of Paintings, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1875 (i), 3379 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Old Age Pensions (prop. res.) 1362 (i).
——— (remarks) 1829 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6133 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3877 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2506 (ii).
Railway Transportation Question, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1906 (i).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3488 (ii).

BURNHAM, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Combines Act) 1518 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5502 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2658 (ii).

BURRELL, Hon. M. (*Minister of Agriculture*) *Yale-Cariboo.*
Agricultural Aid and Encouragement (B. 100) 1° m., 2849 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 5277 (iii); 3° m., 5561 (iv).
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6475 (iv).
Apples and Fruit Growing in N.S. (remarks) 1721 (i).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of (Ans.) 558 (i).
Cattle Quarantine, Res of Chamber of Commerce, Beauceville (remarks) 4985 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Payments to (remarks) 935, 1021, 1199 (i), 3835 (ii), 4460 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (Ans.) 2244, 3335 (ii).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Stmnt., 564 (i).
Census Enumerators, Percentage retained of Salaries (Ans.) 934 (i).
Census, Population of Canada, Quebec Cities, &c. (Ans.) 3336 (ii).
Census Report (presented) 4037 (iii).
Census Returns for Saskatchewan, on Inquiry for Ret., 4983 (iii).
——— Completion of (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5206 (iii).
Conservation Commission, Water Powers Report (presented) 407 (i).
Copyright Bill, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 557, 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 936 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5744 (iv).
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep., &c. (remarks) 6790 (iv).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction for Glanders (remarks) 5694, 5940 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).

BURRELL, Hon. M.—*Con.*
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4549 (iii).
Live Stock Record Association incorp. (B. 167) 1° m., 5553; 2° m., 6021; in Com., 6023 (iv).
Nursery Stock, Purchase for Experimental Farm, N.S. (Ans.) 3333 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 148 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5986 (iv).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Population of Canada and Quebec Cities (Ans.) 731 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5899; in Com., 6219, 6320 (iv).
Regina Census Return (remarks) upon Inquiry for (Mr. Knowles) 1574 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Experimental Farm, Buildings *re* (Ans.) 578 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6469 (iv); (census, &c.) 619 (i), 6462; (experimental farms, branch stations) 6477; (experimental farms, farm bulletins) 6465; (experimental farms, tobacco growing) 6478; (live stock industry) 6469; (Seed Control Act) 6469 (iv).
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Destructive Insect and Pest Act) 6479; (Dom. Exhibition) 6479; (fumigating stations) 6479; (International Institute) 6478; (Toronto exhibition) 6480; Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 6465 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1041 (i); (promotions) 6485 (iv).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 933 (i).
Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at New York (Ans.) 542 (i).

CARDIN, Mr. P. J. A., *Richelieu.*
Dauphinais, Mr. J. O., Dismissals, &c. (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
Dupre, Dr. H., Dismissals from St. Robert Post Office (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 3753 (ii).
Govt. Dredges, Contracting *re* Boarding Employees (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments (Ques.) 5952 (iv).
Investigations *re* Political Partisanships, Cost of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).
Lalonde, Alfred, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3753 (ii).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3753 (ii).

CARDIN, Mr. P. J. A.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Govt. Dredges, Emplymt. of &c. (Ques.) 4256 (iii).
St. Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
Sainte Rochs Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
——— (Ques.) 4248 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Sorel and Ste. Victoria Mail Contracts, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6643 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5828 (iv).

CARRICK, Mr. J. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Grain Act, Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2182, 2383 (ii).

CARROLL, Mr. W. F., *South Cape Breton.*
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt. &c. (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c. (Ques.) 804 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2092 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1444 (i).
Lightkeepers in N. S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Cup., 5234 (iii).
Lobster Twine Customs Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1072 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1649 (i).
Naval Service, Tenders *re* Shipbuilding &c. (Ques.) 558 (i).
New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5226 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1829 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 1509; (Gazette) 1475 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Marine (hospitals) 5238 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5544 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5377 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5219; (wreck subsidies) 5231 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6630 (iv).

CARROLL, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Burke's Head) 2045; (Cape Breton) 2052; (Cow Bay) 2055 (ii).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5831 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2872 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 82 (i).
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 2449 (ii).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6247 (iv).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 1813 (i).
Bath Postmistress, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices, into Canada for 1908-9-10 (M. for ret.) 1267 (i).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3338 (i).
Canadian Agencies in Europe, Names of Appointees (Ques.) 5261 (iii), 5557 (iv).
Canals Staff, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt, *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 1414 (i).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer N.B., Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4564 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6089 (iv).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4395; in Com., 5483 (iii).
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5550 (iv).
Diamond Light and Heating Co., Examination *re* Public Accounts, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 5832 (iv).
See 'Public Accounts.'
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 899 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1074, 1166 (i).
See 'Marine.'
Dredges and Boiler Inspection (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5554 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6252, 6256 (iv).
See 'Volunteer.'
Franco-Canadian Relations (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5759 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N.T.Ry. Commission, British Subject, &c. (Ques.) 4038 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3966 (ii).
Immigration Agent, Mr. Sevigny, Apptmt., Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 1588 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2429 (ii).
I.C.Ry. Supt., Application of Member of H. of C. (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5409 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5959; in Com., 6010 (iv).
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director (Ques.) 1813 (i).
McLean, W. S., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang (Ques.) 4780 (iii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4324; in Com., 4521; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 4653 (iii).
Man. Boundaries Bill, Voting (Mr. Mondou) on 2°, Ques. of, 4397 (iii).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrede, Application *re* Govt. Position (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council (Ques.) 2855 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. of, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 3944 (ii).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Service Commissioner, on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-collector at Richibucto, N.B. (Ques.) 4780 (iii).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants (Ques.) 1813 (i).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3409 (ii).
See 'Gutelius.'
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6235 (iv).
Patronage Committee, Montreal, Recommendation *re* (Ques.) 1866 (i).
Post Office Dismissals, General Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6333 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. 5832 (iv).
See 'Diamond Light.'

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine, on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Apptmt. Min. of Public Works (Ques.) 545 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2522 (ii).
Railway Bridges in N.B. Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6211, 6380 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6211 (iv).
Railway Ties, Contract with Dame Boulay (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Regiments of Foreign Born Citizens, Organization of (Ques.) 534 (i).
Renfrew, S., Election, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2237 (ii).
Robinson, Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer, N.B. (Ques.) 4241 (iii).
Rural Mail: *See* 'C. S. Bill 79.'
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re* (Ques.) 3049 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges B. 188.'
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3946 (ii).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
——— Dismissal, Apptmt. *re* &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. in Immigration Office, &c. (Ques.) 1205, 1814 (i).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 6462 (iv).
Canals (statistical officers) 5801 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1074; Railways (salaries) 1064 (i).
Excise (customs duties) 5827; (salaries) 5812; (travelling expenses) 5826 (iv).
Legislation—Senate (indemnities) 6460 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5454; (allowances) 5447; (associations and bands) 5529; (armouries) 5541; (automobiles) 5493; (clothing) 5521; (customs dues) 5522; (headquarters staff) 5536; (salaries) 5546; (schools of instruction) 5546 (iii).
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot Inquiry) 6487 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5309 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6282; Outside Service (salaries) 6621 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (London, England), 6655 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John dry dock) 3300 (ii); Ont. (French River) 6658 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Board of Management) 4137; (Campbellton) 4162; (construction) 4134; (working expenses) 4163 (iii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (staff salaries) 5801 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Weight and Measures (inspection electric lights) 5828 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2710; in Com., 3025 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6404 (iv).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Canadian.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6177, 6450 (iv).
See 'Fenian.'
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984, 2986, 3280, 3479 (ii).
——— reported from Com., 3280 (ii).
White, James, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5997 (iv).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. of Excise Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Yule, Mr., Collector of Customs at Aurora, Dismissal of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2399, 3190 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4808; Amt. neg. (Y. 44; N. 86) 4833 (iii).
Man. and North Western Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 92) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2160 (ii).

CHABOT, Mr. J. L., *Ottawa.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 129) 1°*, 4835 (iii); in Com., 5904, 5942 (iv).
Ottawa and Ungava Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1069 (i).

CHARLTON, Mr. W. A., *Norfolk.*
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Works (M. for rep.*) 3755 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6163 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6312 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*
Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5276 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1535 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*
Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
McIsaac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 5956 (iv).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers*) 4980 (iii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2017 (ii).
McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry. Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Port Hawkesbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5236 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4735 (iii).
Militia—(armouries) 5545 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving awards) 5228 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness) 2056; (Melford) 2056 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (generally) 2822 (ii).
Railways (surveys, &c.) 4226 (iii).
Weights and Measure (electric light inspection) 5828 (iv).
Telephone Wires strung on Telegraph Poles, permission of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).

CHISHOLM, WM., *Antigonish.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5295 (iii).
Antigonish County Public Works, Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2438 (ii).
Antigonish to County Harbour, Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 6227 (iv).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.) 1268 (i).
—— (Ques.) 548 (i).
—— Defective Answer to Question (remarks) 803 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
Dismissals *re* Inland Rev. Dept., Policy of Min. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*
—— Apptmt. of Commissioners *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3250 (ii).
—— Recommendation by sitting member (remarks) 1278 (i).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5274 (iii).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I. C. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Great Northern Mining and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3715 (ii).
McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3343 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4630 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 783 (i).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Public Works for N. S., Appropriations *re* Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2796 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6171 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6224 (iv).
Senate Vacancies in N. S. (remarks) 1576 (i).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6227 (iv).
Steam Trawling, &c., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2466 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6470, 6477; (bulletins) 6465 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Pictou and Cheticamp) 4736 (iii).
Militia (automobiles) 5496, 5519 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1952 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Bayfield) 2041; (Blue Rocks Island) 2041; (Cribbin's Point) 2046; (Gillis Point) 2056 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 5604 (iv); (Sylvan Valley) 4226; (Truro) 4231 (iii).

CLARE, Mr. Geo. A., *South Waterloo.*
Berlin P.O. Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).

CLARK, Mr. H., *North Bruce.*
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces (Ques.) 3339 (ii).

CLARK, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adj. debate, 1632 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3748 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations in Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2804 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1487 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2996 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6406 (iv).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 210 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 5085 (iii).
Christmas, Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
Civil Service Act B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5265 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1187 (i), 2039 (ii).
Grain Act, Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3475, 3818 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4023 (ii).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3654 (ii).
Horncastle, Isabella Helen, Relief (B. 147) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Cor., 1227 (i).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 599 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1681 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1874 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1380 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5839 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1932 (i).
Stewart, Ethel May, Relief (B. 120) 1°*, 4237 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Marine Dept. (salaries) 1053 (i).

CLARK, Mr. M.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3316 (ii).
Labour Dept. (combines, &c.) 1522 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5481 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2915, 3030, 3593 (ii); on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4148 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6676 (iv).
——— Mace on Table (remarks) 3619 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6415 (iv).
Tower Clock, Repairs to (remarks) 1575 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Brian, Mr., Dismissal from Customs Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Relief *re* Dangers (remarks) 229 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dumontier, Joseph, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector at Quebec, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 643 (i).
Farmers' Bank Investigation (remarks) *re* Report, 2853 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1311 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1657 (i).
Marriage Law, Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation (Ques.) 528 (i).
Newspaper Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Post Office, Change of Names (remarks) 3751 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ (remarks) 2059 (ii).
——— (M.) to adjn. Hse., 2218 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery Extension (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Statutes of Previous Session, Delay *re* Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1077 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1474 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Pelee Island) 642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals) 1326 (i).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 693 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. W. A., *North Wellington.*
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6756 (iv).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Comox-Atlin.*
Budget, The, 5144 (iii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, Capt. Newcombe's Rep. (M. for copy) 2467 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in Different Provinces (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years (Ques.) 1811 (i).

COCHRANE, Hon. F. (*Minister of Railways*) *Nipissing.*
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6315 (iv).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6246, 6305 (iv).
Albert Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (amt.) in Com., 6395 (iv).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312 (iv).
Antigonish to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 6227 (iv).
American Freight passing through Welland Canal (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Employmt. by Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 933 (i).
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry. Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3051 (ii).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims *re* Damages on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2244 (ii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6318 (iv).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6323 (iv).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Can. Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 189) 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6372 (iv).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 187) in Com. on Res., 6081; 1°*, 6082; 2° m., 6331; in Com., 6339; 3° m., 6371 (iv).
Can. Northern Ry., Bridge at Morris, Man., Objections *re* (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Can. Northern Quebec Ry., Maintenance of Road on L'Ile Bourdon (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
C.P.Ry. (Toulon) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1811 (i).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canal Staffs, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage of Freight, &c. (Ans.) 3051 (ii).
Cap. de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Car Shortage, *re* Transportation of Hay Crop (remarks) 2754 (ii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Chateauguay Inundated Lands, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 6661 (iv).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Accommodation, Pets. from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re* (Ans.) 934 (i).
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Cuillerrier, Mr. J., Soulanges Canal Electrician, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
——— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. *Scotia*, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
Dismissals, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4187 (iii).
See 'Canals,' 'I.C.R.', &c.
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Position on N.T. Ry. (Ans.) 2246 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6221 (iv).
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal of as Inspector, &c., on I.C.R. (Ans.) 544 (i).
——— Emplymt. as Contractor *re* Public Works (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Fraser, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4189 (iii).
Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction (Ans.) 3534 (ii).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Freight Rates in the West, Complaints *re* (remarks) 666 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3217 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 4976 (iii).
Goods Roads Bill: *See* 'Highways.'
Goulet, Apptmt. as Inspector of Stations, N.T.Ry. (Ans.) 3935 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2320 (ii).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Oliver) to Com. of Sup., 6205 (iv).
See 'Freight Rates,' &c.
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6324 (iv).
——— Nanaimo and Esquimalt Branch Line Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
G.T.P. Workshops at Quebec, Site for Building (Ans.) 3050 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry.: *See* 'N.T.Ry.'
Great Northern Mining and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N.T. Ry. Commission, British Subject (Ans.) 4038 (iii).
See 'N.T.Ry.'
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1459 (i).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re* (Ans.) 572 (i).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).
Hay Crop and Car Shortage: *See* 'Car,' &c.
Highlands Bridge, Construction *re* (remarks) 1198 (i).
Highways Improvement (B. 77) 1°m., 1571 (i); 2°m., 3633, 3666, 3667, 3946 (ii); 3°m., 4140 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6397 (iv).
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1263 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 745 (i).
I.C. Ry., Board of Management, Abolition of, on Stmnt. (Mr. Emmerson) to Com. of Sup., 5586 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Extension, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 994 (i).
——— Coal Supply, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 2457 (ii).
——— Condon, D. Murray, Transfer of Passenger Agent (Ans.) 3337 (ii).
——— Control by Ry. Commission, Res. *re* (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
——— Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5807 (iv).
——— Dartmouth to Denis Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 543 (i).
——— Employees Retirement Fund, Refund to dismissed men (Ans.) 2450 (ii), 5934 (iv).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
I.C. Ry., Estende to Baddeck Branch Line, Tender *re* (Ans.) 576 (i).
——— Estmere to Baddeck Branch Line, Tenders, &c. (Mr. McKenzie) on M. for papers, 2498 (ii).
——— Fences, Number of Rods on Campbellton Div. (Ans.) 6748 (iv).
——— Fraser, John, Dismissal as Inspector at Stellarton (Ans.) 3935 (ii).
——— Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation (Ans.) 6749 (iv).
——— Guysborough Branch, Construction *re* (Ans.) 571 (i).
——— Hillsborough Branch, Rails loaned, &c. (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
——— Hagerty, S. W., Lismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station at Mulgrave (Ans.) 4976 (iii) .
——— Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
——— Inspector, Application from Member of H. of C. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
——— I.C.R. and G.T.Ry. Arbitration, Delays *re* Settlement (Ans.) 3940 (ii).
——— Matapedia Branch, Inspection *re* Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii).
——— Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating, Stmnt. *re* (Ans.) 6744 (iv).
——— Moncton Shops, Heating Tenders, on Inquiry for Papers, 5762 (iv).
——— Moncton Shops, Transfer to Fraserville (Ans.) 544 (i).
——— 'Ocean Limited,' Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars (Ans.) 2241 (ii).
——— Pay Day, Change *re* (Ans.) 3340 (ii).
——— Pullman Car Porters, Promotion, &c. (Ans.) 1413 (i).
——— Ry. Ties at Sayabec, Name of Contractor, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
——— Rivière du Loup, Workshops at, Removal to Fraserville (Ans.) 570 (i).
——— Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, &c. (Ans.) 2586 (ii).
——— Snow Blockade, Delays *re* Trains (remarks) 1409 (i).
——— Station at Truro, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1413 (i).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6219 (iv).
Lachine Bridge: *See* 'Highlands.'
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lalonde, Damien, Rep. *re* Assault (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Lauzon, Désire, Emplymt. by Govt., References as to character (Ans.) 3538 (ii).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Methot, Denis, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 4255 (iii).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 713; 2° m., 797 (i).
N. T. Ry. Act (Commission) Amt. (B. 76) 1° m., 1571; in Com., 1866 (i); 3126, 3364 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Cost and Progress, in Com. on Bill, 3127 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Branch Lines to Montreal, Construction of (Ans.) 554 (i).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. Leonard, Duties assigned &c., (Ans.) 533 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau (Ans.) 2245 (ii).
——— Payments to Taschereau, Cannon & Co. (Ans.) 2245 (ii).
——— Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 2157 (ii).
——— Commissioners, Notification of Dismissal (remarks) 1196, 1199 (i).
——— Damages in Dorchester County, Amounts paid (Ans.) 6184 (iv).
——— Estimated Cost, Stmnt. *re* (Ans.) 3127 (ii), 6733 (iv).
——— Investigation, Apptmt., Salary, &c., of Messrs. Gutelius and Lynch Staunton (Ans.) 4242 (iii).
See 'Gutelius.'
——— Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted (Ans.) 932 (i).
——— Pets. re Subsidy to Montreal Branch Line (Ans.) 573 (i).
——— Quebec-Moncton Section, Completion *re* Operation by Govt. (Ans.) 723 (i).
——— Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
——— St. Damien Station, Change of Plans (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
——— Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Cor., &c., 759 (i).
N. T. Ry. (Montreal Branch), Subsidy, in Com. 5896, 6215 (iv).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease &c., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 933 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Meeting *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6230 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6235 (iv).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of (Ans.) 578 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Employee of Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co., (Ans.) 973 (i).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).
P. E. I., O'Leary to West Point Ry. Branch Line, Construction *re* (Ans.) 721 (i).
P. E. I., Winter Communication with Mainland, Ry. Service (remarks) 3832 (ii).
Public Works on Rys., Suspension *re*, Names and Locations (Ans.) 531 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6214 (iv).
Ry. Bridges in N.B. Subsidy (B. 188) 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6374; 3° m., 6394 (iv).
Ry. Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails (remarks) 6543 (iv).
Railway Question: *See* 'Freight Rates,' 'Grain Congestion.'
Railway Subsidies (B. 183) in Com. on Res., 5894, 6080; in Com., 6211, 6304; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6395; 3°m., 6395; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) to M. for 3°, 6396 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Roy, Wm., Complaint of Mr. Boulay *re* I.C.R. (Ans.) 934 (i).
Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895, 5896 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
St. Jean-Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ans.) 571 (i).
St. John, N.B., Ry. Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1406 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges, Subsidy, in Com., 6211 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges B. 188.'

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction (remarks) 4461 (iii).
——— Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4233 (iii).
——— Subsidy, Agreement *re* (Ans.) 3050 (ii).
——— Subsidy, Contract to Grand Falls (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
——— Contract *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. Carvell) for papers, 3946 (ii).
Sauve, L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 575 (i).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 6546 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6912 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claims of Denis Martin for Damages (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
——— Employees, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4250 (iii).
Soulanges Canal Patronage, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Souris Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iv).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6224 (iv).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., Appropriation *re* (Ans.) 2290 (ii).
——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 543 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Cornwall (lower lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (lock improvements) 6611 (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Murray (high spots) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (Bank St. bridge) 5791 (iv).
Canals—St. Peters (improvements) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste Marie (locks) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (guard pier) 5798; protection works) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 5799; (Newmarket) 5792 (iv).
Canals—Welland (construction) 6607; Port Colborne elevator) 5796; (surveys) 5786 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Railways (private secretary) 5808 (iv); (salaries) 1064 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5762, 6605 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 4136; (board of management) 4136; (branch lines) 4135 (iii), 5618, 5621 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 4137 (iii); (Campbellton) 4162; (Chatham diversion) 4137; (coal contracts) 5611 (iv); (construction) 4131; (construction, working expenses) 4162 (iii); (equipment account) 5677 (iv); (extensions, &c.) 674 (i); (facilities) 5809 (iv); (gratuity to Cuthbertson children) 5678; (Halifax docks) 5596 (iv); (Hampton) 675 (i), 4225 (iii); (highway crossings) 4226 (iii); 5595 (iv); (locomotives) 5609 (iv); (Moncton office) 5653, 6604; (heating at Moncton) 5611; (Moncton shops) 5604; (North Sydney diversion) 5610; (Riviere du Loup) 5654; (rolling stock) 5653; (Sydney diversion) 5658 (iv); (Truro) 4231 (iii); (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (board of commissioners) 5800 (iv); (litigation) 5801; (remuneration to G. T. P. Director) 5801; (staff salaries) 5801 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5765 (iv).
Railways—P. E. I. (car ferry) 5663; (facilities) 5661; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5659 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario and G. T. R. Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy (B. 186) 1°*, 6082; in Com., 6402 (iv).
T. & N. O. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6080 (iv).
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).
Transportation Question: *See* 'Freight Rates,' 'Grain Congestion.'
Trent Canal Water Powers, Claims of Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5615 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6218 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
Welland Canal Freight: *See* "American Freight.'
Welland Canal Water Power, Diversion, &c. (Ans.) 6748 (iv).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*
Budget, The, 5118 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. of Member for Edmonton *re* Prices in East and West, on M. for Sup., 807 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 2429 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1897 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3034 (ii); on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4150 (iii).

CODERRE, Mr. L., *Hochelaga.*
British Colonial Fire Insurance Co. (B. 10) 1°*, 643 (i).

CODERRE, Mr. L.—*Con.*
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 970 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4875 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignation of Messrs. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6553 (iv).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 794 (i).
Montreal Transcontinental Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 128) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Security Life Insurance Co. of Canada (B. 27) 1°*, 794 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station F) 1352 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Hamilton Harbour B. 32 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 2449 (ii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2109 (ii).

CROMWELL, Mr. F. R., *Compton.*
British Empire, Dom. Trust Co.'s Change of Name (B. 46) 1°*, 970; 2° m., 1201 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6263 (iv).

CROTHERS, Hon. T. W. (*Minister of Labour*) *East Elgin.*
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceeding *re* (Ans.) 572 (i).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4104 (iii).
Cement Merger, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
Coal Combine in B. C., Investigation *re* (Ans.) 4240 (iii).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1503 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B. C., Information *re* (Ans.) 568 (i).
Coal Miners Strike in the West, Settlement of (Ans.) 568 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement (Ans.) 571.
Conciliation Board, Apptmt. of, *re* International Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6259 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6563 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of by late Govt., Rep. of Judge Barron, &c. (Ans.) 2581 (ii); 6563 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1468 (i).

CROTHERS, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*
Hale, Thomas, Dismissal as *Labour Gazette* Cor., Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 4459 (iii).
House of Commons Waiters: *See* 'Waiters.'
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1419 (i).
I.C. Ry. Provident Fund (remarks) 5933 (iv).
Labour Conditions in B.C. (remarks) 178 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Apptmts. in Richelieu County (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Names of Apptmts. (Ans.) 1865 (i).
——— Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 1411 (i).
——— Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1442 (i).
Living, Cost of, Special Rep. (presented) 6332 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4339 (iii).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Labour Dept. (Ans.) 572 (i).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1886 (i).
SUPPLY.
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1500 (i); (contingencies) 6615 (iv); (*Gazette*) 1468; (industrial disputes act) 1500 (i); 6615 (iv); (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection *re* dangerous machinery) 1525 (i); (private secretary) 6615 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5625 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5782 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2912 (ii).
Technical Education Commission's Rep. (Ans.) 1202 (i).
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal (Ans.) 6783 (iv).
——— Investigation, Application to Min. of Justice *re* (Ans.) 3148 (ii).
——— Proceedings *re* (Ans.) 2455 (ii).
Waiters, Minimum Wages paid to, in Cities (Ans.) 3049 (ii).

CRUISE, Mr. R., *Dauphin.*
Chard, J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re* (Ques.) 2458 (ii).
Dauphin Custom House (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. 2571, 3189, 3510 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4788, Neg. (Y. 47; N. 89) 4793 (iii).
Justice, Depy. Min., Salary, Extra Payments, &c. (Ques.) 2458 (ii).
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4684 (iii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *North Simcoe.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5944 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 970 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 819, 836 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship, Lists dismissed by Lib. Party (read) in Com. of Sup., 1096 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Cor., 1391 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6055 (iv).
E. F. Piper, Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1201 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255 (iv).
Flaxseed, Stmnt. *re* Shipment of (Mr. Turriff) 661 (i).
Freight Rates, &c., on Public Ownership (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 664 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2170; in Com., 2182, 2324 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 130) 1°*, 4835 (iii); on Order for Com., 5947; in Com., 6563, 6762 (iv).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, 6563, 6762 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 733 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6004 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6046 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1728 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3417 (ii).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., 773 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1385 (i).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 2413 (ii).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6134 (iv).
Printing Com., 1st Rep. (M.) to conc., 3330 (ii).
——3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 6578 (iv).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 6578 (iv).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Public Works, Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2808 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to M. for Sup., 5443 (iii).
Railway Fares, Reduction to Students (remarks) 6277 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 664, 1923 (i).
Rideau Hall Improvements Amount expended from 1896 to Nov., 1911, (Ques.) 876 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6483 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Outside Ports (salaries) 1096 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3317 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 1511 (ii); (Gazette) 1481 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 630 (i); Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2827 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (branch lines) 5651; P. E. I. (car ferry) 5665 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2880, 3569 (ii).
——Ques. of Order, 3616 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry., and G. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 145) 1°*, 5257 (iii); on Order for Com., 5947; in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6422 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2854; on 3°, 3280 (ii).

DAVIDSON, Mr. A. L., *Annapolis.*
Decoste, Capt., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3259 (ii).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c. (Ques.) 3754 (ii).
Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3998 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3722 (ii).
I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Arbitration, Delays in Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 3939 (ii).
I.C. Ry. Branch Lines, Accommodation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
Lowe, Robt. S., Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3754 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations for N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2810 (ii).
Seamen, St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening (Ques.) 3754 (ii).

DAVIDSON, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5645 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3276 (ii).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 2242 (ii).
Matte, J. Arthur, Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Neuville and C.N.Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of (Ques.) 2067 (ii).
Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 554 (i).
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City (Ques.) 2071 (ii).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 2068 (ii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John, Iberville.*
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 3533 (ii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com. 5852 (iv).
Census Employees, Payments to (Ques.) 3335 (ii).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5808 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors (Ques.) 551 (i).
Garceau, Resignation as Commissioner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4962 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6640 (iv).
St. Jean and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ques.) 551, 571 (i).
SUPPLY—
Excise (revenue officers) 5824; (tobacco stamps) 5826 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6640 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Govt. Information *re* (Ques.) 3533 (ii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Address, The, 348 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5855 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 859 (i).
Combines in Trade, Restraint *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
Dismissals from Public Works, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 3058 (ii).
Dismissals in Hull, Official Inquiry (remarks) 550 (i); 4140 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
—— on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 954 (i).
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, (remarks) 5845 (iv).
French River (remarks) *re* Vote, 6729 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 3060 (ii).
—— Rep. in Ottawa Citizen *re* P.M.G. Speech, 1970 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Route and French River (remarks) 6785 (iv).
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3959 (ii).
Inquiries Act. Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1316 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6010 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4907 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1617 (i).
Naval Question, Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull (Ques.) 551 (i).
Naval Service, O.C. *re* Instructions, Circulars issued, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contracts *re* provisioning (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
—— Sale of (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (remarks) 1587 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4766 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6307 (iv).
St. Peter of Wakefield, Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
South Renfrew Elections, Speech of Minister of Customs (remarks) 1573 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Finance (contingencies) 1069; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1063 (i); Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1474 (i).
Miscellaneous Printing Bureau (plant) 6613 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 6286 (iv).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Louisville) conc., 6800 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6420 (iv).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of (Ques.) 550 (i).

DOHERTY, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice) *Montreal, St. Ann.*
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of (remarks) 1575 (i).
Companies Incorporation, ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal of (Ans.) 529 (i).
Criminal Code (log stealing) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) on M. for 2°, 944; 1821 (i); in Com., 2532 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. (B. 165) 1°m., 5550; in Com., 5862; 3°m., 5892, 5960; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 3150 (ii).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt. (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (additional judge) Amt. (B. 168) 1°m., 5553; in Com., 5893 (iv).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4239 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Transfer (B. 182) in Com. on Res., and 1°*, 5957; in Com., 6181 (iv).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin (Ans.) 4261 (iii).
Inquiries Act, (Dismissals) Amt. (B. 19) 1°m., 710; 2°m., 1021; in Com., 1283; 1414 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. (B. 156) in Com. on Res., 5407; 1°*, 5415 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5958; in Com., 6000; 3°m., 6062; on Amt. (Mr. Proulx) 6063 (iv).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Extra Judges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Justice, Dep. Min., Salary, Extra Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2458, 3150 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 939 (i).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency (Ans.) 713 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4845 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1642 (i).
Marriage Question, Ref. to Privy Council, Provl. Representations (Ans.) 3755 (ii).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judges (remarks) 3907 (ii).
——— (Ans.) 545 (i); 2855 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignations of Messrs. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6552 (iv).

DOHERTY, Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Montreal Judiciary, Pets. *re* Increase of Judges (Ans.) 545 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'
Ottawa County Superior Court Judge, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Deptl. Report (presented) 970 (i).
Penitentiary Employees Salaries, Increases *re* (Ans.) 1205 (i).
Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt. (B. 166) 1°m., 5552; in Com., 5892-3 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4751 (iii).
Revised Statutes of Can., French Translation Correction (B. 65) 1° m., 1197; in Com., 1438 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. (B. 75) prop. Res., 1414; in Com. on Res., 1497; in Com., 1714 (i).
Sorel Workshops, Investigations *re* Payment of Accounts (Ans.) 1205 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1035, 1039 (i); (promotions) 6584 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6597; (N. W. Territories) 6560 (iv).
Justice, Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6487; (litigation) 6561; (pecuniary claims) 6579 (iv).
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6600; (Dorchester) 6561; (McAllister, Mr., moving expenses) 6597; (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Association) 6583; (tuberculosis association) 6579 (iv).
Tourigny, Judge, Charges *re*, Govtl. Action (Ans.) 3147 (ii).
Yukon Territory Judges Act (reduction) Amt. (B. 123) M. for Com. on Res., 3630 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4555-6; 1°*, 4563; 2°*, in Com., 5567 (iii).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*
Camrose Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3512 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4795 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Strathcona) 2213 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt., 1° m., 229 (i).
——— (M. for com.) on prop. Res., 1817 (i).
Cement Duties compared with U.S. (remarks) on Tariff Commission Bill, 2727 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6103 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmts. between Dissolution of Parlt. and Sept. 31st (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Dairying Industry in Can., Grievances *re* weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5711 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084, 1179 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6266 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3706 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1704 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6482 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1084 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Cuba) 4722; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4727 (iii).
Militia (automobiles) 5498 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5385 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2720; in Com., 2973, 2997, 3550 (ii).
Williamsville Post Office, Kingston, Ques. of Priv., 6271 (iv).

ELLIOTT, Mr. Geo. A., *North Middlesex.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3686 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *East Middlesex.*
Immigration Office in London, Ont. (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Boxes in Ont., &c. (Ques.) 6782 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Address, The, 413 (i).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6246, 6304 (iv).
Albert Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6395 (iv).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 2246 (ii).
Bank Notes Printing: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* in Com. of Sup., 5299 (iii).
Beaumont Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).
Census Enumerators, Delay in Payments (remarks) 1971 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4565 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6101 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii), 6187 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5864 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) 892 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dismissals from Westmoreland County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, &c., Limitation as to Tenders (remarks) 1820 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6048 (iv).
Election Expenses in Albert, Delay in Payment (remarks) 2156 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6222 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion on Conc. (remarks) 6805 (iv).
Fisheries Protection, Sawdust Pollution (remarks) 937 (i).
Flags, Use of B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1410 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6078 (iv).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Public.'
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
Great Northern Mining & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2110 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1298, 1418 (i).
I.C. Ry., Board of Management, Abolition of, on M. for Sup., 5571 (iv).
——— Ques. 569 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Legislation *re* Acquisition (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— Branch Lines (prop. res.) 985, 1011 (i).
I.C.Ry., Instructions *re* Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1583 (i).
——— Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating (Ques.) 6743 (iv).
——— Passes to Employees, Newspaper Reporters, &c., Instructions from Ottawa (remarks) 2328 (ii).
——— Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed officials (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5930 (iv).
——— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6787 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C. Ry., Transfer of D. Murray Condon, Passenger Agent (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6014 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6024 (iv).
Man. Boundaries B. 115, in Com., 4609 (iii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 871 (i).
Moncton Heating Tenders, Inquiry for Papers, 5762 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1870, 1878 (i), 3130, 3372 (ii).
N.T. Ry. Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. R. W. Leonard (M. for cor., &c.*) 2246 (ii).
——— Resignation of (remarks) 1199 (i).
N.T. Ry. (Montreal Branch) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Meeting at Newmarket, Representations (remarks) 3057 (ii).
Northern N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com., 6229, 6231 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6234 (iv).
Ocean Limited Express Operation (remarks, in Supply on conc., 6774 (iv).
——— Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars (Ques.) 2241 (ii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1837 (i).
Ottawa Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re* (Ques.) 876 (i).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2351 (ii).
Patent Relief Bills, on M. for 2°, (remarks) 1202 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 1580 (i).
——— Car Ferry System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5220 (iii).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System (M. for copies*) 2072 (ii).
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 655 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickel) in Com., 4755 (iii).
Race Tracks: *See* 'Criminal Code.'
Railway Bills, Amendments by the Senate (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6544 (iv).
——— Explanation *re* (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Railway Com., G. T. Ry., Apptmt. of Subcommittee, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5897; in Com., 6211; 6304; on M. for 3° (amt.) 6395 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2986 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 426 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal as Inspector of Hillsboro Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Roy, Wm., Inquiry *re* Charges, on M. (Mr. Boulay) for Papers, 1393 (i).
St. John and Courtenay Bay Contract, Signing, &c. (remarks) 4743 (iii); 6187 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry., Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
Senate Amts. to Ry. Bills, 6493, 6544 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Shediac Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (construction) 6609 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1076 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6772; Justice (promotions) 6586; Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1157 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3314 (ii).
Justice—Penitentaries (bonus) 6600; (Dorchester) 6561; (McAllister, Mr., moving expenses) 6596 iv).
Justice—Miscellaneous (litigation) 6561 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1476; 1492 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4719 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5541 (iii).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Ass'n.) 6583 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5220; (life saving awards) 5228 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Hillsboro) 1528 (i); (Shediac) conc., 6793 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Sackville) conc., 6805 (iv); (St. John dry dock) 3296 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) conc., 6778 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5764, 6606 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) conc., 6774; (gratuity to Cuthbertson children) 5678; (highway crossings) 5595; (locomotives) 5607; (Moncton, heating) 5610; (Moncton office) 5653; (provident fund) 5677; (refrigerator cars) 5603; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6605 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5672 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 694 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2862, 2887 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Wadge Thomas Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984 (ii).
Winnipeg Govt. Property Sale: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Address, The, 295 (i).
Brazeau, Emiler, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
Canadian Navy, Repudiation by Nationalists &c. (Ques.) 714 (i).
—— Speeches *re* Election Campaign, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).
Debates, Official, Correction *re* Vote of member for St. James, Montreal, *re* Man. Bill, 4983 (iii).
Doherty, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 725 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay *re* Distribution (remarks) 268 (i).
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
House of Commons Messengers, Dismissals, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Judges of Superior Court, Superannuation, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Lauzon, Desire, Emplymt. by Govt., References *re* Character, &c. (Ques.) 3538 (ii).
Mail Carrier, Como to Oka, Compensation *re* Death (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4422; on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4937 (iii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, &c. (Ques.) 573 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re*, Canon Dauth, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).
Point Aux Anglais, Drainage Works, &c. (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries (Ques.) 2453 (ii).
Solicitor General and Min. of Justice, &c. (Ques.) 725 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6282 (iv).

FORTIER, Mr. E., *Lotbinière.*
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
Lotbinière County Postmasters, Dismissals, Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 972 (i).
Postmasters in Lotbinière, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

FORTIER, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Ste. Croix Wharf Construction (M. for papers*) 5557 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6645 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Three Rivers) 2443 (ii).

FOSTER, Mr. A. De Witt, *Kings, N.S.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 201 (i).
Dismissals, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2098 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour, Grounding of *Niobe* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E. (*Minister of Trade and Commerce*) *North Toronto.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 72 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger (Ans.) 1413 (i).
—— Payment to Agents (Ans.) 974 (i).
—— Dismissal of Agents, &c. (Ans.) 727 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates, 1913 (i).
——on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Ret., 1819 (i).
Arichat and Canso SS. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iv).
British West Indies and British Guinea, on Inquiry (Mr. Murphy) for Ret., 1820 (i).
See 'Trade Relations.'
Canada-France Steamship Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
Canadian Agents, Apptmt. of, in Europe (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Canada and G. B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract *re* (Ans.) 547 (i).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies' 'G. B. and Can.'
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Car Shortage in the West, Govtl. Action *re*, on M. for Sup., 1716 (i).
Christmas Holidays, Adjournment *re* (remarks) 702 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5267 (iii).
Commercial Agent in France, Apptmt. as Successor to Mr. A. Poindron (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt. (Ans.) 721 (i).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 897 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dom. Notes Printing, Ques. of Order, 1843 (i).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Franco-Canadian Trade Relation, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 5755 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys.: *See* 'Grain Shipments.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Telegraph.'
Grain Act Amt. (B. 32) prop. Res., 870; in Com. on Res., 871 (i); 2° m., 2161; in Com., 2179, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3513, 3757 (ii); 4042; on Order being called for 3°, (M.) for Com., 4153; in Com., 4154; (amt.) 4787; M. for 3°, 4788; on Amt. (Mr. L. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4796 (iii).
——— M. to take up Govt. Orders, 869 (i).
——— Notice of Amendment, 3630 (ii).
See 'Man. Grain B. 96.'
Grain Act, Farmers' Interests, &c. (remarks) 4744 (iii).
Grain Bill, Notice for Discussion (remarks) 1575 (i).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, Stmnt. *re* Washington Despatch, 2577 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the West, on Inquiry (Mr. Oliver) 6187 (iv).
——— Number of Cars despatched (stmnt.) 5954 (iv).
——— Par. in Toronto Globe (remarks) 5929 (iv).
Grain Shipments from Canadian Ports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 536 (i).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 541 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, &c. (remarks) on Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3976, 4009 (ii).
G.B. and Canada Mail Service, Letter of Quebec Board of Trade (remarks) 1844 (i).
Harvey & Salisbury Ry., on Inquiry for Ret., 1843 (i).
Highlands Bridge Construction, Ques. of Order, 1197 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 747 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2426 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1313 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (feed) Amt. (B. 78) in Com. on Res., 1839 (i); in Com., 6189, 6678 (iv).
Japan, Trade Relations with, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver (Ans.) 560 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Marconi Service (remarks) 4161 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, Establishment of Dom. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Mail Subsidies, Mar. Provs. and Porto Rico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
See 'Supply.'
Man. Boundaries Extension, Answer to Question (remarks) 3755 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 96) 1°m., 2405 3°m., 2575 (ii).
See 'Grain Act.'
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1868 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1375, 1834 (i).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) on Senate Amts., 5679 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to M. for Sup., 5443-4 (iii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com. (amt.) 4759 (iii).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 944 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1923 (i).
See 'Grain Shipments,' &c.
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5902 (iv).
Reciprocity, ref. to in Debate on Address, 76 (v).
Rooms alloted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re* (remarks) 670 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1036, 1039; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1047 (i).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation Act) 1503 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c.) 4714; (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4734; (Canada and Australia) 4714; (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G.B.) 4715 (iii); (Can. and Mexico) 5934 (iv); (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Can. and S. Africa) 4726; (Halifax, Newfoundland and England) 4727; (Halifax and W. Indies) 4740; (Magdalen Islands) 4730 (iii); (North Sydney &c.) 680 (i); (Pictou and Cheticamp) 4736; (Quebec and Gaspe) 4739 (iii); (St. John and Halifax) 678 (i), 4740 (iii); (St. John and W. Indies) 640 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4741 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Trade and Commerce (annuities) 688; (bounties Act) 687 (i); (iron and steel bounties) 5934 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2962 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6671, 6821 (iv).
Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership (remarks) 2007 (ii).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Can. Agents.'
Trade and Commerce Deptl. Report (presented) 971 (i); 2591, 3630 (ii); 6780 (iv).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1995 (ii).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).

FOWLER, Mr. Geo. W., *Kings and Albert.*
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6248 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Lalor) to conc., 2842 (ii).
Dismissals of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 961 (i).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate, 952 (i).
Freight Rates, &c., Public Ownership, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4032 (ii).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4166 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3663 (ii).
I.C.R. Hillsborough Branch Rails Loaned, &c. (Ques.) 4978 (iii).
James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6310 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6329 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1781 (i).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3864 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 784 (i).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1892 (i).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6234 (iv).
Pink Rock Wharf, N.B. Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6234, 6310 (iv).

FOWLER, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
Steele, Col., Apptmt. to Headquarters Staff (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6485 (iv).
Militia (ordnance) 6653 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Office (salaries) 6621 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (St. John) 627 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 5676; P.E.I. (car ferry) 5665 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2937 (ii).

FRIPP, Mr. A. E., *Ottawa.*
Address, The, 409 (i).
Continental Can Co. Patent Relief (B. 119) 1°*, 4236; 2°m., 4395; in Com., 5204 (iii); 5483, 5903 (iv).
Eddy, Ezra B., Change of Name (B. 117) 1°*, 4139; 2°m., 4238 (iii).
Edmond F. Piper Patent Relief (B. 53) 1°*, 970; 2°m., 1201 (i).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 161) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 794 (i).

GAUTHIER, Mr. L. J., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Address, The, 475 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4912 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Dairying Industry, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5726 (iv).
Delisle, L. Treffle, of Trois Pistoles, Dismissals, &c. (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).
Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou (Ques.) 549 (i).
Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction (Ques.) 3534 (ii).
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3150 (ii).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
I.C.R. Riviere du Loup Workshops, Removal to Fraserville (Ques.) 570 (i).
——— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal (Ques.) 1864 (i).
Morice, Theophile, Dismissal from I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Morin, Mr. Theo., Reinstatement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
Naval Cadets, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges &c. (Ques.) 548 (i).
SUPPLY—
Excise (inspectors) 5815 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Riviere du Loup) 5654 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3616 (ii).
Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delays *re* Payment to Dep. Ret. Officer (remarks) 1707 (i).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Address, The, 346 (i).
Buck, Mr. A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal of (remarks) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6355 (iv).
Civil Service (commissioners) Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3145 (ii).
Crystal Beach Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Remarks (Mr. German) 5960 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2183 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6570 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3664; in Com., 3670 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1427 (i).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Extra Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Man. Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 1°, 3906 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3115 (ii).
Peace Memorial Monument in Queen's Park, Toronto, Action of Govt. *re* (remarks) 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5970 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6334 (iv).
Spirella Co. of Canada Patent Relief (B. 71) 1°*, 1410 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (construction) 6607 (iv).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (regulations *re*) 3911 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6607 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2972, 3549 (ii).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5990 (iv).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5731 (iv).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6213 (iv).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 1°*, 4976 (iii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 970 (i).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6361 (iv).
Dismissals from Public Office from 1896 to 1911 (M. for ret.) 1280 (i).
Duffy, Edith Harriet, Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6223 (iv).
Foresters, Ancient Order Subsidiary (B. 157) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3678 (ii).
Jenkins, Wm. Alexander Hunt, Relief (B. 162) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Lumber Combine in B. C., Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2299 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1731 (i).
Moose, Loyal Order Grand Lodge incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 161) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5984 (iv).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6139 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6223 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2702; in Com., 2934 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3959 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., *South Renfrew.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5278 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312, 6317 (iv).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6319 (iv).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6223 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) *re* adjournment, 5938 (iv).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 144 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 5165 (iii).
—— B. 189 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6372 (iv).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 6331; in Com., 6343; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6495 (iv).
C.P. Ry. (Toulon) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5886 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6269 (iv).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6070 (iv).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Transfer B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5958 (iv).
G.T.P. Rv., Assiniboine River Bridge, in Com. on Res., 6061 (iv).
G.T.P. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6324 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6759 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5629 (iv).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6310 (iv).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6011 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900, 6220, 6322, 6327 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6220 (iv).
C

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Live Stock Record Association incorp. B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 1°, 5553; in Com., 6025 (iv).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Moose, Loyal Order incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6126 (iv).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N.T. Ry., Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6732 (iv). *See* 'Supply—Railways.'
Northern N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6230 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6242 (iv).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 6155 (iv); in Com., 6157 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Peace River and Ry. Best Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5973 (iv).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract (stmnt.) *re* English Criticisms, on M. for Sup., 5415 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Queen's College B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5896, 6211, 6307; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) to M. for 3°, 6396 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 172 (Mr. Lalor) in Com., 6127 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges Subsidy, &c., in Com., 6211 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6472; (census and statistics) 6462; Experimental Farms (tobacco growing) 6478; (International Institute) 6479; (Toronto exhibition) 6480; (Year Book) 6465 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (lower lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 5797 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Canals—Lachine (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Canals—Murray (high spots) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (locks) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (guard pier) 5798; (protection works) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (Bank St. bridge) 5791; (dredging plant) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 5799; (Newmarket) 5792 (iv).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 5796; (surveys) 5786 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771; Railways (private secretary) 5808 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6579 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 5256; (inspectors, &c.) 5254 (iii); (International Fisheries Commission) conc., 6779 (iv).
Inland Revenue (peat industry) 6491 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 5237 (iii).
Militia (associations and bands) 5529 (iii); (associations) 6653 (iv).
Mines Branch (ore deposits) 6602 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Royal Mint) 6584; (St. John Ambulance Ass'n) 6584; (tuberculosis association) 6579 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Service (inspectors) 6646 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (London, Eng.) 6655 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (French river) conc., 6778 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5762 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 5598; (branch lines) 5632; (facilities) 5809; (Halifax docks) 5596; (highway crossings) 5595; (Moncton office) 6604; (North Sydney diversion) 5610; (rolling stock) 5653, 5610, 6461; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Board of Commissioners) 5800; (G.T.P. remuneration to director) 5801; (litigation expenses) 5800-1 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5765 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5662; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5660 (iv).
Tidal Service (surveying steamers) 5400 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6442 (iv).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).
Trent Canal Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5909 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 2°, 5968 (iv).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5997 (iv).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5568 (iv).
GUILBAULT, Mr. J. P. O., *Joliette.*
Canadian Northern, Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 970 (i).
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 970 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Emplymt. as Sessional Messenger (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3702 (ii).
Joliette County, Returning Officer, Payments *re* (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4416 (iii).
GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 62 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Carpet Weavers Union *re* J. C. Murray, Prosecution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1510 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569 (iii).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 3213 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contracts, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 754 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1422 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3895; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); on M. for 2° (remarks) 4415; in Com., 4537; (amt.) 4541 (iii).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1882 (i).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5970; on M. for 3°, 6188; 3°, 6338 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2986 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (concilliation board) 1510 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 2601 (amt.) 6 m. h., 2614; neg. (Y. 52; N. 104) 2751; in Com., 2867, 2939, 3015 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J., *South Lanark.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5891 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 909 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 796 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi News Service (remarks) 4161 (iii).
Ry. Act (tariffs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1016 (i).

HARTT, Mr. T. A., *Charlotte.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6526 (iv).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *St. John City and County.*
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew (remarks) 408 (i).
——— Purchase of by Govt. (stmnt.) 489 (i).
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Master and Mates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 162 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Loggie) to adjn. debate, 487 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5278 (iii).
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3054 (ii).
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Biological Board of Canada (B. 118) 1°m., 4037; in Com., 4551 (iii); on Senate Amts., 5696 (iv).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries &c. (Ans.) 4258 (iii).
Bird Rock Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper (remarks) 5258 (iii).
Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master (Ans.) 1814 (i).
British Admiralty, Memo. *re* Conference between Can. and Australia &c. (Ans.) 559 (i).
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
Brymer, Arthur, Dismissal &c. (Ans.) 3752 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. (B. 143) in Com. on Res., 5156; 1°*, 5161; in Com., 5400 (iii).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Protection *re*, &c. (remarks) 1198 (i).
Canadian Navy, Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c. (Ans.) 527 (i).
See 'Navy.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals from (Ans.) 974 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of (Ans.) 1208 (i).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton (Ans.) 1203 (i).
Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Dismissals in N. B. for Political Partisanship by Liberals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Cor., 1391 (i).
Dredge and Boiler Inspection (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Ducharme, Pierre, Dismissal of (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Employees of Govt., Dismissed, Resigned, &c., on M. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Ret., 1818 (i).
False Creek Flats, Application for Lease from Marpole and Macdonald (Ans.) 5953 (iv).
Fisheries Act (oysters) Amt.(B. 140) 1°m., 5053; 2°m., 5271; in Com., 5276 (iii).
Fisheries, Contracts *re* Board for Crews, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 683 (i).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
Fisheries Department, Reorganization of (remarks) 937 (i).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names and Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 3053 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2486 (ii).
Fishery Regulations *re* Hague Tribunal, (remarks) 3830 (ii).
See 'International.'
Fishery Treaty with U.S., Withdrawal of Canada (remarks) 409 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Fish Scrap, Price paid *re* Fertilizing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 684-5 (i).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Gasolene Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c. (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Gaspé Basin Marine Agent, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 878 (i).
Gaspé Marine Deptl. Inquiry, Apptmt. Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1358 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Gaspé Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid *re* (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Govt., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3752 (ii).
Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper, &c. (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* boarding Employees (Ans.) 5953 (iv).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes (Ans.) 5263 (iii).
Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Harbour Commissioners Rep. (presented) 1571 (i).
Hatfield, Mr., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).
Herring Fishery in B.C., Close Season, &c. (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3713 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Terminal Ports, Surveys *re* Navigation, &c. (Ans.) 3943 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2860 (ii).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1004 (i).
International Fisheries Treaty, Memorandum (read) in Com. of Sup., 6646 (i).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
'Kestrel' Cruiser, Condemnation of (Ans.) 550 (i).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 3054 (ii).
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limit of Catch (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
Lightkeepers in N .S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
Lightkeepers in P. E. I., Charges, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Lobster Fishing Season in N. B., Date of Opening (Ans.) 722 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi Connections (remarks) 3833 (ii).
—— (stmnt.) 4041 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4511, 4620 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension of (remarks) 490 (i).
Marine Hospital Ships, Establishment of (remarks) 6788 (iv).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* closing (Ans.) 579 (i).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c. (Ans.) 876 (i).
Montreal Docks, Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 97) Prop. Res., 2295; in Com. on Res., 2406, 2415; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3631 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 150) 1° m., 5258 (iii); in Com., 5696; 3° m., 5960 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Apptmt. of Accountant (Ans.) 6661 (iv).
—— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse (Ans.) 3943 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal (remarks) 2057 (ii).
—— Resignation of Ms. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6555 (iv).
—— Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1813 (i).
—— Res. from Corn Exchange, Delegation, &c., *re* Removal (Ans.) 2070 (ii).
—— Retention of (Ans.) 2062 (ii).
See 'Bourassa,' 'Harbour.'
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debenture Debt (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. and Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 3944 (ii).
Murray, Dr., Charges *re* Poaching in East River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5248 (iii).
Naval Bill Repeal, &c. (Ans.) 4242 (iii).
Naval Cadets, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Naval Defence, Pacific Coast, Res. from B. C. Legislature (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Naval Discipline Act, Application to Canada (Ans.) 1203 (i).
Naval Service, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 970 (i).
Naval Service, O. C. *re* Instructions, Circulars, &c. (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
Naval Service, Tenders *re* Shipbuilding, &c. (Ques.) 527, 558 (i).
Naval Ships for Canada, Ref. *re* Completion (Ans.) 1206 (i).
Naval Service, Visit of Minister to England (remarks) 938 (i).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contracts *re* Provisioning (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
—— Sale of (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
—— Repairs *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5225 (iii).
Oysters: *See* 'Fisheries Act.'
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty (Ans.) 4776 (iii).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Service, Contract *re* Supplies (Ans.) 876 (i).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to, &c. (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Powers, Laurence, Dismissal from Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Charges *re* (Ans.) 3751 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5211 (iii).
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2453 (ii).
Public Works Contracts given without tender (Ans.) 877 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 31) 1° m., 869; 2° m., 1025; 3° m., 1709 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after (Ans.) 579 (i).
——— Resignation of Members (Ans.) 579 (i).
——— Solicitor, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1814 (i).
Railway Bridges in N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6377; on M. for 3°, 6394 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley,' &c.
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Richards, Mr. S., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Rivers, Lachapelle and L. Dubois, Messrs. Charges *re* (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 5259 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Kyte) 5939 (iv).
Révillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. Baker) in Com., 5203 (iii).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Tenders *re* (remarks) 5694 (iv).
St. John N.B., Appropriation *re* Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2369 (ii).
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1404 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) to M. for 3°, 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges.'
St. Lawrence Channel, Average depth of Water between Montreal and Quebec, Cap a la Roche at low tide (Ans.) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
St. Lawrence Channel Ice Breaker (Ans.) 5680 (iv).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration (Ans.) 974 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 1571 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts, &c., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2462 (ii).
——— Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1041 (i); 6652 (iv); Naval Dept. (salaries) 1062 (i).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6579 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 5256 (iii); 6653 (iv); (inspectors, &c.) 5242 (iii); (international commission) 6646; (lighthouse keepers) 6650 (iv); (lobster hatchery) 5256; (oyster culture) 5255; (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys (Arctic) 5398; (Atlantic Coast) 5399 (iii).
Labour Dept. (inspection *re* shipping machinery) 1526 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aid to navigation) 5236, 5241; (constructions) 5237; (International Congress) 5237; (pensions 5236; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Newfoundland) 4728; (Magdalen Islands) 4732 (iii).
Marine (hospitals) 5238; (steamboat inspection) 5238 (iii).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Ass'n. 6584 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5303, 5335 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186, 5211; (life saving awards) 5228; (live stock inspection) 5230; (patrol vessels) 5231; (registration) 5229; (schools of navigation) 5229; (wreck subsidies) 5229, 5231 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 634 (i).
Radiotelegraphic Surveys (wireless stations) 5399 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4138 (iii).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5668 (iv).
White Head Island Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of P. Conway, &c. (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. (B. 138) 1°*, 4976 (iii); 2°m. and in Com., 5989 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com. 3933 (ii).
Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office (M. for cor.*) 3946 (ii).
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c. (Ques.) 3151 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4109 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3239 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5161 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2013 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569 (iii).
E. F. Piper Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4238 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6261 (iv).
Freight Rates, Discrimination, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3200 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2779, 3170 (ii).
Highway Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3694 (ii).
Immigration Agents and Ontario Farm Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6198 (iv).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations *re* Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2804 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5919 (iv).
Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ (remarks) 2059 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922; in Com., 6108 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5919 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3923 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5491 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (refrigerator cars) 5603 (iv).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3265 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2736; in Com., 2881 (ii).
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber (Ques.) 3055 (ii).

HEPBURN, Mr. B. R., *Prince Edward.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5875 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3231 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6571 (iv).
Prince Edward and Hastings Ry. Co.'s in corp. (B. 136) 1°*, 4976 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *King's P.E.I.*
Address, The, 482 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5297 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5857 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (remarks) 2668 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4583 (iii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5275 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3715 (ii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2136 (ii).
Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Magdalen Islands Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4508, 4637; on M. for 3°, 4838 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1694 (i).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2347 (ii).
P.E.I. Better Terms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
P.E.I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).
P.E.I. Car Ferry System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5213 (iii).
P.E.I. Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (iii).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6132 (iv).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation (remarks) 3830 (ii).
Souris Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 5242 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5241; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 4731 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5192, 5213; (life saving awards) 5229 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—P.E.I.—conc., 6794 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5664; (facilities) 5661; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5659 (iv).

HUGHES, Hon. S. (Minister of Militia) *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5279 (iii).
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 533 (i).

HUGHES, Hon. S.—*Con.*
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees (Ans.) 579 (i).
Automobiles, Purchase of: *See* 'Militia Touring Cars,' 'Supply—Militia.'
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5300 (iii).
Bisley Rules: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1190 (i).
—— Ques. of Order, 1183 (i).
Drill Halls, in the West *re* Donation of Lands for Sites (Ans.) 1816 (i).
See 'Moosejaw,' 'Regina,' 'Supply—Militia.'
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, Ques. of Order, 6522 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty (B. 190) prop. res., 5558; 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6252, 6454 (iv).
Fenian Raid Vets, Land Grants to (Ans.) 3334 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Sale (B. 185) (prop. res.) 5557 (iv); in Com. on Res. 5696-7, 6064; 1°*, 6080; in Com., 6203 (iv).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment (Ans.) 723 (i).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 729 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1662 (i).
Medical Director General Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 171) 1°m., 5556; 2°m., 6061 (iv).
Militia Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec (Ans.) 580 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re* (Ans.) 552 (i).
Militia Council Report (presented) 2668 (ii).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ans.) 533 (i).
Militia Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Montreal Military School, Purchase of Site (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 3974 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3742 (ii).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate (Ans.) 578 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Reorganization *re* (Ans.) 580 (i).
Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal (Ans.) 6184 (iv).
Regiments of Foreign Born Citizens, Organization of (Ans.) 534 (i).

HUGHES, Hon. S.—*Con.*
Regina Armoury, Erection of (Ans.) 580 (i).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Acquisition of Additional Lands (Ans.) 533 (i).
Ross Rifle: *See* 'Natl. Rifle Assn.'
Sarnia Armoury, Erection of (Ans.) 555 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Militia (salaries) 1037 (i).
Militia (allowances) 5447; (annual drill) 5452; (armouries) 5541; (associations and bands) 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv); (automobiles) 5492 (iii); (camps) 5521; (clothing) 5521; (customs dues) 5522; (headquarters staff) 5536 (iii); (Rockliffe ranges) 6654 (iv); (schools of instruction) 5546 (iii); (wages) 5546 (iii).
R. N. W. M. P. (pay of force) 5185 (iii).
Sutherland Rifle Sight: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to (Ans.) 1202 (i).
See 'Fenian,' &c.
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Winnipeg Military Property: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*
Digby Clock Tower, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Railway Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 794 (i); in Com., 2011 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5276 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3707 (ii).
Steam Trawlers, Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (protection service) 5389 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3326 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Halifax) 4739 (iii).

KAY, Mr. Wm. F., *Missisquoi.*
Bedford Postmaster, Dismissal, Inquiry for Ret., 5161 (iii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Customs Dismissals in Missisquoi (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Horsfall Herbert Relief (B. 109) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Militia (annual drill) 5469; (associations and bands) 5528; (schools of instruction) 5549 (iii).

KEMP, Hon. A. E., *East Toronto.*
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3375 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, Ont.*
Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Ottawa Commission (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii).
B. C. Lumber Combine, Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts (remarks) 2297 (ii).
Cement Merger, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, Complaints &c. (M. for stmnt.) 563 (i).
——— (remarks) 1440, 1574 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1506 (i).
Dismissals, &c., Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt. (remarks) 2853 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 873 (i); in Com., 2180, 2390, 2548, 2777, 3160, 3455, 3762 (ii), 4044; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) to M. for 3°, 4829; on Amt. (Mr. L. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4799, (amt.) 4804 (iii).
Grain Act, Notice for Discussion (remarks) 1574 (i).
——— Tel. from Sec. Grain Growers' Association (read) 4744 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4000 (ii).
——— Car Service (remarks) 5956 (iv).
Health Department, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5411 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement (M. for papers) 582 (i).
——— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1755 (i).
Members Travelling Allowance during Adjournments (remarks) 1848 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury, Cor. (read) 3972 (ii).
——— Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
——— Delegation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).
Moosejaw District, Proposed Sites, &c. (Ques.) 3342 (ii).
Moosejaw Post Offices, Names and Locations (Ques.) 976 (i).
Moosejaw P. O. Inspector, Pets. *re* Apptmt. (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4237, 4981 (iii).
Moosejaw Public Building, Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited (M. for copy*) 562 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*
Public Ownership, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 649 (i).
Public Works, Appropriations of last year (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2437 (ii).
Regina Census, Inquiry for Ret., 1574 (i). *See* 'Census.'
Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers) 1395 (i).
Saskatcheawn Bank incorp. (B. 89) 1°*, 2216 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay *re* Decision by Govt. (remarks) 3153 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Veterans' Bounty Bill (remarks) 2061 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1501 (i).
Militia (automobiles) 5515 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5323 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2205 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 2211; (Weyburn) 2213 (ii).
Svaigher, Adolphe, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6186 (iv).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2872 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. Bill (remarks) 1577 (i).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W., *Richmond, N.S.*
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Arichat and Canso SS. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Bissett, Geo. E., Dismissal from Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
Boyle, Dougald R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.) 3945 (ii).
Breakwaters, N.S., Inquiry for Ret., 4460 (iii).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
——— (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
Canal Staffs, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5802 (iv).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 1584 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Civil Service Commission Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348 (ii).
Coast Trade, Foreign Shipping, &c. (M. for copies*) 2861 (ii).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ques.) 3148 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1193 (i).
——— Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2587 (ii).
Empire Trade Commission, Apptmt. of Representative (Ques.) 5951 (iv).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duty *re*, on M. for Sup., 5590 (iv).
Fish Reduction Works at Aricaht, Tel. *re* from Prime Minister (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2783 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1464 (i).
I.C. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4223 (iii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5411 (iii).
Little Anse Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges, &c. (M. for papers*) 3945 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1867, 1895 (i), 3130, 3364 (ii).
Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Port Richmond Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 1585 (i).
——— (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Powers, Laurence G., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal, Charges *re* (Ques.) 3751 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light, &c., Co.) on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5834 (iv).
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as assistants (Ques.) 5954 (iv).
Public Works in N. S., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2803 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2512 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4223 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 5939 (iv).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2588 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canal—St. Peters (improvements) 5798 (iv).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4735; (Mahone and Tancook) 4733 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Arichat) 2039; (Petit de Grat) 2050 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5609 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2655; in Com., 2879, 3540 (ii).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees, &c. (Ques.) 579 (i).
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* Closing (Ques.) 579 (i).
Militia Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec (Ques.) 580 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after (Ques.) 579 (i).
——— Reorganization of (Ques.) 580 (i).
——— Resignation from Board of Members (Ques.) 579 (i).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Highway Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3698 (ii).
Montcalm Postmasters, Pets. *re* Removal (Ques.) 575 (i).
St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 560 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue of P.O., &c. (Ques.) 724 (i).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Budget, The (remarks) 5070 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4104 (iii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue &c. (Ques.) 2066 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6260 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3202 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6198 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3141 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2353 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 172) in Com., 6127 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agricultural Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6467 (iv).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3927; (regulations) 3914 (ii).
Militia (armouries) 5542; (associations and bands) 5530 (iii).

LAMARCHE, Mr. P. E., *Nicolet.*
Manitoba Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4398; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) 4840 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and Amt. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1664 (i).
Naval Repeal Bill, Discussion *re* (Ques.) 4239 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*
Cockshutt Plough Co. Prices *re* (remarks) 820 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1194 (i); 3251 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 911 (i).
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. (B. 4) 1°m., 12 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3203 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2314 (ii); 4069 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6749 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 12; 2° m., 1597 (i); neg. (Y. 61; N. 87) 1706 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage B. 3.'
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4765 (iii).
Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 5) 1°m., 13 (i).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1947 (i).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6488 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. '88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2978 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6674 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6454 (iv).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie & Napierville.*
Budget, The, 5147 (iii).
Census Population of Canada, and Quebec Cities, &c. (Ques.) 731 (i), 3336 (ii).
Napierville Public Building. Purchase of Site (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
——— Instructions *re* (remarks) 3153 (ii).
——— Payment to Mr. Bourgeois (remarks) on M. to adjn., 2373 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1354 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I.C.Ry. (Ques.) 3050 (ii).
Courcy, Mr. P., Appmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5821, (iv).
——— Emplymt. in Inland Revenue (Ques.) 5952 (iv).
Deschenes, Louis, Wharfinger at River Ouelle, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv). (iv).
Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5806 (iv).
Garceau, Mr. N., Appmt. as Inquiry Commissioner (Ques.) 2860 (ii).
Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici, (M. for pets.*) 2587 (ii).
Herbert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
——— Letters missing from Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Retirement Fund, Refund to dismissed men (Ques.) 2450 (ii).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment, Montmagny (Ques.) 723 (i).
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs (Ques.) 1864 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Lizotte, Luc, Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 3055 (ii).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4948 (iii).
Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P.O. at St. Germain (M. for cor.) 1592 (i).
Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c. (M. for Cor.) 1818 (i).
N.T. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section, Completion, &c., Operation by Govt. (Ques.) 723 (i).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate (Ques.) 578 (i).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of (Ques.) 578 (i).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 6781 (iv).
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct, &c., Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6577 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4744 (iii).
Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment (Ques.) 723 (i).
St. Anaclet Postmaster, Request *re* Dismissal (M. for cor.) 2588 (ii).
St. André Wharf, Discontinuance of Work *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Erection of Buildings (Ques.) 577 (i).
St. Germain, Dismissal of Postmaster, (M. for cor.) 1592 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1579 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
St. Valier Wharf, Contract of Alex. Duchesneau (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6478 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6651 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6598 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5499 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6292 (iv).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C. (Ques.) 1209 (i).
Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* Extension (Ques.) 577 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. L. A., *Montreal, St. James.*
N.T. Ry. and Montreal Branch Lines, Cor. O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 582 (i).
——— (Ques.) 573 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, *East Quebec and Soulanges.*
Address, The, 33, (amt.) 49; Neg. (Y. 77; N. 121) 517 (i).
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1494 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5290 (iii).
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3933 (ii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5850 (iv).
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com. (M. for copy*) 1409 (i).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 6082; in Com., 6339; on M. for 3°, 6371 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (Aud. Gen.) Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 3632 (ii).
Civil Service Act (additional commissioner) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3143 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com. on Res., 3972 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) on Prop. Res., 1033; in Com., 1435 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6084 (iv).
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Borden) to present, 710, 794 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5550; on M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2842 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 893 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1092 (i).
Dismissals, &c., on Objection (Mr. Macdonald) to Mr. Dep. Speaker's Ruling in Com. of Sup., 3255 (ii).
Dismissals: *See* 'Inquiries B. 19,' 'Morine.'
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4238 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6260 (iv).
Fife, Duke of, Decease of (remarks) 2155 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6064; in Com., 6203 (iv).
Fishery Regulations *re* Hague Tribunal (remarks) 3830 (ii).
Freight Rates on Rys., &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 2377 (ii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Mr. Borden) 1969 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes (Ques.) 5262 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on Order for 3°, and in Com., 4153 (iii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6570 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 711 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. (Implementing P.C. judgment) on Prop. Res. (Mr. White) 2296 (ii).
See 'N.T.Ry. B. 95.'

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Gutelius, Mr. F., Form of Question, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (i).
Hague Tribunal: *See* 'Fishery.'
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 1°, 1572 (i); on M. for 2°, 3633; Amt. to ref. to Gov. Gen., 3641; in Com., 3667, 3729, 3946 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4140; Amt. neg. (Y. 50; N. 79) 4141 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 749 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B 19 (Mr Doherty) in Com, 1283, 1417 (i)
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii), 6009 (iv).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 943 (i).
L'Assomption Public Works (remarks) *re* Answer, 6782 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lobster Twine, Customs Duties, on M. for Sup., 1072 (i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1781 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3539, 3840; on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4359; (amt.) 4375, neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4393; in Com. on Amts. (Mr. Borden) 4837; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4888 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 778 (i).
——— Memorial from Premier to Gov. Gen. (remarks) 3630 (ii).
——— Swamp Lands, Acerage, Inquiry for Stmt., 3751 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1637 (i).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. *re* (remarks) 576 (i).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* as Candidate for Election (remarks) 6185 (iv).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
Mounted Police, Increase in Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1866 (i), 3130 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3061 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Factums, 2589 (ii). *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.T.Ry. Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building (M. for cor. &c.) 755, 763 (i).
——— (remarks) 6786 (iv). *See* 'Gutelius.'

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., &c. 772 (i).
Naval Defences (remarks) in Debate on Address, 42 (v).
Naval Service, Minister's Visit to England *re* (remarks) 938 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'
Newspaper Articles, Reading *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
Northumberland County Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 6186 (iv).
Ontario Boundaries, Extension (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, and Architects' Association (M. for cor.) 977 (i).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5972 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 4460 (iii).
——— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan (M. for copy*) 1590 (i).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
P. E. I. Subsidy, on Prop. Res. (Mr. White) 5558; in Com. on Res., 5860 (iv).
Provincial Rys. and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance (M. for cor.*) 562 (i).
Public Accounts Com., 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc., 6492 (iv).
Quebec Boundary Extension, (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Quebec Boundary Extension, B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 5269 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders &c. (M. for papers) 1401 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 1028; on M. for 3°, 1709 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5896 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3883 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2505 (ii).
Railway Rates: *See* 'Freight Rates.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
Reciprocity, Ref. to in debate on Address, 36 (i).
Renfrew, S. Election, Issue of Writ, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn., 2230 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1576, 1707 (i), 1971, 2059, 2377 (ii).
——— Speech of Min. of Customs *re* Georgian Bay (remarks) 1573 (i).
Ste Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, (remarks) 6577 (iv.)
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) B. 75 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Separate Schools: *See* 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French, 1808 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Agriculture (salaries) 1041; Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033, 1034; Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1092 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Inland Revenue (salaries) conc., 6770 (iv); Justice—Exchequer Court (D. Clark) 1035; Militia (salaries) 1037; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1063 (i).
Mounted Police (pay of force) 5179 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5310, 5358 (iii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv); Buildings—Ottawa (grounds) 3240 (ii); Que. (Louiseville) conc., 6799 (iv); Que. (Quebec P.O.) 1851 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2862, 2947, 3024, 3555, (ii); on M. for 3°, 4144 (amt.) 4146, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 81) 4151 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6665, 6818 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 6080; in Com., 6428 (iv).
Thompson, Dr., Dismissal from N.W.M.P. (remarks) 6784 (iv).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1999 (ii).
Waterways Commissioners, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Comsioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5991 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4556 (iii); in Com., 5569 (iv).

LAVALLEE, Mr. J. O., *Bellechasse.*
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation, &c. (Ques.) 4260 (iii).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
—— Position *re* N. T. Ry. (Ques.) 2245 (ii).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4241 (iii).
Lettelier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re* (Ques.) 3150 (ii).
N. T. Ry. St. Damien Station, Change in Plans (Ques.) 3532 (ii).

LAVALLEE, Mr. J. O.—*Con.*
Sorel Wharf, Claim of Mr. Larivière for Timber supplied (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
—— Contractors *re* (Ques.) 2859 (ii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*
Fish Trap Licenses issued to Capt. J. H. Thorburn (M. for copy of pets.*) 2861 (ii).
Hatfield, A. M., Charges *re* (M. for copy*) 5263 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5253 (iii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6193, 6680 (iv).
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 5252 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Halifax) 678 (i).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5187; (life saving awards) 5228; (schools of navigation) 5229 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 694 (i).
Webster, Dr., C. A., Port Physician at Yarmouth, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6186 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3273 (ii).
Yarmouth Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3269 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R., *Rouville.*
Address, The, 241 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5282 (iii).
Annuities Branch, Transfer to P. O. Dept., Dismissal of Agents (Ques.) 727 (i).
—— Extra Payment to Agents (Ques.) 973 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 878 (i).
Anse à Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx (Ques.) 2072 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service: *See* 'Mail Service.'
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5847 (iv).
Banking Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1820 (i).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5299 (iii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 2062 (ii).
Berlin Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper (remarks) 5258 (iii).
Bourgoin, Geo., Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 5557 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 5259 (iii), 6188 (iv).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims for Damages *re* I.C.R. (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
B.C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington (remarks) 2754 (ii).
Cable Rates Exchange (M. for cor.*) 5557 (iv).
Cable Rates to G. B., on M. for Sup., 3237 (ii).
Cable Rates, Reduction of Fees (remarks) 931 (i).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4088, (amt.) 4097, Neg. (Y. 40, N. 70) 4120 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal of (M. for pets.*) 2460 (ii).
Canada-France Steamship Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5262 (iii).
—— Notice for Discussion, 4742 (iii).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6306 (iv).
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation, &c. (Ques.) 1582 (i).
Cap Chat P. O., Pet. *re* Change of Name (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site (Ques.) 1020 (i).
Census Enumerators, Delays in Payments (Ques.) 2244 (ii).
—— Percentage retained of Salaries (Ques.) 933 (i).
—— (remarks) 935 (i).
Civil Service Act (additional commissioner) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3144; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569, 4578 (iii).
Civil Service Act (mail clerks) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. on Res., 3156 (ii); in Com., 4783, 5264 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill 105.'
Civil Service Act (postmasters) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. on Res., 4583 (iii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922; in Com., 6091 (iv).
Civil Service Commissioners, Increase in Number (Ques.) 728 (i).
Civil Service Reform, and Outside Servie (Ques.) 727 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Com. on Res., 3343 (ii).
Commercial Agent in France, Successor to Mr. A. Poindron (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ques.) 2242 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5551; in Com., 5862 (iv).
Customs Salaries: *See* 'C. S. Bill 116.'
Debates, Examination of Reporters, Inquiry for Papers, 6338 (iv).
—— Translation, 6613 (iv).
Deschamps, Mr. R., Apptmt. by Govt. (remarks) 6277 (iv)
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1275, 1955 (i), 3252 (ii).
Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in *Le Devoir* (remarks) *re* Question, 2453 (ii).
Dismissals from Post Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2035 (ii).
See 'Inquiries Act, &c.'
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, Complaints of British Tenderers (remarks) 1842 (i); 5843 (iv).
Dry Docks Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) on prop. Res., 5560; in Com., 6201 (iv).
Ducharme, Mr. G. N., Apptmt. of (M. for cor.*) 4980 (iii).
—— Attack *re* Apptmt. to Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2830 (ii).
—— Resignation *re* (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
Elevator Men employed by Govt., Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (Judges) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5553; in Com., 5894 (iv).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4239 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Reimbursements *re* (Ques.) 528 (i).
Fast Atlantic SS Service, Conference *re* (remarks) 5695 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6253, 6454 (iv).
Fidelity Trust Co., Incorporation &c. (M. for papers*) 3757 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Relations, Apptmt. of Agents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5747 (iv).
See 'Can. and France, &c.'
Franking: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 878 (i).
—— Deptl. Inquiry, Salary &c. (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of (Ques.) 1204 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Gaspé Basin to Matapedia Line of Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Gaspé Shore Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid, *re* (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction &c. (Ques.) 544 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Govt., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4980 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Sale B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6181 (iv).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable,' 'Parcel,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
Griever, Mr. S., Lighthouse Keeper, Charges *re* (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal, of (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser Montreal, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3343 (ii).
Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).
Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
——— Letter *re* Dismissal (read) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).
Harbours and River Works, Policy *re* Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3675 (ii).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin (Ques.) 4261 (iii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c., (Ques.) 2860 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Dismissal, Number and Names (Ques.) 877 (i).
Immigration Agents in Belgium, Number, &c. (Ques.) 878 (i).
Immigration Agents in France, Number, &c. (Ques.) 878 (i).
I. C. R. Moncton Shops, Transfer of to Fraserville (Ques.) 544 (i).
——— Snow Blockade, Delay of Trains (remarks) 1409 (i).
——— Ties contracted for at Sayabec, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1311 (i).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Japan, Trade Relations with, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver (Ques.) 559 (i).
Justice, Dep. Min., Travelling Expenses (Ques.) 3150 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 940 (i).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
——— and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements &c. (Ques.) 528 (i).
Laberge, Mr., Mail Carrier, Compensation to widow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
Langevin Block, Overcrowding: *See* 'Post Office.'
L'Assomption Public Works (remarks) *re* Answer, 6782 (iv).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Levis Dry Dock, on Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike in Montreal, Settlement &c. (remarks) 269 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Magdalen Islands Marconi News Service, Copy. of Instructions *re* (M. for papers*) 4459 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3833 (ii), 4159 (iii).
——— (remarks) on stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 4042 (iii).
——— Salary of Correspondent (Ques.) 4262 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 4777 (iii).
Mail Clerks: *See* 'C.S. Bill 106.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (M. for ret.*) 2460 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5693 (iv).
Mail Service between G.B. and Canada, Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec (read) 1843 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3852, 3896 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4461 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 783 (i).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Messages to all Dominions (Ques.) 2585 (ii). *See* 'Magdalen Islands.'
Marriage Act Amt., Ref. to Privy Council, Provincial Representations (Ques.) 3755 (ii).
Marriage Laws, Ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Montreal Athletic Association at Nancy, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid (remarks) 1722 (i).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Addition, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 545 (i); 2855 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3907 (ii).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals (Ques.) 4040 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Montreal Docks Construction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 1708 (i), 2057 (ii).
——— Resignation of Messrs. Ballantyne and Geoffrion (remarks) 6551 (iv).
——— Res. from Corn Exchange Protesting *re* Removal, Delegations, &c. (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Govt. (Ques.) 572 (i).
Montreal Military School, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (Montreal Branch) Subsidy, in Com., 5896, 6215 (iv).
Naval Policy of Govt. ref. to in debate on Address, 250 (i).
Naval Service Cor. between Can. and G. B. (M. for copy*) 562 (i).
Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill (M. for copy*) 2459 (ii).
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1384, 1832 (i).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6158 (iv).
Ottawa City Federal District, Referendum *re* (Ques.) 1356 (i).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Parcel Post System, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2337 (ii).
See 'Cable,' 'Postal Regulations,' &c.
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re* (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— (M. for papers) 1396 (i).
——— Request for Papers, 935 (i).
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6175 (iv).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (remarks) 1586 (i).
Postal Regulations, &c., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2285 (ii).
Postmasters dismissed by Govt., List read in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase of Salary to (remarks) 3060 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3351; in Com. 3358 (ii).
See 'C. S. Bill 106.'
Post Office Deptl. Building, Condition of Offices, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i), 2010 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re* &c. (M. for ret.) 1395 (i).
Post Office Dept., Stmnt. *re* Dismissals since Oct. 1911 (M. for ret*.) 1589 (i).
——— Salaries: *See* 'Bill 106.'
——— List read, 6636 (iv).
Pouliot, Louis, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
Private Secretaries: *See* 'Bill 60.'
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Provident Trust Co., Incorporation, &c. (M. for papers*) 3755 (ii).
Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 5269 (iii); in Com., 6162 (iv); on M. for 3°, 6188 (iv).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction, &c. (remarks) 6784 (iv).
——— Subsidy, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Board, Removal of Members, &c. (Ques.) 560 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Queen's Hotel Co., Limited, Litigation *re* (M. for cor.*) 3755 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5895; in Com., 6212, 6306 (iv).
Reciprocity, Ref. to in debate on Address, 244 (i).
Relatives appointed to Govt. positions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6295-97 (iv).
Rideau Hall Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Robitaille, J. C., Charges *re* Inland Revenue, Quebec (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922 (iv).
See 'Bill 179.'
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Rural Mail Routes, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4978 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Routes, &c., Inquiry for, 5561 (iv).
St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
St. Agathe des Monts Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Bedard (Ques.) 973 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
——— Investigation *re* Charges (M. for cor.) 1591 (i).
Ste Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
St. Angele de Laval, County of Nicolet, Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ques.) 3755 (ii), 4039 (iii).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Average depth of water between Montreal and Quebec Cap a la Roche at low tide (Ques.) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence River Power, Res. from Board of Trade, Montreal (Ques.) 2456 (ii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of (Ques.) 1584 (i).
St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L. St. Pierre, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 1589 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
Ste. Rosalie Branch, I.C.R., Lack of Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4134 (iii).
Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 575 (i).
Sayabec Post Office, Appmnt. of Miss Boulay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Separate Schools, Establishment of in Man. (M. for pets.*) 4263 (iii).
Separate Schools in Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members (Ques.) 4247 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Sheldon v. Rex. (M. for papers*) 3756 (ii).
Sikhs in B. C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives (Ques.) 2457 (ii).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1816 (i).
——— Vacancy (remarks) 1577 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278; (promotions) 6280; Public Works (private Secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6580 (iv).
Fisheries (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6604 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys (Arctic) 5398; (Atlantic Coast) 5399 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3311 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6598; (miscellaneous expenditure) 6560; (miscellaneous litigation) 6562; Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Labour Dept. (contingencies) 6615; (Industrial Disputes Act) 6615 (iv).
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 4727; (Magdalen Islands) 4732; (Quebec and Gaspé) 4738 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Militia (annual drill) 5457; (automobiles) 5516; (rifle ranges, Rockliffe) 6654 (iv).
Miscellaneous—(Parliamentary Documents translation) 6613; (Paris agency) 6614 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5304 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6290; Outside Service (inspectors) 6646 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (furniture) 3286 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1951; (Renfrew) 1953; (Seaforth) 1953; (Sudbury) 1954; (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Eastern Block) 1339; (examining warehouse) 1949 (i); (furniture) 3279, 3285; (grounds) 3240; (heating, &c.) 3278 (ii); (Historic Tableaus) 1336; (Library improvements) 1950; (plumbing, &c.) 1855 (i); (rents) 3291; (Rideau Hall repairs) 3285; (site for new buildings) 3242; (snow cleaning) 3279 (ii).
Public Works—(Buildings—Que. (Levis armoury) 1347 (i); (Louiseville) conc., 6794 (iv); (Maisonneuve) 1347; (Marieville) 1348; (Montreal barracks) 1350; (Montreal customs) 1351; (Montreal P. O. enlargement) 1348; (Montreal postal station F) 1353; (Quebec custom house) 1849; (Quebec drill hall) 1849; (Quebec P. O.) 1851; (St. Lambert) 1853 (i); (St. Laurent) conc., 6804 (iv); (St. Therese) 1854; (Shawinigan) 1852; (Three Rivers) 1854 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John dry dock) 3299 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse au Canard) 2785; (Blue Rocks Island) 2043; (Levis graving dock) 3295; (Quebec harbour) 2836; (River St. Charles) 2837 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 2823; (monument to Madeleine de Verchères) 2824; (Temiskaming dam) 2830 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Gaspé) 3305; (Magdalen Islands) 3302; (repairs, &c.) 2817; (Yukon system) 3303 (ii).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster indian reserve) 6806 (iv).
Radiotelegraphic Service (wireless stations) 5399 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (construction) 4134 (iii).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5829 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2157 (ii).
Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate Apptmt. (Ques.) 545 (i).
Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership (remarks) 2007 (ii).
See 'Cable,' &c.
Therrien, J. F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).
(iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).
Tobacco Growers of Yamaska, Govt. Aid to (M. for cor.) 1591 (i).
Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2060 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6219 (iv).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6176 (iv).
Williamsville Post Office, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Edwards) 6274 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4557 (iii); in Com., 5405, 5567 (iv).
Yule, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4779 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5291 (iii).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5905 (iv).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2012 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 847 (i).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2841 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3651; in Com., 3670 (ii).
Marriage Bill 3 (Mr. Lancaster) remarks *re* 2nd reading, 582 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal B. 30 (Mr. G. V. White) in Com., 4699 (iii).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1894 (i); 3410 (ii).
Postal Regulations, on M. to take in Mondays (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Railway Committee, Apptmt. of Subcommittee *re* G.T.Ry. Bill, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5617 (iv).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, (remarks) 6456, 6494, 6577 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Naval Service (maintenance) 5320 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) Ques. of Order, 3618; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3616 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6669, 6811 (iv).

LESPERANCE, Mr. D. O., *Montmagny.*
Carriere and Laine Property, Levis, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 731 (i).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).
International Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 5156 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4863 (iii).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Address, The, 487, (M.) to adjn. debate, 487, 491 (i).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4190 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1154 (i).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duties *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5593 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1095 (i); Public Works—Buildings (Chatham) conc., 6804 (iv); Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4138 (iii).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *Renfrew South.*
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 725 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Master and Mates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 107 (i).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Employmt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 933 (i).
Art Gallery of Painting (Ques.) 1865 (i).
Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re* &c. (Ques.) 576 (i).
Banking Act Legislation (remarks) 938 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Benoit, Joseph, Dismissal from I.C.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).
Bisley Rules: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master (Ques.) 1814 (i).
British Admiralty, Memo. *re* Conference between Canada. and Australia, &c. (Ques.) 559 (i).
B.C. Boundary, Agreement *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 971 (i).
B.C. Fishing Ret., Inquiry for, 6277 (iv).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs. (Ques.) 573 (i).
'British News,' &c., Purchase of by Interior Dept. (Ques.) 6660 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Cable Rates, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 4102 (iii).
Canada and G.B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract *re* (Ques.) 547 (i).
See 'G. B. and Canada.'
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5199 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5161 (iii).
Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service (M. for cor.*) 3342 (ii).
Census Returns, Number of Males, Females, &c. (M. for ret.*) 561 (i).
Christmas Adjournment, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6085 (iv).
Coal used in Govt. Buildings, Canadian (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re* (M. for cor.*) 2588 (ii).
Continental Can. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4396; in Com., 5204 (iii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5866 (iv).
Dartmouth and Denis Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 543 (i).
Deschamps, Raoul, Apptmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
Dismissals, Apptmt. of Commissioners in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3247 (ii).
—— Objections to Ruling of Dep. Speaker in Com. of Sup., 3254 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 921 (i).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto,' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees (M. for ret.*) 1816 (i).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris &c. (Ques.) 559 (i).
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 543 (i).
False Creek Flats, Date of Application for Lease from Messrs Marpole and Macdonald, (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
—— (M. for papers*) 6186 (iv).
Farmers Bank Investigation, Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith (remarks) 3332 (ii).
—— O. C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith (M. for copy*) 3756 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Fenian Raid, Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6257 (iv).
See 'Veterans.'
Fishery Act Prosecutions in Pictou County, (M. for papers*) 1589 (i).
Fraser, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4188 (iii).
—— Dismissal of (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of (Ques.) 546 (i).
See 'Stellarton.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 872 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. (B. 20), 1° m., 711; (M.) to suspend Rule, 713; 2°m., 795 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6572 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Employees Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i), 6572 (iv).
Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re*, Investigation by H. P. Duchemin (M. for papers*) 2588 (ii).
G. B. and Canada Mail Service, Contracts *re* (remarks) 1845 (i), 4718 (iii).
See 'Can. and G. B.'
Goods purchased by Public Works since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1578 (i).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Govt. Business on Mondays (remarks) 2377 (ii).
Govt. Printing, Patronage to French Papers in Quebec (Ques.) 1357 (i).
Govt. Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Governor General of Canada, Letters Patent (M. for copy*) 2247 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1465 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5626 (iv).
Hale, Thomas, Dismissal as Correspondent *Labour Gazette*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Hawkes, Mr.: *See* 'British News.'
Highway Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3656; in Com., 3719, 3947, 3956 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4142; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 85) 4142 (iii).
Immigration in Ont., Promise of Premier, *re* Assistance (Ques.) 546 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity, &c., on M. for Sup., 2420 (ii).
I. C. Ry., Coal Supply, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 2457 (ii).
—— Employees in Pictou, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (M. for cor.*) 2246 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
I. C. R. and Ry. Commission, Res. *re* Control (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Japanese, Oriental, &c., Immigration, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 875 (i).
Leaitch, Alvena Bell Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 5156 (iii).
Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
McAuley, Angus, Claims for Damages *re* Fire, Investigation (M. for rep.*) 3756 (ii).
McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 4460 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3851; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); in Com., 4525 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4844; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4708 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. &c. *re* Settlement with Provs. of Man. and Ont. (M. for cor.) 774, 789 (i).
——— Terms *re* (Ques.) 716 (i).
Maritime Telephone Co., and P. E. I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1698 (i).
Marriage Law, Cor. with Federal Govt. *re* Legislation (M. for copies*) 3341 (ii).
——— Cor. with Prime Minister *re* Legislation (M. for copy*) 2861 (ii).
Matheson, Jas. W., Charges *re* (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c. (Ques.) 876 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmt. of Accountant (Ques.) 6661 (iv).
——— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse &c. (Ques.) 3943 (ii).
Murray, Dr., Poaching on East River for Salmon (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1880 (i); 3378 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Investigation *re* Construction (remarks) 2060 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 2157 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley (remarks) 3730 (ii).
Naturalization Legislation, Uniformity in (M. for cor. &c.) 765 (i).
Naturalization: *See* 'Imperial.'
Naval Defence of the Pacific Coast, Res., from B. B. Legislature &c. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Naval Discipline Act. Application to Canada (Ques.) 1203 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1822 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Employee of Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co. (Ques.) 973 (i).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract Supplies to Crews, &c. (Ques.) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
Poaching for Salmon on East River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Postmasters and Town Councillors, Regulations *re* Acceptance (Ques.) 2587 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3355 (ii).
P. E. I. Car Ferry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5189, 5210 (iii).
P. E. I. Ferry Papers, Inquiry for 4232 (iii).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6118, 6130 (iv).
Public Works, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 559 (i).
Public Works Contracts, Amounts given without Tender (Ques.) 877, 1578 (i).
——— Contracts in Montreal and Quebec, given without tender (Ques.) 877 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Supplies, Orders without Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2459 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Solicitor, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1814 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3884 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Stmnt. (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Railway Facilities in N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
Rayne, R. W., Caretaker, Truro Armoury, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. (remarks) 3331 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) 3449 (ii).
River John, Mail Carrier, Name, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1579 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 2247 (ii).
Rural Mail: *See* 'C. S. Bill 179.'
Salmon Fisheries, B. C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c. (M. for papers*) 3756 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re* (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5161 (iii).
Smith, Angus, Pilot of D. G. S. 'Earl Grey' Suspension of (M. for papers*) 1590 (i).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 546 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Solicitor General, Vacancy (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Stellarton Postmaster Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
See 'Fraser.'
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of (M. for cor.*) 2247 (ii).
Sunny Brae to Guysborough Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 542 (i).
Sunnybrae Branch Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4216 (iii).
See 'Guysboro.'
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (oyster culture) 5255 (iii).
Immigration (agencies) 3307 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1468; (combines investigation act) 1501; (conciliation board) 1509; (industrial disputes act) 1500 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (International Congress) 5237; (pensions) 5236 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4718; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Can. and S. Africa) 4726; (Halifax, Nfld. and England) 4728; (Magdalen Islands) 4732; (North Sydney) 678 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5453; (allowance) 5449; (associations and bands) 5528; (automobiles) 5492, 5513; (camps) 5521; (customs dues) 5522 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5189, 5210; (patrol vessels) 5231; (St. Lawrence channel) 5231; (wrecks) 5229; (wreck subsidies) 5231 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries, &c.) 6625 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1951 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (electric power) 3286; (lighting) 3291 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (P.E.I. system) 3303 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 4136; (branch lines) 4135 (iii), 5620 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 4137 (iii); (coal contracts) 5611 (iv); (construction) 4130 (iii); (Guysborough branch) 676 (i); (SS. subsidies improvements) 5597 (iv); (working expenses) 4163 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (bounties act) 687 (i).
Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re* (Ques.) 547 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2159; in Com., 3551 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Report *re* (Ques.) 1202 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy, B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6406, 6439 (iv).
Vale Ry. Lease Bill, and Acadia Coal Co., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 933 (i).
—— Operation by I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
Venoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1817 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to (Ques.) 1202 (i).
See 'Fenian.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Westville Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1531 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*
Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co. (B. 36) 1°*, 969 (i); in Com., 2410 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 644 (i).
Dominion Trust Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1862 (i); in Com., 4237 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6764 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep., &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 733 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (aids) Amt. (B. 87) 1° m., 2058 (ii).
Mexican Interurban Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 132) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Moose Loyal Order incorp. (B. 158) in Com., 6126 (iv).
Patent Act (time limit) Amt. (B. 59) 1° m., 1020 (i).
Ry. Act (section men) Amt. (B. 86) 1° m., 2058 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Halifax.*
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew (remarks) 408 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1440 (i).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke (M. for cor.) 1361 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5846 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2410 (ii).
Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Biological Board of Canada B. 118 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 4551 (iii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S., Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
B. C. Railway Belt, Unalienated Lands, O. C. *re* (remarks) 1200 (i).
Budget, The, 5011 (iii).
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Subsidies, Guarantee, &c. (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5160 (iii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5264 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Compensation (remarks) 1199 (i).
Chester Canal, N.S., Discontinuance of Work (Ques.) 716 (i).
——— (remarks) 806 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2049 (ii).
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Digby Clock Keeper, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 1183 (i).
Dismissal of Public Officials (M. for papers, &c.) 878 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of Irrelevant Subjects (remarks) on Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker), 2444 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, 1575 (i).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 4196, 4719 (iii), 6496 (iv).
Fishery Treaty with U. S., Withdrawal *re* (remarks) 408 (i).
Financial Review, 6707 (iv).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Goucher, Wesley, Lightkeeper at Margaretsville, N.S. Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Sale B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6181 (iv).
Govt. Loans, Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4777 (iii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii), 6496 (iv).
Ham, Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital, Halifax (Ques.) 875 (i).
Hawke, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. on M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. C., 617 (i).
Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Dismissal from Customs, (Ques.) 4039 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 1°, 1572 (i); in Com., 3689 (ii).
House of Commons Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2139 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1300, 1420 (i).
I. C. R. Brotherhood Unions, Agreements, &c. (M. for papers) 793 (i).
——— Pullman Conductors, Promotions &c. (Ques.) 1413 (i).
——— Truro Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 1412 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1443 (i).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening (Ques.) 722 (i).
Lobster Traps, Customs Change in Tariff on Twines (M. for papers) 1362 (i).
Lobster Twine Customs Duties, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 1070 (i).
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Mader, D., Dismissal from Mahone Post Office (Ques.) 722 (i).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Man. Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 1°, 3906 (ii); in Com., 4524 (iii).
Medical Attendance free to Fishermen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 1812 (i).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1899 (i); 3446 (ii).
'Niobe' Cruiser, Repairs to (Ques.) 577 (i).
Nursery Stock, Purchase of Experimental Farm, N.S., (Ques.) 3333 (ii).
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax (Ques.) 717 (i).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6124 (iv).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6174 (iv).
Railway Companies incorp. (B. 191) 1° m., 6492 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2056 (ii).
Revised Statutes, Correction *re* French Translation B. 65 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1438 (i).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Royal N. W. M. P., Annuties to families of Inspector Fitzgerald and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5176 (iii).
Spry Bay Post Office, Removal *re* (M. for cor*.) 582 (i).
——— (Ques.) 577 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1076; Marine Dept—(salaries) 1053 (i); Post Office (promotions) 6279 (iv).
Fisheries (lobster hatchery) 5256 (iii); (medical attendance, free) 680 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 3305; (agents) 3918 (ii).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1501; (Gazette) 1476; (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection dangerous machinery) 1527 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 4714; (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G. B.) 4719 (iii); (Canada and Mexico) 5935 (iv); (Halifax and W. Indies) 4748; (Magdalen Islands) 4730; (St. John and Halifax) 4739 (iii); (St. John and W. Indies) 641 (i).
Militia (associations and bands) 5530 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186, 5216 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6286; Outside Service (salaries) 6616, 6621 (iv).
Public Works—B. C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Lawlor's Island) 1341; (Lunenburg) 1343; (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1531 (i).
Public Works—Ottawa—(H. of C. telephones) 3243 (ii); (observatory) 1322; (Sussex St.) 1322 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal P. O.) 1353 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Devil's Island) 2055 (ii); (dredging) 639 (i); (Yarmouth) 2056 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 677 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 622; (Dartmouth branch) 670 (i); (Halifax docks) 5596, 5601 (iv).
R.N.W.M.P. (pay of force, &c.) 5176 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (bounties on steel and iron) 5934 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2621; in Com., 2997, 3043, 3548 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3617 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 3618 (ii).
Tariff Commission, Legislation *re* (remarks) 938 (i).
Trade Relations between W. Indies Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2002 (ii).
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal (Ques.) 6783 (iv).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Budget, The, 5041 (iii).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4097 (iii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).
Combines Act, *re* Companies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1516 (i).
Companies, Over-capitalization of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1516 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 645 (i).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable Rates,' 'Parcel,' 'Public Ownership,' 'Ry. Rates.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2172; in Com., 2199, 2317, 3472 (ii), 4063 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4424; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4946 (iii).
Man. Bill, Correction *re* Voting (remarks) 4984 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1630 (i).
Parcel Post, Extension of System (amt.) on M. for Sup., 2329 (ii).
Public Ownership of Public Utilities, on M. for Sup., 645 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. for Sup., 1902 (i).
——— Notice of Discussion, 1494 (i).
Reciprocity in Trade (remarks) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines act) 1516 (i).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 688; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2959 (ii).
United Shoe Co.'s Machinery, Investigation, Application to Min. of Justice *re* (Ques.) 3148 (ii).
——— Proceedings *re* (Ques.) 2455 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908, Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 1°, 4975 (iii).

MACNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*
Adams, William Hollaway Relief (B. 122) 1°*, 4457 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, 4810 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Strike and Board of Conciliation (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Guarantee Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 154) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1258 (i).
Isaac, Isabell, Relief (B. 131) 1°*, 4835 (ii).

MACNUTT, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2524 (ii).
Sutherland, George McKay, Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2749 (ii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*
Bank Act. Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5855 (iv).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 2664 (ii); in Com., 5198 (iii).
Coal in the West, Remission of duties (remarks) 178, 230 (i).
Drill Halls, in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites (Ques.) 1815 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2179; in Com., 2201, 3790 (ii); 4043, 4155; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4803 (iii).
Grain Congestion in the Northwest (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5760 (iv).
International Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 148) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Moosejaw Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2349 (ii).
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 534 (i).
Railways in Man. and N.W., Subsidies &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c. on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1934 (i).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick P.O., Cor. &c. (read) on M. for Sup., 5922 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5764 (iv).
Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition (Ques.) 542 (i).

McCREA, Mr. F. N., *Sherbrooke.*
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Eastern Township, Field for Immigrants (remarks) 6557 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6267 (iv).
Immigration into Eastern Townships (remarks) 6557 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Militia (automobiles) 5518 (iii).

McCREA, Mr. F. N.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6631 (iv).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *West Kent.*
Kennedy, John Angus Relief (B. 164) M. 1°*, 5549 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wheatley Creek) 640 (i).

McCURDY, Mr. F. B., *Shelburne & Queens.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6506 (iv).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4203 (iii).
Mail Subsidies *re* W. Indies Service, Establishment by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5634 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2933 (ii).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and W. Indies, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2004 (ii).

McKAY, Mr. J., *Prince Albert.*
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1232 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 740 (i).
Keewatin Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation, incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1410 (i).
Northern Territorial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).
Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 794 (i).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1862 (i).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *North Cape Breton.*
Address, The, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt., 178 (i).
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3053 (ii).
Apples and Fruit Growing in N.S., Resolution of Fruit Growers' Ass'on. *re* Industry (remarks) 1719 (i).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5303 (iii).
Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iv).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re* (Ques.) 5948 (iv).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5403 (iii).
Christmas Adjournment (remarks) 703 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4582 (iii).
Civil Service Commission, Attack *re* Apptmts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2834 (ii).
Clock Towers in Public Buildings, N.S., Votes *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
Dismissals, Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5803 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dismissals from Public Works, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3251 (ii).
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re* (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (judges) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5893 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6521 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6457 (iv).
Gillies, Cap., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2563, 3507, 3767 (ii).
Grand Narrows Canal, Obstruction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1456 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3710 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1301, 1416 (i).
I. C. R., Estende to Baddeck Branch Line Tenders *re* (Ques.) 576 (i).
—— Estmere to Baddeck Branch Line, Surveys, Tenders, &c. (M. for papers) 2494 (ii).
—— 'Market Tickets' to Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5409 (iii).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re* &c. (Ques.) 3054 (ii).
Lighthousekeepers, Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5234 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6034 (iv).
McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4345; in Com., 4621 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2838 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1876 (i).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase of Salary (remarks) 3060 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3362 (ii).
Public Works in Cape Breton County, Appropriations omitted from Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).
Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re* (remarks) 805 (i).
Public Works, Votes for last year, Continuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Inquiry for Answer to Question, 5561 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3489 (ii).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. Barker) in Com., 5203 (iii).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6477; Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6481 (iv).
Excise (inspectors) 5825 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 6653 (iv); (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3309, 3916 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1475; (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection *re* dangerous machinery) 1526 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aid to navigation) 5238; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c.) 4714; (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4734; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4727 (iii); (North Sydney) 679 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4740 (iii).
Marine (steamboat inspection) 5238 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5544; (associations and bands) 5535; (customs dues) 5523 (iii).
Miscellaneous (honoraria *re* pelagic sealing) 5811 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5372 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186; (life saving awards) 5228; (live stock inspection) 5229; (registration) 5229 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293 (ii); (generally) 1340 (i); (rents, &c.) 3290 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Baddeck) 6658 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (leases) 1324 (i); (water supply) 3294 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Cape Breton) 2817; (Wood Mountain) 2821; (working expenses) 3302 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5765, 6607 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 4137; (Chatham diversion) 4139 (iii); (extensions) 673 (i), 5641; (Moncton shops) 5607; (refrigator cars) 5603; (Sydney diversion) 5658 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 691 (i).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5829 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2873, 3551 (ii), 4080 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6423 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6453 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2983 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2142 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 786 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1620 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6140 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5207 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5196, 5207 (iii).
Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. (B. 126) 1°*, 4835 (iii); in Com., 5907, 5940 (iv).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury and Queens, N.B.*
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1405 (i).

McMILLAN, Mr. J. A., *Glengarry.*
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency (Ques.) 713 (i).

MARCILE, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).

MARCILE, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Excise (inspectors) 5812 (iv).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*
Budget, The, 5102 (iii).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3226 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2731; in Com., 3046 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*
Budget, The, 5154 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees, &c. (Ques.) 4247 (iii).
Ministers from Quebec, Statements at St. Eustache Election Campaign Meetings (Ques.) 553 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*
Address, The, 464 (i).
Armoury at Regina, Erection of (Ques.) 580 (i).
British Western Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 3049 (ii).
Car Shortage *re* Grain Shipments (remarks) 802 (i).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) for stmnt., 564 (i).
Census of Saskatchewan, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 4983 (iii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4579 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6456 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2170; in Com., 2563, 3182, 3491, 3767 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4808; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) 4816 (iii).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4687, 4701 (iii).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* Candidate in last Election (Ques.) 6185, 6335 (iv).
Mounted Police, Increase *re* Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
Natural Resources, Provincial Control of in the West, Promise *re* (Ques.) 553 (i).
Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 970 (i).
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Leg. of Saskatchewan, *re* Negotiations for transfer of Resources (Ques.) 2577 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 466 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Board of Trade of Wilcox (remarks) 2299 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Regina) 2212 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2728 (ii).
Tariff Commission, ref. to in debate on Address, 465 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6453 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Minister of the Interior (Ques.) 553 (i).
Western Dom. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 125) 1°*, 4835 (iii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2410 (ii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C. N. R. Right of Way, Title *re* (Ques.) 934 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 817 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2189, 2321, 3475, 3506, 3783, 4046 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4810, 4814 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 602 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Power of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Questions, 798 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4286 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor. *re* Ont. Govt. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1870 (i); 3414 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3090 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 2414 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4774 (iii).
Railway Act (farm crossings) Amt. (B. 7) 1°m., 267 (i); 2°m., 2500 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2689; in Com., 2876, 2978, 3022, 3545-8 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2854, 2983; on M. for 3°, 3281 (ii).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
Railway Bridges, N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Senatorship from Mar. Prov., Pet. *re* French Apptmt. (remarks) 2755 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Contract *re* (Ques.) 577 (i).
——— Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Contract to Grand Falls (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies) 3915 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *North Grey.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2847 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Papers, 956 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6268 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1880 (i).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3069 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light Co. &c.) 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 5832 (iv).
——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to adopt., Ordering Attendance of Mr. R. C. Miller, 6333 (iv).
——— 4th Rep. (presented) 6492 (iv).
——— 5th Rep. (presented) 6732 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3489 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Naval Service (maintenance) 5325 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, (M.) to adjn. debate, 2664; resmd. debate, 2668; in Com., 2880, 3546 (ii).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and West Indies, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2002 (ii).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*
Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections (Ques.) 2587 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4596 (iii).
Man. Boundaries, Conference *re* Separate Schools (Ques.) 715 (i).
——— Eastern and Western Line, &c. (Ques.) 971 (i).
Parliament, Duration of Present Redistribution Bill, &c., Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor (Ques.) 557, 715 (i).

MONDOU, Mr. A. A., *Yamaska.*
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt., Salary &c. (Ques.) 1587 (i).
Address, The, 263, 270 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4455; in Com., (amt.) 4656; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4839; Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4924 (iii).
—— Notice of Amt., 4537 (iii).
Naval Bill, Repeal of, &c. (Ques.) 3942 (ii), 4242 (iii).
Naval Policy of Govt., ref. to in debate on Address, 270 (i).
Yamaska Electoral Agent, (Ques.) 1584 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D., (Minister of Public Works) *Jacques Cartier.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 223 (i).
Adjournment of House, *re* defective Electric Light (M.) 267 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 878 (i).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates, 1912, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Ret., 1819 (i).
Art Gallery, Purchase of Paintings (Ans.) 1865 (i).
See 'National.'
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5557 (iv).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3337 (ii).
Bissett, Geo. E., Dismissal from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
Bridge Works at Fraserville, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou (Ans.) 549 (i).
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Cabinet Dissensions (remarks) in debate on Address, 233 (i).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissals from St. Louis du Mile End (Ans.) 1414 (i).
Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Carrier Laine Property at Levis, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 732 (i).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ans.) 555 (i).
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to, *re* St. Lawrence River, &c. (Ans.) 728 (i).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 1584 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Chats Falls Timber Slide, Date of Deed, &c. (Ans.) 4549 (iii).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. as Investigation *re* Public Works Dept., 1414 (i).
Chester Canal, Discontinuance of Work, (Ans.) 716 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2050 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmts. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2835 (ii).
See 'Dismissals,' 'Ducharme,' &c.
Coal, Canadian used for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
Clocks in Towers of Public Buildings, N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy B. 111 (M.) for Com. on Res., 3343, in Com. on Res., 3450, 1* of Bill, 3451; 2° m., 3633 (ii).
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
See 'St. John.'
Dauphin Custom House (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal from Dredge Cape Breton (Ans.) 548 (i).
—— defective answer (remarks) 804 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1270 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
Deschamps, Raoul, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
—— (remarks) 6278 (iv).
Dismissals from Govt. Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1956 (i), 2018 (ii).
See 'Inquiries B. 19,' 'Ottawa.'
—— Official Inquiry in Hull (remarks) 4140 (iii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. (B. 180) in Com. on Res., 6047; 1°*, 5939; 2°*, in Com., 6201 (iv).
Ducharme, Mr., Attack of ex-P. M. G. *re* Appmt. to Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2832 (ii).
—— Resignation *re* (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Dumelong, Mr. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption P. O. (Ans.) 720 (i).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 4039 (iii).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2021 (ii).
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 725 (i).
Elevator Men Employed by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of Irrelevant Subjects (remarks) *re* Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker), 2444 (ii).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris, &c. (Ans.) 559 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3150 (ii).
Gaspe Landing Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction *re* (Ans.) 544 (i).
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ans.) 555 (i).
Govt. Works Tolls Act Amt. (B. 103) in Com., 3450 (ii).
See 'Timber.'
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal &c. (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Harbours and Rivers Works, Policy *re* Tendering (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
House of Commons, Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
——— Improvements in Acoustics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
——— Parliamentary Restaurant, Payment to Waiters (Ans.) 2861 (ii).
——— Telephones in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3539 (ii).
Ice-Breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2452 (ii).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Genevieve Wharfs, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 557 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2427 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1299 (i).
I. C. Ry., Passes to Employees, Instructions *re* Newspaper Reporters, &c. (remarks) 2329 (ii).
——— Ocean Limited Express, Hauling Private Cars (remarks) on conc., 6776 (iv).
Inverness Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1535 (i).
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
Kennedy, Mr., Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal (Ans.) 6782 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2295 (ii).
Lalonde, Mr. Alfred, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4779 (iii).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer at Lake Aylmer (Ans.) 4550 (iii).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector (Ans.) 5055 (iii).
L'Assomption Public Works, Votes in Estimates (Ans.) 5951, 6781 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriation for (Ans.) 2451, 2579 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property (Ans.) 2451 (ii).
Lemieux, Hon. R., late P.M.G., Par. in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals (Ans.) 2665 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 728 (i).
Little Anse Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6025 (iv).
Lorneville Cove, Tests *re* Foundations (Ans.) 555 (i).
Lowe, Mr. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 3754 (ii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2017 (ii).
Magdalen Islands Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of (Ans.) 550 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4407; in Com., 4548; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4903 (iii).
Man. School Bill, ref. to in debate on Address, 226, 231 (i).
Maritime Telephone Co. and P.E.I. System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).
Melford, N.S. Public Wharf, Notice to suspend (Ans.) 549 (i).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ans.) 533 (i).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury, Construction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040, 2207 (ii).
Moosejaw Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
Napierville Post Office Site, Purchase of (remarks) 2374, 3153 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Purchase of Paintings, &c. (Ans.) 6184, 6337 (iv).
——— Presentation of Oil Painting by H.R.H. Princess Louise (announcement) 5056 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
Naval Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 234 (i).
Naval Question, Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull (Ans.) 551 (i).
New Harbour Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2045 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co., Prohibition *re* Grinding Machines (remarks) 2060 (ii).
Ottawa Dismissals, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
See 'Dismissals,' &c.
Ottawa Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re* (Ans.) 876 (i).
See 'Sussex St.,' 'Supply—Buildings—Ottawa.'
Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded (Ans.) 532 (i).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re* (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Pink Rock Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
Point Aux Anglais Drainage Works (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
Port Hawkesbury Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
Port Richmond Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 1585 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1811 (i).
Printing Bureau, Policy of Govt. *re* Erection (Ans.) 546 (i).
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re* (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
Public Expenditures, Scandals, &c., by late Govt. (remarks) in debate on Address, 231 (i).
Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re* (remarks) 805 (i).
Public Works in N.B., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2436 (ii).
Public Works Contracts *re* (Ans.) 559 (i).
Public Works Contracts given without tender (Ans.) 877 (i).
Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in Different Provs. (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
Public Works Employees, Dismissal of workmen (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
Public Works, Engineering Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058-9 (i).
Public Works now under construction, Approval of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
——— Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1204 (i).
——— (remarks) 1579 (i).
Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c. (Ans.) 530 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Public Works, Votes for last year, Continuation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1402 (i).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re* (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
——— (remarks) 6785 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Subsidy (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Board, removal of Members (Ans.) 560 (i).
Reciprocity Treaty, (remarks) in debate on Address, 231 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4460 (iii), 6494 (iv).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Amount expended from 1896 to 1911 (Ans.) 876 (i).
——— Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupency (Ans.) 547 (i).
——— Lighting and Heating (remarks) *re* Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 727 (i).
Rivière des Prairies, Drainage, Continuation of, &c. (Ans.) 715 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Roy, Wm., Charges *re*, Rep., &c., on M. (Mr. Boulay) for Papers, 1394 (i).
St. André Wharf, Discontinuance of Work *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).
St. Jean and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ans.) 551 (i).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day (Ans.) 548 (i).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. John and Courtenay Bay Contract, Signing, &c. (remarks) 6187 (iv).
See 'Courtenay.'
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2068 (ii).
Separate Schools: *See* 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Shediac Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).
Sorel Deep Water Wharfs, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
——— Claim of Mr. Lariviere for Timber supplied (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulation *re* Reading prayers in French, 1808 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1848 (i).
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 5055 (iii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY.
Civil Govt.—Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Marine Dept. (salaries) 1050 (i); Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv); Public Works (salaries) 1064 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1469 (i).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa river) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2204; (Edmonton) 2206; (Lethbridge) 2212; (Strathcona) 2213 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293; (furniture) 3286 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Hampton) 1527; (Hillsboro) 1528; (St. John quarantine) 1530 (i); (Shediac) conc., 6794 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Lawlor's Island) 1341; (Lunenburg) 1343; (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1530; (Wolfville) 1343 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Gananoque) 1855; (Kingston R.M.C.) 1855; (Midland) 1855; (Port Arthur) 1951; (Renfrew) 1953; (Seaforth) 1953; (Sudbury) 1954; (Toronto warehouse) 1964 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Eastern Block addition) 1339 (i); (electric power) 3286 (ii); (examining warehouse) 1949 (i); (furniture) 3279; (grounds) 3239; (heating, &c.) 3278 (ii); (leases) 1324; (library improvements) 1950 (i); (lighting) 3291 (ii); (observatory) 1321 (i); (rents, &c.) 3290; (Rideau Hall furniture) 3285; (site for new buildings) 3242; (snow cleaning) 3279 (ii); (Sussex St.) 1322 (i); (water supply) 3295 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine) 1346, 1953; (Lévis armoury) 1346 (i); (Louiseville) conc., 6795 (iv); (Maisonneuve) 1347; (Montreal barracks) 1350; (Montreal customs) 1351; (Montreal P. O. enlargement) 1348; (Montreal postal station F) 1352; (Napierville) 1354; (Quebec customs house) 1849; (Quebec drill hall) 1849; (Quebec P.O.) 1851; (Rigaud) 1852; (St. Lambert) 1853 (i); (St. Laurent) 6804 (iv); (St. Thérèse) 1854; (Shawinigan) 1852; (Sherbrooke) 1853; (Three Rivers) 1854 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2204; (Humboldt) 2211; (Regina) 2212; (Weyburn) 2213 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta. (Athabaska river) 2815; (Edmonton) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2814 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii); (dredging) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Bathurst) 2363 (ii); (Beaumont) 2366; (generally) 2368; (Goose Creek) 2373 (ii); (St. John) 627 (i); (St. John dry dock) 3297 (ii); (Sackville) conc., 6805 (iv).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Arichat) 2040; (Bayfield) 2041; (Blue Rocks Island) 2041; (Burke's Head) 2045; (Cape Breton) 2053; (Cole Harbour) 2055; (Cow Bay) 2055; (Devil's Island) 2056 (ii); (dredging) 639 (i); (Gillis Point) 2056; (Inverness) 2056; (Melford) 2056; (repairs, &c.) 2051; (Yarmouth) 2056 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) conc., 6777 (iv); (Toronto harbour) 2445 (ii); (Wheatley Creek) 640 (i); (York bridge) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Levis graving dock) 3296; (Quebec Harbour) 2836; (Rivieres des Prairies) 2441; (St. Charles River) 2837; (Three Rivers) 2441 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 2823; (Temiskaming dam) 2827 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. and Saskn. (Athabasca Landing) 2819; (Fort McMurray) 2819; (Moose to Durlingford) 2820; (North Battleford) 2823; (Peace River) 2822; (Wood Mountain) 2821 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs, Generally 3303; (repairs, &c.) 2817; (working expenses) 3303 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs, N.S. (Cape Breton) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (P.E.I. system) 3304 (ii); conc., 6794 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Gaspé) 3305; (Magdalen Islands) 3302 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon system) 3303 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 623 (i).

Sussex St. Property, Purchase by Govt., Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1359 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 2010 (ii).
Sutherland, Mr. Roderick, Dismissal of (remarks) 1274 (i).
——— *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2019 (ii).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3268 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam, on Inquiry for Ret., 6662 (iv).
Tolls for Timber on Govt. Works (B. 103) 1°m., 3049 (ii).
See 'Govt. Tolls B. 103.'
Tower Clock, Repairs to (remarks) 1575 (i).
——— (explanation) in reference to repairs, 1708 (i).
Vegreville and Lloydminister Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
Waterways Commissioners, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6705 (iv).
Weedon Public Building, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 4550 (iii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for ten years (Ans.) 1812 (i).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of (Ans.) 551 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).

MORPHY, Mr. H. B., *North Perth.*
Agricultural Committee, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2156 (ii).
Cattle diseased, Compensation *re* Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5882 (iv).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5740 (iv).
Farmers Bank Failure, Inquiry by Chief Justice Meredith (remarks) 6710 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6459 (iv).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6757 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6043 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2° (remarks) 4307 (iii).
Poaching in East River, N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5247 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6471 (iv).
Militia (associations and bands) 5533 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5365 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5625, 5633 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3011 (ii).

MURPHY, Hon. C., *Russell.*
Address, The, 501 (i).
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 533 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1495 (i).
Bread Combines, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Cabinet Ministers from Quebec, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Monk (Ques.) 526 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1436 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Civil Service Competitive Examination, Extension *re* (Ques.) 533 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Settlement of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 529 (i).
Companies Incorporation, Ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal by Govt. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5552; in Com., 5868 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
——— Limitations *re* Tenders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursement to Depositors (Ques.) 527 (i).
——— Indemnifying Shareholders, Speech Hon. Mr. Crothers *re* (Ques.) 3147, 3332 (ii).
——— Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c. (Ques.) 713 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6569 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Naturalization of, &c. (Ques.) 4242, 4978 (iii).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. *re* Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 527 (i).
House of Commons Sessional Employees, Number dismissed, &c. (Ques.) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1309, 1426 (i).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5413 (iii).
King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant (Ques.) 1809 (i).
Maritime Law International Conference, Invitation to Govt. *re* (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ques.) 532 (i).
Militia Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co. (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1879, 1889 (i),
N. T. Ry. Commission, Duties assigned to New Chairman (Ques.) 533 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Apptmt., Salary &c., of Messrs Gutelius and Staunton (Ques.) 4242, 4978 (iii).
Naval Policy, Interview with Hon. Geo. H. Perley in London (remarks) 1576 (i).
——— Promise *re* Referendum (Ques) 526 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
——— Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 526 (i).
Petewawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded (Ques.) 532 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Changes *re* Duties (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts. (Ques.) 1809 (i).
——— Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 2066 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Policy of Govt. *re* Erection of (Ques.) 546 (i).
Public Works on Rys., Suspension *re*, Names and Locations (Ques.) 531 (i).
Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c. (Ques.) 530 (i).
Renfrew, S. Election, Issue of Writ, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse. 2238 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4836 (iii), 5560 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Acquisition of Additional Land (Ques.) 533 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture, Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6484; (International Institute) 6478 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6462 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (lock improvements) 6611; Welland (construction) 6610 (iv).
Charges of Management (coin circulation) 1034 (i).
Civil Govt—Agriculture (promotions) 6485 (iv); Customs (salaries) 1040 (i); Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Interior (salaries) 1039; Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1035 (i); (promotions) 6585 (iv); Militia (salaries) 1037; Post Office (salaries) 1067; Public Works (salaries) 1065; Secretary of State (printing bureau) 1038; (salaries) 1038 (i).
Civil Service Commission (additional commissioner) 6615 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6582 (iv).
Inland Revenue (explosives apparatus) 6604 (iv).
Justice (pecuniary claims) 6579 (iv).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1500; (Gazette) 1472; (industrial training commission) 1527 (i).
Militia (Rockliffe ranges) 6654 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6485; (claim of Mrs. Wiley) 6489; (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486; (Olympic games) 6486 (iv).
Printing Bureau (plant, &c.) 6611 (iv).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Korks—Buildings—Ont. (Gananoque) 1855 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St.) 1333 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) 6657; conc., 6776 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6607 (iv).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) on Senate Amts., 6670 (iv).
Typewriters and Supplies, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 1809 (i).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6326 (iv).
Waterways Commission, Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt. (Ques.) 533 (i).
W. Indies Trade Arrangements, Negotiations *re* (M. for papers*) 977 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1820 (i).

NANTEL, Hon. W. B. (*Minister of Inland Revenue*) *Terrebonne.*
Courcy, Mr. P., Apptmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iv).
——— Emplymt. in Inland Revenue (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Courchene, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept. (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Desmarais, Mr., Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).
Dismissals from Inland Rev., Letter sent out (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iv).
Dumontier, Joseph Alphonse, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector, Quebec (Ans.) 3340 (ii).
Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept. at Petrolia (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c. (Ans.) 726 (i).
Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner (Ans.) 2860 (ii).
Inland Revenue Reports (presented) 565 (i)
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4959 (iii).
Maple Sugar, Cancellation of O.C. *re* Standards (Ans.) 716 (i).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Robitaille, J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); (salaries) 1040, 1061; Mines Dept. (salaries) 1066 (i).
Excise (customs duties) 5827; (inspectors) 5812; (salaries) 5812; (tobacco stamps) 5826; (travelling expenses) 5826 (iv).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6604 (iv).
Inland Revenue (explosive apparatus) 6603 (iv).

NANTEL, Hon. W. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mines (French reports) 6491; (ore deposits) 6602, 6490; (peat industry) 6491 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster Indian reserve) 6806 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspection electric lights) 5828 (iv).
Therien, J. F., Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1413 (i).
Three Rivers, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Hebert (Ans.) 1209 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. of Excise Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Census Enumerators and Returning Officers, Delays *re* Payment (remarks) 2156 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks 824 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contract (M.) for O. Cs., &c., 732 (i).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2187, 2306, 2392, 2545, 2770, 3160, 3762 (ii), 4155 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 592 (i).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1927 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings (generally) 2215; Sask. (Humboldt) 2211 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 622 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2904 (ii).
Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *North Oxford.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Budget, The, 5134 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., Rural Mails, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4088 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5200 (iii).
Canal Staffs, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5802 (iv).
Civil Servants and Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5204 (iii), 5903 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5862 (iv).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Dominion Trust Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 4238 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 872 (i); in Com., 2184, 2556 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3682 (ii).
Lumber Combine in B.C., Ques. of Order, 2299 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4546 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Discussion *re* Man. School Questions (Ques.) 534 (i).
Manitoba Questions (remarks) *re* Answers, 581 (i).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3126 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1869 (i), 3372 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 2414 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3354; in Com., 3361 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3881 (ii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2988 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922 (iv).
See 'Cable.'
Rural Telephone System, placing in Post Office, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2248 (ii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1°*, 970 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 620 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1041; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1040; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1046 (i).
Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 5793; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 5797 (iv).
Labour Dept. (industrial training commission) 1527 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4717 (iii).
Militia (allowance) 5451; (annual drill) 5452, 5464; (associations and bands) 5535 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John quarantine) 1530 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals) 1327 (i).
Railways—Generally (salaries) 5801 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (board of commissioners) 5800; (litigation) 5801 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 698 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2696; in Com., 2871, 2903, 3546 (ii), 4080 (iii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).
West Ontario Pacific Railway Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 795 (i).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4559 (iii).

NICHOLSON, Mr. D., *Queens, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6150 (iv).

NICKLE, Mr. W. F., *Kingston.*
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3437 (ii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1377 (i).
Queens Theological College incorp, (B. 69) 1°*, 1410 (i).
Queens University at Kingston (B. 68) 1°*, 1410 (i); in Com., 3874 (ii); 4745; Order called for Com., 4237; 3°m., 4869 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6601 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2738 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Address, The, 357 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1632 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3746 (ii).
N.T. Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3093 (ii).
Naval Policy of Govt., Ref. to in debate on Address, 357 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6434 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F., *Edmonton.*
Address, The, 448 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5293 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5564 (iv).
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of (remarks) 1575 (i).
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6314 (iv).
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5904, 5942 (iv).
Budget, The, 5093 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., on M. to withdraw Res., 3448 (ii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6323 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 189 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6373 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6361 (iv).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Staples) in Com., 5201 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143, in Com., 5401 (iii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 929 (i).
Civil Service Commission Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Cockshutt) 812, 815 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6220 (iv).
Farm Implements, Price of: *See* 'Cockshutt,' 'Tariff Commission.'
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6455 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys. on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).
See 'Ry.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2174, 2180, 2303, 2382, 2535, 2755, 3156, 3452, 3508, 3758 (ii), 4053; on Order for 3° and M. (Mr. Foster) for Com., 4153-4; (amt.) 4806; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) 4820 (iii).
See 'Man. Grain Act.'
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution (remarks) 5956, 6556 (iv).
——— Further Information, Inquiry for, 6186 (iv).
Grain Congestion, Transportation, &c., Remarks on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West, Freight Rates, &c. (prop. res.) 3975; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 84) 4035 (ii).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Grain Storage at Minneapolis, Inquiry for Papers, 6493 (iv).
Grain Transportation in the West, Par. in Toronto Globe (remarks) 5928 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5901 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Hawkes, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. (M. for O.Cs.) 605 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3721 (ii).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction for Glanders (remarks) 5693, 5939 (iv).
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6790 (iv).
House of Commons, Ventilation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1240 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 746 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2146 (ii).
Immigration, Rep. of Mr. Hawkes, Inquiry for, 6551 (iv).
See 'Hawkes.'
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2428 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6189, 6679 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6310 (iv).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6015 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).
Live Stock Record Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 6022; in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1794 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3870, 3886; on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4297; in Com. (amt.) 4673 (iii).
Manitoba Boundary Extension, Answer to Question (remarks) 3755 (ii).
——— Eastern Boundary Extension (Ques.) 3936 (ii).
——— Financial Terms, &c. (Ques.) 558 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 3448, 3834 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1°, 2406; on M. for 3°, 2575 (ii).
See 'Grain Act.'
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal B. 30 (Mr. G. V. White) in Com., 4699 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment.) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3086 (ii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1875 (i); 3426 (ii).
Ottawa City Items (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5969, 6175 (iv).
Public Works Estimates, Information *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4767 (iii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2513 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4124 (iii).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1943 (i).
See 'Freight Rates,' 'Grain Congestion,' 'Hudson Bay Ry.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5899; in Com., 6218, 6310 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2985, 3332, 3484 (ii).
——— on Order for Com. (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 449 (i).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (census) 6463 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 1039 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6773 (iv); Interior (salaries) 1038 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3306, 3919 (ii).
Justice (N.W. Teritories) 6560; Penitentiaries (salaries) 6596 (iv).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1502; (Gazette) 1491 (i).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2205; (Edmonton) 2206 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2204 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Athabaska River) 2814; (Edmonton) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Athabaska Landing) 2819; (Fort McMurray) 2819; (North Battleford) 2822; (Peace River) 2821; (Wood Mountain) 2821 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6605 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (bounties act) 687 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) in Com. on Res., 2160; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2685; in Com., 2877, 2972, 2994, 3586, (ii); on Senate Amts., 6675 (iv).
Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908, 5940 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6218 (iv).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 933 (i).
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6177 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2983 (ii).
Webster, Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 2°, 6182 (iv).

OSLER, Sir E. B., *West Toronto.*
Architectural Institute of Canada (B. 35) 1°*, 969 (i).
Canadian Mortage Investment Co.'s (B. 11) 1°*, 643 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Transfer (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5709 (iv).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2542 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 5793 (iv).

PACAUD, Mr. L. T., *Megantic.*
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame de Lourdes, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1863 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of (Ques.) 2579 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6285 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*
Budget, The, 5151 (iii).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 2012 (ii).
Dismissals from Government Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Relations (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5759 (iv).
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 619 (i).
Immigration Agents for Farm Labourers, in Quebec, Number (Ques.) 1359 (i).
Immigrant Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1212 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Immigration, Amount expended, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 1211 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended (Ques.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Hospitals, Number and Location (Ques.) 1210 (i).
Immigration Literature, French Publications (Ques.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended (Ques.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1211 (i).
I. C. R., Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4966 (iii).
N. T. Ry., Inspector of Stations, Apptmt. of Mr. Goulet (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
Paris Exposition, Payments for Space, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 582 (i).
SUPPLY—
Militia (annual drill) 5501 (iii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceedings *re* (Ques.) 572 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5730 (iv).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6088 (iv).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).
Fleming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Revenue Dept., Petrolla (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1376 (i).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Tels., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 2458 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Govt. Car Service, Tel. sent to A. A. McLean (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c. (M. for papers*) 4262 (iii).
Sarnia Armoury, Erection of (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i); (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii); (Ques.) 555 (i).
Sarnia Winter Harbour (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i); Inquiry for Ret., 5946 (ii).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, 519 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (regulations) 3911 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P. (Postmaster General), *Quebec County.*
Anse a Valeau, Charges against Postmistress Madame Proulx (Ans.) 2072 (ii).
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Dismissal (Ans.) 5950 (iv).
Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re* (Ans.) 576 (i).
Bedford Postmaster Dismissal, on Inquiry for Ret., 5161 (iii).
Boucher, Mr. F. O., Pet. *re* Dismissals (Ans.) 976 (i).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal (Ans.) 6337 (iv).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re* (Ans.) 5948 (iv).
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
Brown, William, Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Buck, Mr. A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal of (remarks) 3910 (ii).
Cable Rates, Reduction of Fees, Tel. from Imp. P.M.G. (read) 931 (i).
See 'Australia.'
Cable Rates to G. B. (remarks) on M for Sup. 3238 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4114 (iii).
See 'Parcel Post,' &c.
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6306 (iv).
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Canso Postmaster, Pet. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1207 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet. *re* Change of Name (Ans.) 1204 (i).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site (Ans.) 1920 (i).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 1863 (i).
Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4039, 4780 (iii).
Civil Service Act (mail clerks) Amt. (B. 106) M. for Com. on Res., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3155 (ii); in Com., 4782; on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 5263 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill 105.'
Civil Service Act (postmasters) Amt. (B. 124) M. for Com. on Res., 4042; in Com. on Res., 4583; 1°*, 4584 (iii).
Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4550 (iii).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 3148 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Dismissal of Conservative Postmasters *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 2295 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 915 (i).
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame de Lourdes, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1863 (i).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c. (Ans.) 3754 (ii).
Dumelong, E., Postmaster at L'Assomption, Dismissal of (Ans.) 580 (i).
Dupré, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) on prop. Res., 5560; in Com. on Res., 6051; in Com., 6201 (iv).
East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Farly, Mrs. Paul, Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
Franking Privilege: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of (Ans.) 546 (i).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of (Ans.) 1204 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Policy (remarks) 1971 (ii).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c. (remarks) 804 (i).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Parcel Post,' 'Postal Regulations,' 'Rural Telephones.'
Henry, Norbert, Mail Contract between Scott Junction and Station (Ans.) 975 (i).
I. C. R. Branch Lines, in prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1010 (i).
Investigations *re* Political Partisanships, Cost of (Ans.) 5951 (iv).
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
Laberge, Mr. H., Compensation *re* Death as Letter Carrier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Lacombe, J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P. O., Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 975 (i).
Langevin Block, Condition of: *See* 'P. O. Deptl. Bldg.'
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Legault, Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5950 (iv).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Linwood and Grosvenor's Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 6337 (iv).
Lotbinière County Postmasters, Dismissed, Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 972 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office (Ans.) 2243 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Dismissal of (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P. O. (Ans.) 722 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi News Service, Salary of Correspondent (Ans.) 4262 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4042 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms (Ans.) 4777 (iii).
Mail Clerks: *See* 'C. S. Act,' P. O. B. 105.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 5693 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4426; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4946 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor. (remarks) 780 (i).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Message to all Dominions (Ans.) 2586 (ii).
See 'Magdalen.'
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1685 (i).
Marriage Bill, Correction *re* Speech, 3532 (ii).
Michaud, Mr. J., Dismissal from St. Moïse Station (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Montcalm Postmasters, Pets. *re* Removal (Ans.) 575 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office Inspector, on Inquiry for Ret., 4981 (iii).
Moosejaw Post Office, Proposed Sites, &c. (Ans.) 976 (i), 3342 (ii).
Moreau, Mr. J., Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Lapointe) for Cor., 1818 (i).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Station, Quebec City, Construction (remarks) 6786 (iv).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for O.Cs., &c., 760 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage B. 3.'
Neuville Mail Contract and C. N. Ry. Station, Cancellation *re* (Ans.) 2067 (ii).
Newspaper Postage, Opinion from P. M. G. *re* Regulations (Ans.) 2291 (ii).
New Waterford Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
Northumberland Co., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 6186 (iv).
Notre Dame des Anges, Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ans.) 554 (i).
Parcel Post between Canada and France, Signature *re* (Ans.) 569 (i).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2354 (ii).
See 'Postal Regulations.'
Parcel Post, Rates to European Countries (Ans.) 4777 (iii).
Payson, W. W., Dismissal from Post Office at Deep Brook (Ans.) 2243 (ii).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2580 (ii).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (Ans.) 1586 (i).
Postal Convention between Canada and France (remarks) 935 (i).
Postal Regulations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2258 (ii).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Postmaster dismissed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissals (Ans.) 6781 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 3060 (ii).
Postmasters in Temiscouata Co., Dismissals, &c., Ans., 549 (i).
Postmasters and Town Councillors, Acceptance *re* (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 105) in Com. on Res., 3154; 2° m., 3349; in Com., 3355 (ii).
Post Offices, Change in Name (remarks) 3751 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Buildings, Charges *re* Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1857 (i), 2015 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy *re* (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Pouliot, Louis, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4459 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 1030; on M. for 3°, 1711 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6214 (iv).
Ry. Mail Clerks: *See* 'C.S. Act,' 'P.O. Bill 105.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6214, 6305, 6321 (iv)

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4744 (iii), 5560 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Applications *re* (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
River John Mail Carrier, Amount paid *re* (Ans.) 1579 (i).
Robert, Mr., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office (Ans.) 3537 (ii), 4778 (iii).
Rogers, J. M., Postmaster at East Roman Valley, Dismissal of (Ans.) 723 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery (B. 179) prop. Res., 5680; in Com. on Res., 5921; 1°m., 5922; in Com., 6084 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension, &c. (remarks) 2061 (ii).
—— Number of Boxes in Ont. (Ans.) 6782 (iv).
—— Routes, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
—— Routes, &c. (remarks) 5561 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes (Ans.) 1580 (i).
Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2250 (ii).
St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Charges *re* R. Molloy, Investigation (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
St. Agathe des Monts, Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Bedard (Ans.) 973 (i).
—— Investigation *re* Charges, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Cor., 1592 (i).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, on M. for Sup., 5926 (iv).
St. Amour Post Office, Changes since Jan. 1912 (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request *re* Dismissal, on M. (Mr. E. Lapointe) for Cor., 2588 (ii).
St. Angele de Laval Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ans.) 3755 (ii); 4039 (iii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contracts, Expiry of (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail (Ans.) 5260 (iii).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Germain, Dismissal of Postmaster C. Michaud, on M. (Mr. E. Lapointe) for Cor., 1594 (i).
—— Changes *re* Apptmt. (Ans.) 1579 (i).
St. Isidore Postmastership, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 561 (i).
Ste. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of (Ans.) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite Mail Carrier, &c. (Ans.) 2583 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
St. Paul L'Ermite Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts (Ans.) 3342 (ii).
St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6288 (iv).
Ste. Therese and Laurentides Post Offices, Revenues, &c. (Ans.) 3336 (ii).
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (Ans.) 2068 (ii).
—— Dismissal of Postmistress, and Apptmt. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster in 1903, Charges *re* &c. (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Seamen St., Annapolis County, Post Office, Date of Opening (Ans.) 3755 (ii).
Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office (explanation) 1242 (i).
—— (remarks) 1280 (i).
Sorel and St. Victoria Mail Service, Date of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
Spry Bay Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 577 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Naval Dept. (salaries) 1064 (i); Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278 (iv); (salaries) 1066 (i); 6278 (iv).
Inland Rev. (salaries) conc., 6770 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5306 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6282; Outside Service (inspectors) 6646; (salaries) 6616 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec drill hall) 1851; (Quebec P.O.) 1852 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) 6657 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 691 (i).
Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c. (stmnt.) 934 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2906 (ii).
Thibodeau, George, Resignation &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4249 (iii).
Val des Eboulis Mail Service, Date of William Roberts' Contract (Ans.) 3537 (ii), 4778 (iii).
Vaudreuil Post Office, Dismissal of J. B. A. Valois (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Weedon Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 2855 (ii).

PERLEY, Hon. G. H., *Argenteuil.*
Dry Docks Subsidy Act (prop. res.) 5559 (iv).
St. John Harbour, Dredging Tenders *re* (remarks) 5695 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1678 (i).

POWER, Mr. Wm., *West Quebec.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6510 (iv).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1583 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6631 (iv).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*
Agricultural Committee, Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 2156 (ii).
Car Shortage *re* Transportation of Hay Crop (remarks) 2753 (ii).
Daoust, Done, Postmaster at Alfred, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3945 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3955 (ii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5413 (iii), 6001 (iv); on M. for 3° (amt.) 6062 (iv).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4423; on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4967 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1691 (i).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Renfrew, N., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Public Service (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
——— Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan., 1912 (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
——— Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
St. Isidore de Prescott Postmastership, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6460 (iv).
Mines Branch (ore deposits) 6602 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4561 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm., *St. John City.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 139 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5277 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 5561 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) on M. for 1°, 5555 (iv).
Bath, N.B., Dismissal of Postmistress (remarks) 966 (i).
Bathurst Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5300 (iii).
Boundary Waterways Treaty, Apptmt. of Commissioners, Inquiry for Ret., 2589 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3833 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Brodie, Mr., Dismissal *re* St. John Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4099, 4111 (iii).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2012 (ii).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6350 (iv).
Census Enumerators and Commissioners, Payments to (remarks) 1020 (i), 3835 (ii).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ques.) 554 (i).
Christmas Holidays, Adjournment *re* (remarks) 702, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1435 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4577 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy B. 111 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 3633 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5868; on M. for 3° (amt.) to ref. back to Com., 5960 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 963-4 (i).
Dismissals from Govt. Service *re* Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1166, 1562 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 5559; in Com. on Res., 6050 (iv).
See 'Collingwood.'
Elevators, &c., ref. to in debate on Address, 154 (i).
Estimates, Discussion of outside works (remarks) *re* Ruling of Mr. Deputy Speaker, 2443 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) *re* Adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6510 (iv).
See 'G.B. & Can.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Gratuity Res. (remarks) 5559 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Fisheries, Contracts with Stewards *re* Boarding Crews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Fish Scrap, Price *re* for Fertilizer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Flags, Use of, B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1411 (i).
Fort Howe and Fort Cumberland, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Transfer (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5698 (iv).
——— Papers asked for, 5558 (iv.)
Gaspé Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2790 (ii).
Good Roads: *See* 'Highways.'
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ques.) 555 (i).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Transfer, B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5958 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 869, 871 (i), 3521 (ii).
G.B. and Canada Mail Service, Contracts *re* (remarks) 1846 (i).
See 'Fast Atlantic.'
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re*, &c. (Ques.) 572 (i).
Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4124, 4171 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1843 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3647 (ii).
Highways and Road Construction, ref. to in debate on Address, 152 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2°, 1021; in Com., 1284, 1415 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt., Tel. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 994 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6012 (iv).
Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6782 (iv).
'Labour Gazette' Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1443 (i).
Lake Temiskaming Dam, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
See 'Temiskaming.'
Langevin Block, Condition of: *See* 'P. O. Deptl. Bldg.'
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6024 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B., Tests *re* Foundation, &c. (Ques.) 555 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3854; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4271; in Com., 4585; (amt.) *re* Subsidies, 4496; Amt. Neg. (Y. 62, N. 101) 4641; on Amts. (Mr. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4837; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4708 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension of, Par. in 'Montreal Star' (remarks) 489 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 781 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege, Signing of Resolution, 801 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 869; in Com. on Res., 871 (i).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrède, Application *re* Govt. Position (remarks) 2069 (ii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2839 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1868 (i).
N. T. Ry. Commissioners, Notification of Dismissal (remarks) 1196 (i).
N.T. Ry., Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted (Ques.) 932 (i).
Naval Ships for Canada, Ref. of Min. of Marine *re* Completion (Ques.) 1206 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Powers of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 797 (i).
——— Questions asked by the late Govt., Concurrence by present Govt., &c. (Ques.) 719 (i).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6155 (iv).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5968 (iv).
Post Office Deptl. Building, Charges *re* Condition (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1858 (i).
Preferential Tariff with G. B., prop. Res. (M.) to withdraw, 1390 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6119, 6151 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies: *See* 'Highways,' 'Man. Boundaries,' &c.
Public Works Engineering Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1059 (i).
Public Works, N.B., Appropriation last year (correction) 2436 (ii).
Public Works, now under construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6160 (iv).
Railway Bridges, N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6374; on M. for 3°, 6394 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4123 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, ref. to in debate on Address, 142 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal as Inspector of Hillsboro Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2377 (ii).
Returning Officer W. H. Downey, Delay in Payments (remarks) 2057 (ii).
Rideau Hall, Expenditure *re*, Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire,' 799 (i).
—— Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy (Ques.) 547 (i).
—— Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Kemp *re* Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 726 (i).
Rivière à la Prairie Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 622 (i).
Rooms alloted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re* (remarks) 670 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Tenders *re* (remarks) 5694 (iv).
—— Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623, 669 (i), 2371 (ii).
—— Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities (Ques.) 566 (i).
—— Wharf Appropriation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day (Ques.) 548 (i).
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square (M.) for Cor., &c., 1402 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction (remarks) 4461 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4232 (iii).
See 'Ry. Bridges.'
Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry. (M. for copy*) 562 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1846 (i).
Sussex St. Property and Govt. Buildings Explanation *re* Abandonment, 2007 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census and statistics) 619 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 1040; Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033; (salaries) 619; Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069; Finance (contingencies) 1068 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); (salaries) 1062; Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1036, 1039; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1041; Militia (salaries) 1037; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1062; Public Works (salaries) 1064; Railways (salaries) 1064 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1469; (inspection *re* shipping machinery) 1525 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G. B.) 4718 (iii); (Canada and Mexico) 5935 (iv); (Halifax and Nfld.) 4729; (Halifax and W. Indies, &c.) 4740 (iii); (Mar. Provs. and Porto Rico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i); (Pelee Island) 678; (St. John and Cuba) 678; (St. John and W. Indies) 640 (i).
Militia (armouries) 5543; (automobiles) 5515; (customs dues) 5522 (iii); (public buildings) 620 (i).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5319, 5327 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5187 (iii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (water storage dams, Temiskaming dam) 2827; (monuments) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings (generally) 623 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hampton) 1527; (Hillsboro) 1528; (St. John drill hall) 1529 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Gananoque) 1855; (Kingston R.M.C.) 1855 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs house) 1849; (Quebec P.O.) 1852; (St. Lambert) 1853; (Shawinigan) 1852 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2814 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2441; (dredging) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 2363; (Goose Creek) 2372 (ii); (St. John) 623 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burke's Head) 2045; (repairs, &c.) 2051 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 2445; (York bridge) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivieres des Prairies) 2441; (Three Rivers) 2441 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Athabasca Landing) 2819; (North Battleford) 2823 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4137; (construction) 4133 (iii); (extensions) 5639 (iv); (Hampton) 4225 (iii); (Hampton spur) 675 (i); (working expenses) 4165 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 689; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3044, 3541 (ii); 4080 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6668 (iv).
—— Appeal from Ruling (Mr. Bennett) 3615 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam, Inquiry for Ret., 5928, 6661 (iv).
See 'Lake Temiskaming.'
Transportation Question: *See* 'Fast Atlantic,' 'National Ports,' 'Dry Docks, St. John.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6180 (iv).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners (M. for O. Cs., &c.) 981 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Waterways Commission, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. for Sup., 6680 (iv).
—— (remarks) 966 (i).
See 'Boundary.'
West Indies, Australia and Canada Trade Relations, on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).

RAINVILLE, Mr. J. H., *Chambly Verchères.*
Address, The, 337 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4865 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignation of Messrs. Ballantyne and Geoffrion (remarks) 6554 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissals by Liberal Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6296 (iv).

REID, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 5054 (iii).

REID, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs) *Grenville.*
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
Asbestos Importations, Total Value, on M. (Mr. Beland) for Ret., 1818 (i).
Asbestos Manufactures, Imports, &c. Value &c., on M. (Mr. Beland) for Ret., 1591 (i).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 1362 (i).
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices into Canada for 1908-9-10, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Ret., 1267 (i).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value, 1910-11 (Ans.) 3534 (ii).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4459 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufactured and Imported in each prov. for 1905 (Ans.) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. (B. 116) (M. for Com. on Res.) 3829 (ii); in Com. on Res., 3971; 1°*, of Bill, 3972 (ii); 2°m., 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).
Coasting Trade, O.C. extending Time (Ans.) 1815 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices, (remarks) 854 (i).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911 (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Customs Contracts given without tender (Ques.) 877 (i).
Customs Deptl. Report (presented) 971 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case, Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Ans.) 2072 (ii).

REID, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, on stmnt. (Mr. Sinclair) to M. for Sup., 5594 (iv).
Gerrior, Wm., Dismissal from Larry's River Customs Port (Ans.) 3052 (ii).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 539 (i).
Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Officer at Mulgrave, Dismissal (Ans.) 1815 (i).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Customs Officer at Spring Hill, Dismissal (Ans.) 4039 (iii).
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs, 1864 (i).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Lobster Trap Twine, Change in Customs Tariff, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
—— (remarks) 1071 (i).
See 'Twine.'
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, (amt.) suggested, 582; Reply to, 589 (i).
—— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1803 (i).
McLean, W. S., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
Miner, Bill, Escape (remarks) 939 (i).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Mundle, Mr. D. I., Dismissal from Customs at Richibucto (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3366 (ii).
Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Pet. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1207 (i).
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Quebec Customs (Ans.) 2071 (ii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 83 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3280 (ii).
Renfrew Election, Minister's speech *re* Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) 1573 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2057 (ii).
Robinson, Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer, N.B. (Ans.) 4241 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c. (Ans.) 561 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1040; Outside Ports (salaries) 1073 (i).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 622 (i).
Therrien, J. F., Dismissal from Inland Revenue (Ans.) 3152 (ii).
Twine Materials Importations (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
See 'Lobster.'

REID, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Yule, Andrew, Customs Collector at Aurora Dismissal (Ans.) 4779 (iii), 5950 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*
Fast Atlantic Service, and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6501, 6516 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5628 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provinces (prop. res.) 2072 (ii).
Molson, Kenneth Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
Political Literature, Distribution *re*, Racial Prejudices (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6516 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5628; (double tracking) 5637; (extensions) 5639 (iv).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*
O'Leary to West Point Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re* (Ques.) 721 (i).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to *re* St. Lawrence River, &c. (Ques.) 728 (i).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value for 1910-11 (Ques.) 3534 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4572 (iii).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911 (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5741 (iv).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2179; in Com., 2182, 2541, 3167, 3760 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6190 (iv).
Live Stock Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6032 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6330 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6478; (farm bulletins) 6467; Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6482 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5488 (iii).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J., (Secretary of State) *Marquette.*
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 2450 (ii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 2062 (ii).
Canadian Agents, Names of Appointees in Europe (Ans.) 5557 (iv).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J.—*Con.*
Canadian Missionaries in China, Stmnt. from Home Govt. (read) 6559 (iv).
C.P. Ry. Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
Carleton County Electoral District, Issue of Writ, &c. (Ans.) 1810 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized, &c. (Ans.) 556 (i).
Civil Service List, on Inquiry for (remarks) 6187 (iv).
Commissioners of Investigation, Number employed by Govt., Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 6336 (iv).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 529 (i).
Dunnville Customs and Postal Revenue for 1910-11 (Ans.) 2066 (ii).
Election Accounts, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 2156 (ii), 4461 (iii).
Govt. Printing, Patronage to French Papers in Quebec (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Naturalization of (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
Joint Stock Companies Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
Joliette, Elections, Returning Officer (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Keewatin, Pet. *re* Education Clauses (Ans.) 3149 (ii).
King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant (Ans.) 1809 (i).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Maritime Law, International Conference, &c. (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of (Ans.) 4776 (iii).
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct of, Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec District (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as assistants (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts. (Ans.) 1809 (i).
——— Employees, Changes *re* Duties (Ans.) 2243 (i).
——— Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 2067 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations (remarks) 2243 (ii).
Renfrew, N., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Govt. Service (Ans.) 3334 (ii).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J.—*Con.*
Renfrew, S., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue, &c. *re* P.O. (Ans.) 725 (i).
Secretary of State, Report (presented) 565 (i).
SUPPLY.
Civil Govt.—Secretary of State (salaries) 1038 (i).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*) 1472 (i).
Miscellaneous (additional commissioner) 6615; Parliamentary Documents (translation) 6614 (iv).
Printing Bureau (plant, &c.) 6611 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Information *re* (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
Typewriters and Supplies, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 1809 (i).
Vickers-Maxim Co., Contract *re* Montreal Dry Dock (Ans.) 2450 (ii).
Yamaska Electoral Agent, &c. (Ans.) 1584 (i.).

ROGERS, Hon. R. (Minister of the Interior) *Winnipeg.*
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary (Ans.) 1587 (i).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 1814 (i).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Medical Indian Attendant at Chester, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4976 (iii).
B. C. Railway Belt Lands, O. C. *re* Transfer (remarks) 1200 (i).
British News, &c., Purchase of by Int. Dept. (Ans.) 6660 (iv).
See 'Hawke.'
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6371 (iv).
Carpet Weavers Union, Violation of Immigration Act by J. C. Murray (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (remarks) 2668 (ii).
Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re* (Ans.) 2458 (ii).
Coal Supply in the West, Remission of Duties (remarks) 230 (i).
Combines in Trade, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1519 (i).
Crown Lands in Man., Alberta and Sask., Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands (Ans.) 1588 (i).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal (Ans.) 552 (i).
Dupont, Rene, Dismissal at Immigration Agent (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Eastern Township, Field for Immigration (remarks) 6558 (iv).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Farm Labourers Immigration: *See* 'Immigration.'
Forts and Military Property, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).
French Canadian Repatriation (remarks) 619 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2781 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution (remarks) 6557 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6205 (iv).
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Ham, Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital at Halifax (Ans.) 875 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 527 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. C., 615 (i).
See 'British News,' 'Immigration.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3727 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors in Sask., Number dismissed, &c. (Ans.) 1588 (i).
House of Commons Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Agents in Belgium, Number, &c. (Ans.) 878 (i).
Immigration Agents, Dismissals, Number and Names (Ans.) 877 (i).
Immigration Agents *re* Farm Labourers, Number appointed (Ans.) 874 (i).
——— in Quebec, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1359 (i).
Immigration Agents in France, Names and Salaries (Ans.) 878, 1212 (i).
Immigration Agents, Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus (Ans.) 875 (i).
Immigration Agents and Ontario Farm Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3928 (ii).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition of Govt. (remarks) 3154 (ii).
Immigration Hospitals, Number and Location (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Immigrant Inspection before sailing for Canada (remarks) 618 (i).
Immigration Literature, French Publications (Ans.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Immigration, Money expended, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ans.) 1211 (i).
Immigration Office in London, Ont. (Ans.) 2451 (ii).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2143 (ii).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended (Ans.) 1212 (i).
Immigration, Rep. of Mr. Hawkes, 6551 (iv). *See* 'Hawkes.'
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1211 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1319 (i).
Japanese, &c., Immigration, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 875 (i).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Land Grant to Railways in Western Provs., prior to 1896 (Ans.) 726 (i).
Laurier, R., Immigration Agent at Detroit, (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 2°, 4375; in Com., 4537; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4934; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4682 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 787 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act (prop. res.) 793 (i).
Man. Swamp Lands, Sale of by Auction (remarks) 4308 (iii).
Mining Rights Administration, O. Cs. *re* Resolution (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants (Ans.) 1813 (i).
Murray, J. P., Breach of Immigration Regulations *re* Carpet Employees (Ans.) 550 (i).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6244 (iv).
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Buildings at Halifax (Ans.) 717 (i).
Oriental Immigration into B. C., Total Number (Ans.) 4779 (iii).
Peace River Railway Belt and Block (B. 149) 1°*, 5257 (iii); in Com., 5968, 6175; 3° m., 6188, 6338; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6401; 3° m., 6401 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6244 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2855 (ii).
Sevigny, Mr., Apptmt. *re* Immigration Office (Ans.) 1205, 1588, 1814 (i).
S. A. Veterans' Bounty Bill (remarks) 2061 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay *re* Decision (remarks) 3154 (ii).
Statue erected on Govt. Lands in Quebec City by Provl. Govt. (Ans.) 2668 (ii).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 1039; Interior (salaries) 1038 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3306, 3915; (regulations *re*) 3912 (ii).
Labour Dept—(Gazette) 1468 (i).
Militia—(public buildings) 620 (i).
Miscellaneous (Paris agency) 6615 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (London, Eng.) 6655 (iv).
Svaigher, A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6186 (iv).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* Cancellation (Ans.) 1209 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908 Amt. (B. 137) 1° m., 4974 (iii); 2° m., 5968 (iv); in Com., 6176, 6450 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act (remarks) 1577 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int. (Ans.) 553 (i).
Water Rights in Ry. Belt.: *See* 'Peace River.'
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
White, Mr. James, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 5939; in Com., 6182 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Canadian Public Health Association incorp. (B. 127) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. *re* Prices (remarks) 814 (i).
Grain Act. Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2170, 2181, 2304, 2383, 2535, 2759, 3157, 3458, 3473 (ii), 4069 (iii).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, &c., Ref. to Washington Despatch (remarks) 2576 (ii).
Grain Shipments from the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3978 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1248 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contract *re*, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., &c., 734 (i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1731 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4763 (iii).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1945 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 1331 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2967 (ii).
Wheat Grades, &c. (remarks) on Public Ownership debate, 663 (i).

SEGUIN, Mr. P. A., *L'Assomption.*
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Montreal, Dismissal (Ques.) 5950 (iv); (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Can. Northern Quebec Ry. Co., Maintenance of Road on L'Ile Bourdon (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1862 (i).
Coffin, Henry, Apptmt. as Messenger H. of C., Dismissal of M. Picotte (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Dumelong, M. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption P. O. (Ques.) 580, 720 (i).
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges (Ques.) 726 (i).
Ice-Breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice-Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
L'Assomption Public Works, Votes in Estimates (Ques.) 5951, 6781 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 2451, 2579 (ii).
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Charges *re* &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite &c., Mail Carrier, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).
——— Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts (Ques.) 3341 (ii).
Ste. Therese and Laurentides Post Office, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3335 (ii).

SEVIGNY, Mr. A., *Dorchester.*
Address, The, in Answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 27 (v).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Joint Stock Companies, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).

SEVIGNY, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4945, 4956 (iii).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau (Ques.) 2244 (ii).
——— Payments to Taschereau, Cannan & Co. (Ques.) 2245 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Damages in Dorchester Co., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6213 (iv).
Vickers-Maxim Co., Contract *re* Construction of Dry Dock at Montreal (Ques.) 2450 (ii).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *East Peterborough.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 1st. Rep., Ref. to Printing Com. (M.) 3933 (ii).
——— Reports (presented) 2375 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 818 (i).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2557 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *North Ontario.*
Chats Falls Timber Slide, Date of Deed to D. O'Connor, &c. (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6089 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6458 (iv).
Imperial Loan and Investment Co.'s (B. 184) 1°*, 6061 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6038 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1665 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1890 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4759 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2987, 3490 (ii).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, on M. for Sup., 6549 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*) 1493 (i); Militia (customs dues) 5525 (iii); Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5672 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3018, 3557 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*
Budget, The, 5109 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2312, 2777, 3165, 3498, 3520 (ii), 4159 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2894 (ii).

SHEPHERD, Mr. F. H., *Nanaimo.*
B. C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season (Ques.) 4256 (iii).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction (Ques.) 4256 (iii) .
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2481 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3360 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Address, The, 323 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates of 1913 (M. for ret.) 1819 (i).
Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Biological Board of Canada B. 118 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 4552 (iii).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c., (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Blind River Post Office, Change of Name (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 5928 (iv).
B. C. Fishing Licenses, Transfer, &c. (M. for pets.*) 3945 (ii).
Canadian Coal for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3288 (ii).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Cost (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Canal Tolls, Abolition of, O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 2861 (ii).
Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
——— Dismissal of R. Sutherland (M. for cor.*) 1409 (i).
——— Pet. *re* (Ques.) 1207 (i).
See 'Sutherland.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ques.) 974 (i).
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ, &c. (Ques.) 1810 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1208 (i).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4572 (iii) .
Civil Service Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 1581 (i).
Coasting Trade, O.C. extending Time (Ques.) 1814 (i).
Commissioners appointed by Govt. *re* Investigations, Number, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5680, 6336 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Conciliation Board, Apptmt. of *re* International Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).
Conway, Patrick J., Lightkeeper at White Head Island, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2587, 3342 (ii).
See 'Whitehead.'
Cox, Mr. A. B., Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal (Ques.) 1582 (i).
Crown Lands in Man. Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands, &c. (Ques.) 1587 (i).
Davis, John, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2845 (ii).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Decoste, Capt., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3271 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service *re* Political partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1088, 1557 (i), 2018, 3248, (ii),4187 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Papers, 944 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re* (M. for cor.) 1391 (i).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6514 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255 (iv).
Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5273 (iii).
Fisheries Department, Reorganization of (remarks) 936 (i).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 3053 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3055 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2470 (ii).
Fish Scrap sold as Fertilizer, Increase in Price (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duties *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5587 (iv).
Gasolene Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2242 (ii).
Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S. (Ques.) 3051 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Gerrior, Mr. William, (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).
Glenelg, N.S. Postmaster, Complaints *re* Pets., &c. (M. for papers*) 1817 (i).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) 1445 (i), 5261 (iv).
Hagerty, S. W., Dismissal from Inspector ship of Ry. Station (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4205 (iii).
Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head. Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers*) 2588 (ii).
Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Office, Mulgrave, Dismissal (Ques.) 1815 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii) .
Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept. (M. for cor.*) 3342 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3703 (ii).
House of Commons, Improvements *re* Acoustics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1335 (i).
I.C.R., Guysborough Branch, Construction *re* (Ques.) 571 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6006 (iv).
Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works (M. for cor.*) 3341 (ii).
Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs. prior to 1896 (Ques.) 725 (i).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector (Ques.) 5055 (ii).
Linwood and Grosvenor's Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 2587 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Complaints *re* as Postmaster at Tracadie Road (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Man. and N.S., Federal Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 4258 (iii).
Marine Hospitals, Ships for Fishermen (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Melford, N.S., Wharf, Notice to suspend Work, &c. (Ques.) 549 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 97 (Mr. Hazen) 2416 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debenture *re* Debt. (Ques.) 1357 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1871 (i).
N.T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3102 (ii).
Naval Policy of Govt., Ref. to in debate on Address, 331 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Stmnt. of Member for Peterborough (Ques.) 731 (i).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
New Harbour Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Oyster Ponds, Preventive Officer, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1207 (i).
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c., Repts. of U.S. Papers (remarks) 2446 (ii).
Political Partisanship, Letter sent to Officers Inland Rev. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
Public Works under construction, Estimates *re* (remarks in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Public Works in Mar. Provs., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2436 (ii).
Public Works for N.S., omitted from Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2794 (ii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4769 (iii).
Railway Contracts, Terms *re*, Applicable to N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4233 (iii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4122 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6228, 6305 (iv).
Reciprocity Treaty, Ref. to in debate on Address, 323 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S. from 1890 to 1891 (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Richards, Mr., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).
Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissals, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3341 (ii).
Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley Post Office, N.S. (Ques.) 722 (i).
—— (M. for pets.*) 1409 (i).
Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Smith, Lyman C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
—— Letter (read) in Com. on Bill, 4575 (iii).
Steam Trawling on Can., Coasts and Outside (M.) for Papers, 2461 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties, (M. for pets.*) 5957 (iv).
Steam Trawlers, Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Steel and Iron Bounties, *re* Budget Speech (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., I.C.R., Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6228 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6468; (fumigating stations) 6479; (Toronto exhibition) 6481 (iv).
Civil Govt. — Customs — Outside Ports (salaries) 1088 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6278 (iv).
Fisheries (lighthouse keepers) 6650 (iv); (protection service) 5387 (iii); (scrap as fertilizer) 684 (i).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1503 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 4714; Can. and G.B.) 4719; (Can. and S. Africa) 4727; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4728 (iii); (North Sydney) 679 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4742 (iii).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6486; (pelagic sealing) 5811 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5308, 5383 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6281, 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6622 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Wolfville) 1343; Ont. (Sarnia) 1952; Ottawa (leases) 1324 (i); Ottawa (rents, &c.) 3290 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440; (Cole Harbour) 2055; (Melford) 2056 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6606 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 4136 (iii); (branch lines) 5621 (iv); (Dartmouth) 671 (i); (double tracking) 5638 (iv); (highways) 4226; (Mulgrave) 4225 (iii); (SS. Scotia) 5655; (wages) 5809; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 695; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Sutherland, Mr., Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2018; Cor., &c. (read) 2022 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1274 (i).
See 'Canso.'
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3549 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6418 (iv).
Tory, H. L., Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re* (M. for cor.*) 4459 (iii).
Twine Materials Importations, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Webber, James, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
See 'Conway.'
SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2855 (ii).
——— Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5999 (iv).
SMITH, Mr. Wm., *South Ontario.*
Live Stock Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6038 (iv).
SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule) *East Grey.*
Address, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Blondin) 372 (i).
Address, The, 'Trusts and Mergers,' applied to Min. of Fin., Member asked to withdraw, 63 (i).
Agriculture, 1st Rep. of Com., Irregularity *re* (remarks) 2375 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3934 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (remarks) 407 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36, on M. for 3°, 2413 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec. (read) 794 (i); 3236 (ii); 4775 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent, 4849 (iii).
Cable Rates to G.B., on M. for Sup., Members remarks checked, 3237 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux), Irrelevancy of debate, 4108 (iii).
——— Members remarks checked, 4104 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt. Bill (Mr. Edwards) on M. to introduce (remarks) 229, 267 (i).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 3°, (ruling) 6371 (iv).
Canso Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
Car Shortage in the West, Members remarks checked, 1709 (i); 2754 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
Chicoutimi Electoral District, Controverted Election Certificate of Judge (presented) 11 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 820 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5962; on M. for 3°, 5892 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2847 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Dismissals, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fowler) 952 (i).
Documents handed in to 'Hansard,' not read (ruling) 6718 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 644 (i).
Dom. Notes Printing Contract, Members remarks checked, 1843 (i).
Educational Bills, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bickerdike) *re* Dom. Jurisdiction, 3873 (ii). *See* 'Queens.'
Estimates, Discussion in Conc., (remarks) 6805 (iv).
Fenian Raid Vets., Gratuity (remarks) *re* Resolution, 5559 (iv).
Fishery Treaty with U.S. (remarks) *re* Notice of Question, 408 (i).
Flags, Use of, B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1411 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Guthrie) 3213 (ii).
——— (ruling) *re* permission to insert table in 'Hansard', without reading, 3222 (ii).
Georgian Bay Route and French River, Members's remarks checked, 6785 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, members remarks checked, 4813 (iii).
——— (ruling) *re* irrelevancy of debate, 4800 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3996 (ii).
G.T.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 711; on M. for 2° (remarks) 796 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 6576 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. Fred., Apptmt. *re* Improper form of Question (remarks) 3934 (ii).
Hamilton Harbour B. 32 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 2449 (ii).
Highlands Bridge Construction, Member called to Order, 1197 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to 2°, 3640 (ii); Senate Amendments (presented) 6731 (iv).
Immigration from U.S., Members remarks checked, 3154 (ii).
Immigration from the U.S., *re* Wm. Pearson Co., Members remarks checked, 3152 (ii).
Inquiries Act. Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2° (remarks) 1025 (i).
——— (ruling) *re* Procedure, 1281 (i).
Judges Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for Com. on Res., 5958 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Juvenile Delinquents B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com. (remarks) 939 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., Members remarks checked, 1412 (i).
Lobster Twine, Customs Duties, Members remarks checked, 1072 (i).
Lumber Combine in B. C., Distribution in Member's Boxes (personal explanation) 2299 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) Members remarks checked, 2297 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Rep. *re* Winnipeg 'Free Press' (remarks) *re* Question, 2446 (ii).
Man. Boundaries B. 115, on M. for 1°, Members remarks checked, 3902 (ii).
——— Ques. *re* Voting (Mr. Mondou) on 2°, 4398 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Vote on 3°, 4984 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* M. to ref. back to Com., 4890 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. *re* Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for cor. (remarks) 777 (i).
——— Eastern Boundary Extension (ruling) *re* Question (Mr. Oliver) 3936 (ii).
——— Members remarks checked, 490 (i).
Man. Grain Act, on M. for Com. on Res., 869 (i).
Marine Hospital Ships, Members remarks checked, 6787 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, Members Remarks checked, 1604 (i).
Marriage Law, Par. in Toronto 'Star,' (ruling) *re* Question, 3942 (ii).
Members remarks checked, 177 (i).
Mess from His Ex. Estimates, 1911-12 (presented) 525 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, Members remarks checked, 3974 (ii).
Moosejaw Inspector, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) Ruling, 4982 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of (remarks) 1708 (i).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* as candidate for election (remarks) 6185 (iv).
——— Correction *re* Ruling on Question, 6335 (iv).
Napierville Post Office Site, Members remarks checked, 3153 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Question *re* Ownership (remarks) 6337 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Station at Quebec, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for O. Cs. (remarks) 760 (i).
Naval Service Act, Repeal of (ruling) *re* Question (Mr. Mondou) 3943 (ii).
Ne Temere Decree, Questions asked, Members remarks checked, 720 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Newspaper Articles, Reading of, &c. (ruling) 3059 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) on M. for 3°, (remarks) 2414 (ii).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. B. 99, on Senate Amts. (ruling) 5679 (iv).
Panama Canal, Tolls, Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) checked, 2447 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) members remarks checked, 2346 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Armstrong) 2348 (ii).
Parliament Opening, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec., 6 (v).
Peace Memorial Monument, Members remarks checked, 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 3°, 6188 (iv).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage, Ques. of Order, 1587 (i).
P. E. I., Better Terms, Member (Mr. J. J. Hughes) remarks checked, 5172 (iii).
Printing Com., 1st Rep. of Joint Com., on M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 3330 (ii).
Private Bills, Rep. of Examiner of Pets., &c., Divergency *re* Rules (remarks) 643 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 6780 (iv).
——— Mess from the Senate, 6824 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., 2nd Rep., Ques. of Order., 5839 (iv).
Public Ownership, Members remarks checked, 666 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 1°, 869 (i).
Quebec West Electoral District, Controverted Election Certificate of Judge (presented) 407 (i).
Queen's College B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
See 'Educational.'
Questions to be asked, Proper Form, &c. (remarks) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Questions and Notices of Motions, Rules *re* Standing (remarks) 1015 (i).
Question *re* (Mr. Lemieux) ruled out of Order, 2580 (ii).
Railway Com., Reports of (remarks) 5999 (iv).
Renfrew S., Election, Issue of Writ, Members remarks checked, 2059 (ii).
——— Vacancy (notification) 926 (i).
Rideau Hall Expenditure, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) Members Remarks checked, 800 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Rural Telephone System, prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) Ruled out of Order, 2250 (ii).
——— Further Ruling, 2287 (ii).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Members remarks checked, 5695 (iv).
Seed Grain Distribution, Members remarks checked, 2300 (ii).
Senate Amendments Railway Bills (remarks) 6550-1 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde, Objection *re* Question, 4249 (iii).
Speaker, (remarks) *re* Election, 6 (v).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, Member asked to withdraw Stmt., 522 (i).
Speech from the Throne (read) 8 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
Shipping Act Amt. Bill, Ruling *re* M. to introduce, 229, 267 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771, 6772 (iv).
Dismissals, &c., members remarks checked, 2039 (ii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Louiseville) Members remarks checked, on conc., 6797 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 on Appeal from Chairman (Mr. Pugsley) 3616 (ii).
——— Member (Mr. Oliver) cannot impute motives, 2688 (ii).
——— Senate Amendments (presented) 6808 (iv).
——— on Senate Amts., Irrelevancy of debate, 6674 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16, on M. for 3°, 3280 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. P. E. Blondin) *Champlain.*
Address, The, Ques. of Order *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 371 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com., amt. (Mr. Nesbitt) (ruling) 2412 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 4578 (iii).
Dismissals &c., Irrelevancy of Debate, in Com. of Sup., 3253 (ii).
——— Members remarks checked, 1960 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Maclean) 1184 (i).
Estimates, Members remarks checked, 2439 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., Members remarks checked, 3711 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. P. E. Blondin) —*Con.*
I. C. Ry. Estimates, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Stevens) 4219 (iii).
Napierville Post Office Site, Payments *re* Members remarks checked, 2373 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 4759 (iii).
——— (ruling) *re* Amts., 4774 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2992 (ii).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site, Members remarks checked, 2442 (ii).
Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 2448 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Members remarks checked, 2043 (ii).
Militia, Member called to Order, 5538 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance), Member called to order, 5317 (iii).
Post Office, Irrelevancy of debate (ruling) 6299 (iv).
Tariff Bill, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) ruled out of Order, 3615 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. H. Clark) 2997 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3617 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 3619 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., Irrelevancy of debate 6423 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6304 (iv).
Dismissals from Public Service, Apptmt. of Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3249 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6190 (iv).
I. C. R., Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed Officials (remarks) 5933 (iv).
——— Market Tickets to Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Railway Com., G.T. Ry. Bill, Apptmt. of sub-Committee, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5617 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6304 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2057 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3306 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C., addition) 1951 (i); Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5830 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3012 (ii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 850 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2309, 2541, 2759, 3168, 3187, 3467, 3781 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Freight Rates, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3985 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1726 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3893 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4308; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4679 (iii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Tenders *re* Mail Boxes, &c. (Ques.) 1580 (i).
St. Lorette, Lake Man. Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2813 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2826 (ii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2813 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2909 (ii).
Voters' Lists for Man., Distribution from Printing Office (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16, on M. for 3°, 3281 (ii).

STEELE, Mr. M., *South Perth.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6266 (iv).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3684 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4762 (iii).

STEVENS, Mr. H. H., *Vancouver.*
Address, The, 281 (i).
Agriculture, 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 2375 (ii).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6318 (iv).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5200 (iii).
Chinese entering B.C., Total Number (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Chinese Tax in B.C., Ref. to in debate on Address, 285 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized (Ques.) 555 (i).
See 'Oriental.'
Coal Combine in B.C., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 853 (i).
Criminal Code (piracy of logs) Amt. (B. 9) 1°m., 407; 2°m., 944, 1821 (i); in Com., 2532 (ii).

STEVENS, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Elevators, Terminal, ref. to in debate on Address, 287 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6222 (iv).
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2473 (ii).
Fisheries Question in B.C., ref. to in debate on Address, 290 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3232 (ii).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Good Roads, ref. to in debate on Address, 284 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3986, 3998 (ii).
I. C. Ry. Estimates, Ques. of Order, 4218 (iii).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of (Ques.) 549 (i).
Logs, Stealing of: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 9.'
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1747 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3423 (ii).
Naval Policy, ref. to in debate on Address, 291 (i).
North Arm Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 643 (i).
Oriental Immigration into B.C., Total Number (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
See 'Chinese.'
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1925 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6218, 6318 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2936 (ii).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) 1°*, 4976 (iii).
Vancouver Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 643 (i).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6218 (iv).
——— Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).

STEWART, Mr. T. J., *West Hamilton.*
Hamilton Harbour (B. 23) 1°*, 794 (i); in Com., 2449 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Mr. D., *South Oxford.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6265 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2554, 2767 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3695 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Immigration Agents *re* Farm Labourers Number appointed, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).
——— Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus, &c. (Ques.) 875 (i).
Immigration Agents for Placing Farm Labourers in Ont., Complaints *re* (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2126 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental farms (branch stations) 6485 (iv); Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3923 (ii); Railways—I. C. R. (branch lines) 5624 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6412 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 2840 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 594 (i).
——— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1766 (i).

THOBURN, Mr. Wm., *North Lanark.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6090 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 828 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6264 (iv).
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6206 (iv).
Negro Immigration (remarks) on Immigration Question, 608 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2484 (ii).
Mounted Police, Annuities to families of Messrs. Fitzgerald, and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5177 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Mines (ore deposits) 6490 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2741 (ii).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4562 (iii); in Com., 5568 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6182 (iv).

THOMSON, Mr. L., *Qu'Appelle.*
Gold Coinage by Mint (Ques.) 1213 (i).

THOMSON, Mr. L.—*Con.*
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2183, 2304, 2323, 2397, 2536, 2783, 3794 (ii), 4064, 4158 (iii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, 2576 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3° (amt.) 4794, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 92) 4801 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed, &c. (Ques.) 1588 i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1742 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2519 (ii).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6045 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Capital Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 177) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Carrier, Mr., Postmaster at St. Francis Xavier de Brampton, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4578 (iii).
Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).
Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Garthby, Lake Aylmer Wharf Construction (M. for papers, &c.*) 4781 (iii).
Ham Nord Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer (Ques.) 4550 (iii).
Postmasters dismissed, Investigation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Shurtleff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6472 (iv).
Militia (headquarters staff) 5537 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries, &c.) 6615 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Generally (London, Eng.) 6656 (iv).
Weedon Public Building, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4550 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).

TREMAIN, Mr. H. B., *Hants.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6512 (iv).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
Address, The, 388 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger &c. (Ques.) 1413 (i).
Caraquet North Shore Ry. Branch Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).
Customs Collector P. J. Venoit, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
——— Dismissal of, Inquiry for Ret., 5259 (iii).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duty *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5594 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3965 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1003 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 4585 (iii).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re* (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6230 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 2364 (ii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5945 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6368 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 4460 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 842 (i).
Customs Tariff, Changes *re* Jute Cloth, Dressed Lumber, &c. Rulings, &c. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
Election Accounts, Payments of (remarks) 4460 (iii).
Flaxseed, Shipment of, Excessive Freight Rates (remarks) 661 (i).
Freight Rates, Discrimination in the West (amt.) on M. for Sup., 3194 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion, 3048 (ii).
See 'Grain Shipments.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Public.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2317, 2535, 2758, 3169, 3502, 3761 (ii), 4065 (iii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6207 (iv).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4012 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1252 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 742 (i).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition of Govt. (remarks) 3154 (ii).
—— *re* Wm. Pearson Co. (remarks) 3152 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1008 (i).
Lumber Duties, Inspection as reported in Winnipeg 'Free Press' (remarks) 2446 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act (amt.) 1723; neg. (Y. 62; N. 107) 1806 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3869 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 781 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Inquiry for, 1820 (i).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3140 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co., Prohibition *re* Grinding Machines (remarks) 2059 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
See 'Parcel.'
Railway Act (tariffs) Amt. (B. 6) 1°m., 176 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 6) 2°m., 944; 2°m., 1015 (i).
—— resmd. adjourned debate on 2°, 2499 (ii).
—— on M. for adjnd. debate, 1821 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2529 (ii).
Ry. Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6543 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3491 (ii).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1921 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6303 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2928, 2969, 3024 (ii); on Senate Amts. 6673 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4557 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Address, The, 276 (i).
Budget, The, 5056 (iii).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P.O. at St. Louis du Mile End (Ques.) 1414 (i).
Cold Storage Establishments in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3343 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5561 (iv).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
I.C.R., Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation (Ques.) 6748 (iv).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Apptmt. in Richelieu County (Ques.) 2292 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Names of Apptmts. (Ques.) 1865 (i).
—— Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 1411 (i).
—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1441 (i).
Lord's Day Act (musicians) Amt. (B. 85) 1°m., 2057 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of (Ques.) 550 (i).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application for Leave (Ques.) 5954 (iv).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations (Ques.) 550 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 279 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1375 (i).
Parliamentary Restaurant, Payments to Waiters, &c. (Ques.) 2861 (ii).
Reciprocity, ref. to in debate on Address, 277 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1471 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5502 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve, 1347 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3041 (ii).
Waiters in Restaurants, &c., Minimum Wages paid to (Ques.) 3049 (ii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *Center York, Ont*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1630 (i).

WARNOCK, Mr. D., *Macleod.*
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6315 (iv).

WARNOCK, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5906 (iv).
Coal Shortage in the West, for Household Consumption, &c. (Ques.) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B. C., Information *re* (Ques.) 568 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3504 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4790 (iii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2530 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. 6315 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 2212 (ii).

WEBSTER, Mr. J., *Brockville.*
Address, The, 372 (i).
Dairying Industry, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5727 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6574 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6197 (iv).

WEICHEL, Mr. W. G., *North Waterloo.*
Address, The, 401 (i).
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt. (Ques.) 721 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage for 1911 (Ques.) 3051 (ii).
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1409 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 795 (i); in Com., 4699 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators, &c., Exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c. (Ques.) 561 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (surveys) 5789 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5470 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy, B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6422 (iv).
Welland Canal, Quantity of American Freight passing through (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
—— Water Power, Diversion, &c. (Ques.) 6747 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. Wm. H., *Victoria, Alberta.*
Grain Act Amt., B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3519 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4001 (ii).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal (Ques.) 6183 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. Wm. H.—*Con.*
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Moose to Durlingville) 2820 (ii).
R. N. W. M. P. (pay of force) 5180 (iii).
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

WHITE, Hon. W. T., (Minister of Finance) *Leeds.*
Address, The, 440 (i).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 970 (i).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 5555; in Com., 5846 (iv).
Banking Act Legislation (remarks) 938 (i).
Bank Note Contract: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Battlefields Commission, (M.) to strike out vote (remarks) 5299 (iii).
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i). *See* 'Steel.'
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 155 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 5946 (iv).
British Empire Trust Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Cromwell) on M. for 2°, 1201 (i).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 4985 (iii). *See* 'Financial Review.'
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Subsidy (B. 144) M. for Com. on Res., 4140; in Com. on Res., 5162; in Com., 5404 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantee &c. (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
Civil Service Act (Aud. Gen.) Amt. (B. 113) prop. Res., 3539; in Com. on Res., 3632 (ii); 1°* of Bill, 3633 (ii); in Com., 4081 (iii).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest (Ans.) 1811 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
—— Limitations *re* Tenders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
—— Complaints of British Companies (explanation) 5843 (iv).
Estimates, The (1911-12) presented, 525 (i).
Estimates (1912-13) presented, 971 (i).
Estimates Supply (remarks) 1576 (i), 6154 (iv).
Estimates, Supply (1912) M. to ref. to Com., 4974 (iii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursements *re* (Ans.) 528 (i).
Farmers' Bank and Banque St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors (Ans.) 551 (i).

WHITE, Hon. W. T.—*Con.*
Financial Review (reply) to Mr. A. K. Maclean, 6722 (iv).
See '*Budget.*'
Gold Coinage, by Mint (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry. Implementing Judgment (B. 95) prop. Res., 2296; in Com. on Res., 2378; 1°*, of B., 2381, 2°m., 3060, 3115 (ii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Hull City Hall Square Improvements *re* (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1304 (i).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements *re* (Ans.) 528, 551 (i).
Loans: *See* 'Govt.'
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3848 (ii); in Com., 4530 (iii).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Marriage Act, Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1665 (i).
Montreal Athletic Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid (remarks) 1723 (i).
National Battlefields Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3366, 3395 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Bill 95 (remarks) *re* Factum, 2589 (ii).
Notes, Printing of: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1368 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
Preferential Tariff to G.B., Increase of (Ans.) 554 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy (B. 178) (prop. res.) 5558; in Com. on Res., 5859; 1°*, 5862; in Com., 6114, 6128 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies: *See* 'Man. Boundaries,' 'P.E.I. Subsidy.'
Public Accounts Rep. (presented) 11 (i).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. (B. 170) 1° m., 5556; in Com. and 3°*, 5859 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3878 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 447 (i).
Royal Society of Canada Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
Steel and Iron Bounties, *re* Budget Speech (Ans.) 529 (i); 4249 (iii).

WHITE, Hon. W. T.—*Con.*
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2589 (ii).
Supply (M.) for Com., 525 (i).
Supply (B. 18) prop. Res., 702; 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 703 (i).
Supply (B. 193) in Com. on Ways and Means, 6807 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1040, 1061 (i); Charges of Management (coin circulation) 1034; (dom. notes) 1033; (salaries) 619; Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069; Finance (salaries) 1068 (i).
Labour Gazette (Gazette) 1488 (i).
Tariff Commission (B. 88) Res. prop.., 1839 (i); in Com. on Res. 2157; 2° m., 2591; in Com., 2862, 2939, 3026, 3540 (ii), 4079; 3° m., 4144 (iii); on Senate Amts. (M.) *re* concurrence, 6663; (objections) 6808 (iv).
Travelling Allowance to Members during adjournments (remarks) 1849 (i).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 4985 (iii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 525, 702 (i).

WILCOX, Mr. O. J., *North Essex.*
Brian, Mr., Dismissal for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077, 1169 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6752 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs Outside Ports (salaries) 1077 (i); Militia (automobiles) 5508 (iii).
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2217 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4248 (iii).
Civil Service List, Inquiry for, 6187 (iv).
Copyright Law, Legislation *re* Uniformity (Ques.) 557, 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 935 (i).
Dismissals from Ottawa Depts., Inquiry for Ret., 3834 (ii).
Govt. Employees, Dismissal, resigned, &c. (M. for ret.) 1818 (i).
G.T.P. Workshops at Quebec, Site for Building (Ques.) 3050 (ii).
House of Commons Dismissals, Inquiry for Ret., 6807 (iv).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Geneviève Wharfs, Completion of Repairs (Ques.) 557 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6194 (iv).
Maple Sugar, O.C. *re* Standard, Annullment of (Ques.) 716 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1691 (i).

WILSON, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Penitentiary Employees Salaries, Increase *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3876 (ii).
Rivières des Prairies, Drainage, Continuation of, Amount voted *re* (Ques.) 714 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
SUPPLY—
Justice—Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster Indian Reserve) 6807 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways—I.C.R. (locomotives) 5657 (iv).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5571 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. G. C., *Wentworth.*
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3420 (ii).

WRIGHT, Mr. Wm., *Muskoka.*
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 853, 861 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1587 (i).

'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 489 (i).

Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Pilots: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii) .

Adams, Wm. Holloway, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Address, The, in Answer to His Royal Highness' Speech: Moved (Mr. R. B. Bennett) 14; Seconded (Mr. Sevigny) 27 (i).

DEBATE.

(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 33 (amt.) 49; Neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 517; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 50; (Mr. Guthrie) 62; (Mr. Foster) 72; (Mr. Carvell) 82; (Mr. Aikins) 94; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 107; (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 127; (Mr. Pugsley) 139; (Mr. Hazen) 162; (Mr. McKenzie) 178; (Mr. A. DeWitt Foster) 201; (Mr. M. Clark) 210; (Mr. Monk) 223, 231; (Mr. Lemieux) 241; (Mr. Mondou) 263, 270; (Mr. Verville) 276; (Mr. Stevens) 281; (Mr. Ethier) 295; (Mr. Burnham) 318; (Mr. Sinclair) 323; (Mr. Rainville) 337; (Mr. Devlin) 348; (Mr. Northrup) 357; (Mr. German) 364; (Mr. Webster) 372; (Mr. Turgeon) 388; (Mr. Weichel) 401; (Mr. Buchanan) 403; (Mr. Fripp) 409; (Mr. Emmerson) 413; (Mr. W. T. White) 440; (Mr. Oliver) 448; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 464; (Mr. Gauthier) 475; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 482; (Mr. Loggie) 487, 491; (Mr. Boivin) 497; (Mr. Murphy) 501 (i).

Address, The, Precedence: M. (Rt. Hon. Mr. Borden) 9 (i).

——— M. to Present (Mr. Borden) 519 (i).

——— Reply from H.R.H.: Presented (Mr. Borden) 932 (i).

Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2449 (ii).

See 'Public Works.'

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 100.'

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1041 (i), 6485 (iv).

Agricultural and Colonization Com., 1st Rep.: M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3933 (ii) .

——— M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to conc., 2375; objection (Mr. Speaker) 2375 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2155 (ii).

Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Animals Health, Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Apples and Fruit Growers Association, N.S., Resolution *re* Industry: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 1719 (i).

Archives Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).

Cattle Diseased, Compensation *re* Damages: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).

Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 557 (i).

Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 4984 (iii).

Dom. Exhibition, Grant to Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).

Experimental Branch Stations for Farms: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).

Experimental Farm Bulletins, Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).

Horses imported from U.S., Destruction of for Glanders: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5693, 5939, 6790 (iv).

International Institute of Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv) .

Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Nursery Stock, Purchase of for Experimental Farm, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3333 (ii).

Paris Exposition, Payments for Space: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Paquet) 582 (i).

Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).

Tobacco Growing, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).

Toronto Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6480 (iv) .

Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 542 (i).

Year-book: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).

See 'Marine.'

Air Brakes, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).

Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Alabama Traction Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 1575 (i).
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6246, 6304 (iv).
See 'Harvey.'
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3053 (ii).
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3536 (ii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312 (iv).
Algoma Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34."
American Freight passing through Welland Canal: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3533 (ii).
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceedings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 572 (i).
See 'United Shoe.'
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase: in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Animals Health, Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Annuities Branch: in Com. of Sup., 688 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1413 (i).
—— Extra Payment to Agents: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).
—— Transfer to P. O. Dept., Dismissal of Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 727 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Anse au Canard Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Anse à Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2072 (ii).
Antigonish County Public Works Appropriations: Remarks (Mr. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2438 (ii).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Antigonish to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6227 (iv).
See 'Railways.'
Apples and Fruit Growers' Association, N.S., Resolutions *re* Industry: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 1719 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates of 1913: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sinclair) 1819 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Archambault, Mr. Emile, Dismissal *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Séguin) 5957 (iii).
—— Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Séguin) 5950 (iv).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Architectural Institute of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Archives Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Archives, Dep. Minister: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).
Archives Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
'Arctic' Steamship, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5398 (iii).
Arichat and Canso Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Arichat, Retaining Wall: in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Armouries and Public Buildings, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).
See 'Public Works.'
Art Gallery: in Com. of Sup., 2825 (ii).
—— Purchase of Paintings: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1865 (i).
See 'National Art Gallery.'
Asbestos Manufacture Imports, Total Value, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Béland) 1590, 1817 (i).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 3343 (ii).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Assent to Bills: *See* 'Bills.'
Athabasca Landing to Grand Prairie Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Athabaska River Landing: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
Atlantic Coast Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Temporary Clerks: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Aud. Gen.'s Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 970 (i).

Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 561 (i).
Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 576 (i).
See 'Cable.'
Australian Trade Possibilities: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1981 (ii).
Automobiles purchased for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4714 (iii).
Baddeck Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6658 (iv).
Bait, Cold Storage: in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1361 (i).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4979 (iii).
Bands, and Associations Grants, *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Bank Act (extension of charters) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Banking Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1820 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 938 (i).
Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Bath Postmistress, Dismissal: in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
See 'Boham.'
Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).
Battlefields Commission: M. (Mr. White) to strike out vote, 5299 (iii).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Bayfield Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3337 (ii).
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3151 (ii).
Beaumont Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).
Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Bedford Postmaster, Dismissal: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Kay) 5161 (iii).
See 'Jones.'
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3050 (ii).
Benoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1817 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2062 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Berlin P. O. Clock: Remarks (Mr. Clare) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Berthier-en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Barrette) 1409 (i).
—— Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4248 (iii).
Bills, Sen. Amts., 6493, 6544, 6577 (iv).
Bills, Royal Assent, 819 (i), 3241 (ii), 4849 (iii), 6824 (iv).
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 794 (i), 3236 (ii), 4775 (iii).
BILLS:
Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. Borden).
1°*, 9 (i).
Bill (No. 2) To amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 12; 2°, 939; in Com., 939; 3°*, 1596 (i).
Bill (No. 3) To amend the Marriage Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 12; on Order for 2°, 581; 2° m., 1597; Amt. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, agreed to (Y. 87; N. 61) 1707 (i).
Bill (No. 4) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 12 (i).
Bill (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 13 (i).
Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 176; 2° m., 944, 1015, 1821 (i); 2499 (ii).
Bill (No. 7) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 267 (i); 2°, 2500 (ii).
Bill (No. 8) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Burnham).
1°, 337; 2° m., 1017 (i).
Bill (No. 9) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 407; 2° m., 944; 2°, 1821 (i); in Com., 2532; 3°, 2535 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 10) Respecting the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 643; 2°*, 1120; in Com., and 3°*, 1577 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company, and to change its name to The Canadian Mortgage Investment Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°, 643, 2°*, 1120 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2061 (ii).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1120 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) To incorporate the Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 643; 2°*, 795 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 14) To incorporate the North Arm Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1530 (i).

Bill (No. 15) To incorporate the Vancouver Life Insurance Company, of Vancouver, B.C.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas Wadge.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., 2854, 2983, 3280; 3°*, 3283 (ii).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 644 (i).

Bill (No. 18) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1912.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 702, 1°*, 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 703 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To amend the Inquiries Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 710; 2m., 1021; ruling, 1281; 2° and in Com., 1283, 1318, 1414; 3°*, 1494 (i).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.— (Mr. Macdonald).
M. for leave to introduce, 711; 1°*, 713; 2°, 795; in Com., and 3°*, 797 (i).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°*, 713; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 797 (i).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 2011; 3°*, 2012 (ii).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Harbour of Hamilton.—(Mr. Stewart, Hamilton).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 2449; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121; in Com., and 3°*, 1577 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 4699; 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act, 1899.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 869; 2°, 1025; in Com., 1032; 3°, 1709 (i).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting Grain.—(Mr. Foster).
Res. prop., 793, 869; in Com. on Res., 870; 1°* of Bill, 874 (i); 2°, 2161; in Com., 2179, 2186, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2560, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3491, 3630, 3757 (ii); 4042, 4153, 4787; 3°m., 4788; agreed to, 4835 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Alberta Electric Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Alberta Interurban Railway Company.'—(Mr. Bennett, Calgary).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting the Architectural Institute of Canada.—(Sir Edmund Osler).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., 2410; 3°* 2413 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Staples).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., 5201; 3°*, 5202 (iii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Canadian Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.—(Mr. Guilbault).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Guilbault).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company and the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company.—(Mr. Achim).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Cap de la Magdeleine Railway Company.—(Mr. Paquet).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., 2012; 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Baker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting *La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.*—(Mr. Achim).
1°*, 970, 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Dominion Trust Company, and to change its nome to 'British Empire Trust Company.'—(Mr. Cromwell).
1°*, 970; 2°, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4237 (iii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 970; 2*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., 2413; 3°m., 2414; 3°*, 2784 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 53) Respecting certain Patents of Edmund F. Piper.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 970; 2°m., 1201; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Quinze River and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Brabazon).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 55) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1530 (i).

Bill (No. 56) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the Union Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Department of External Affairs.—(Mr. Borden).
1°, 971; 2°*, 1434; in Com., and 3°*, 1434 (i).

Bill (No. 59) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 1020 (i).

Bill (No. 60) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. Prop., 1018; in Com. on Res., 1032; 1°* of B., 1033; 2° and in Com., 1434 (i); 3343, 3540; 3°*, 3631 (ii).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company, and to change its name to The Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.—(Mr. Chabot).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Premier Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Bennett, Calgary).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.—(Mr. Bradbury).
1°, 1069 (i).

Bill (No. 65) To correct certain Clerical Errors in the French Version of the Revised Statutes, 1906.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 1197; 2° and in Com., 1438; 3°*, 1440 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Public Archives.—(Mr. Borden).
In Com. on Res., 1282; 1°* of B., 1282; 2°, 1440; in Com., 1494; 3°*, 1713 (i).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew).
1°*, 1409; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting Queen's College at Kingston, and to change its name to 'Queen's University at Kingston.'—(Mr. Nickle).
1°*, 1410 (i); 2°*, 2560; Remarks, 3730, 3873; in Com., 3874 (ii), 4237, 4745; 3°, 4869 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate Queen's Theological College.—(Mr. Nickle).
1°*, 1410 (i); 2°*, 2560 (ii); in Com., 4237, 4775; 3°*, 4869 (iii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Keewatin.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting a certain patent of the Spirella Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) To incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., 2448; 3°*, 2559 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Barnard).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the use of Flags.—(Mr. Bradbury).
1°, 1411 (i).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
Res. prop., 1414; in Com. on Res., 1497; 1°* of B., 1498; 2° and in Com., 1713; 3°*, 1714 (i).

Bill (No. 76) To amend The National Transcontinental Railway Act.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°, 1571; 2° and in Com., 1866 (i); 3126, 3364; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) To Encourage and Assist the Improvement of Highways.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°, 1571 (i); 2°, 3633; in Com., 3667, 3672, 3946 (ii); 3°, 4140 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6397, 6731 (iv).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Foster).
In Com. on Res., 1839; 1°* of B., 1839 (i); 2° and in Com., 6188, 6678; 3°*, 6680 (iv).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company—(Mr. Buchanan).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Dominion Trust Company, Limited, and to change its name to Dominion Trust Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., 4237; 3°*, 4238 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Northern Territorial Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Saskatchewan Power Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 84) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., 2855, 2985, 3280, 3284, 3332, 3479; 3°*, 3491 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Lord's Day Act.—(Mr. Verville).
1°, 2057 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 2058 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 2058 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) To provide for the appointment of a Tariff Commission.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 1839 (i); in Com. on Res., 2157; 1°* of B., 2161; 2°m., 2591, 2668; Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 2614, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 104) 2752; in Com., 2862, 2939, 2994, 3540 (ii), 4079; 3° m., 4144 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6663, 6808 (iv).

Bill (No. 89) To incorporate the Bank of Saskatchewan.—(Mr. Knowles).
1°*, 2216; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 2854 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Clements).
1°*, 2216; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Clements)
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 2217. 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia (Limited).—(Mr. Buchanan).
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Wilcox.)
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2784 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 95) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 2296; in Com. on Res., 2378; 1°* of B., 2381; 2°, 3060; in Com., and 3°*, 3126 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Foster, Toronto).
Res. prop., 793 (i); in Com. on Res., 2405; 1°* of B., 2°*, and in Com., 2406; 3°, 2575 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Hazen.)
Res. prop., 2295; M. for Com. on Res., 2406, 2415; in Com. on Res., 2420; 1°* of B., 2420; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3632 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 2664; 2°*, 3284 (ii); in Com., 5198; 3°*, 5201 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 2664; 2°*, 3284 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) For the Aid and Encouragement of Agriculture.—(Mr. Burrell).
1° m., 2849 (ii); 2° and in Com., 5277 (iii); 3° m., 5561 (iv).

Bill (No. 101, from the Senate) To incorporate the British Western Loan Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 3049; 2°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 102, from the Senate) For the Relief of Edna Wells.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 3049; 2°*, 3285; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 103) To amend the Government Works Tolls Act.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 3049; 2° and in Com., 3450; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 104) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 2862; in Com. on Res., 3143; 1°* of B., 3146; 2°, 3347; in Com., 3349; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 105) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3154; 1°* of B., 3155; 2°, 3349; in Com., 3355; 3°*, 3364 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3155; 1° of B., 3155 (ii); 2° and in Com., 4782, 5264; 3°*, 5268 (iii).

Bill (No. 107, from the Senate) Respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. Bennett, Simcoe).
1°*, 3449 (ii).

Bill (No. 108, from the Senate) Respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. Baker).
1°*, 3349; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4237 (iii).

Bill (No. 109, from the Senate) For the relief of Herbert Horsfall.—(Mr. Kay).
1°*, 3449; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) For the relief of Kenneth Molson.—(Mr. Rhodes).
1°*, 3449; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) To authorize the payment of a subsidy to the Collingwood Ship-Building Company, Ltd.—(Mr. Monk).
Res. prop., 3343; in Com. on Res., 3450; 1°* of B., 3451; 2°, 3633; in Com., and 3°*, 3633 (ii).

Bill (No. 112, from the Senate) For the relief of James Denny.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°*, 3630 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 3539; in Com. on Res., 3632; 1°* of B., 3633 (ii); 2° and in Com., 4081; 3°*, 4082 (iii).

Bill (No. 114, from the Senate) To incorporate Révillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 3828 (ii); 2°*, 4171; in Com., 5202; 3°*, 5204 (iii).

Bill (No. 115) To provide for the Extension of the Boundaries of the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835; 1° of B., 3898 (ii); 2°m., 4263, 4353; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 m. h., 3886, 4375; Amt. Neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4395; 2° resmd. 4397, 4461; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4495; in Com., 4496, 4584, 4656, 4701, 4836; 3°m., 4838; Amt. (Mr. Mondou) Separate Schools, 4839; Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4925; Amt. (Mr. Beland) 4934; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4973; 3° agreed to, 4974 (iii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
Res. prop., 3829, in Com. on Res., 3971; 1° of B., 3972 (ii); 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4787 (iii).

Bill (No. 117, from the Senate) To change the name of Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey.—(Mr. Fripp.)
1°*, 4139; 2°, 4238; in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To create the Biological Board of Canada.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 4037; 2° and in Com., 4551; 3°*, 4555 (iii); Sen. Amdts., 5690 (iv).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Continental Can Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 4236; 2°, 4395; in Com., 5204, 5483 (iii); 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate) For the relief of Ethel May Stewart.—(Mr. Clark).
1°*, 4237; 2°*, 4397; in Com., and 3°* 5259 (iii).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate) Respecting the Rainy River Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 4457; 2°*, 4701; in Com., 5198; 3°*, 5198 (iii).

Bill (No. 122, from the Senate) For the relief of William Holloway Adams.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 4457; 2°*, 4701; in Com., and 3°*, 5259 (iii).

Bill (No. 123) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
Res. prop., 3630 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4555; 1°* of B., 4563; 2° and in Com., 5405; (iii); 5567; 3°*, 5571 (iv).

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Civil Service —(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 4042; in Com. on Res., 4583; 1°* of B., 4584; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4787 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) To incorporate the Western Dominion Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5259 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To incorporate the Universal Eyesight Insurance Company.—(Mr. McLean, Queens).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5259 (iii); in Com., 5907, 5940; 3°*, 5942 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Public Health Association.—(Mr. Schaffner).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) To incorporate the Montreal Transcontinental Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting the Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Chabot).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., 5904, 5942; 3°*, 5946 (iv).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., 5947, 6563, 6749; 3°*, 6769 (iv).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) For the relief of Isabell Isaac.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) Respecting Mexican Interurban Electric Traction Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexican Interurban Electric Railway Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) Respecting the Methodist Church.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°*, 4975; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate) Respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate) To incorporate the Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company.—(Mr. Hepburn).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 137) To amend the Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 4974 (iii); 2°, 5968; in Com., 6176, 6450; 3°*, 6454 (iv).

Bill (No. 138) To incorporate the Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 4976 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5988; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Lake McGregor Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 5053; 2°, 5271; in Com., 5276; 3°*, 5277 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate The Interprovincial Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Lesperance).
1°*, 5156; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate) For the relief of Alvena Bell Leaitch.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 5156; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Hazen).
Res. prop., 5156; in Com. on Res., 5161; 1°* of B., 5161; 2° and in Com., 5400; 3°*, 5404 (iii).

Bill (No. 144) Respecting Aid toward the construction of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 4140; in Com. on Res., 5162; 1°* of B., 5166; 2° and in Com., 5404; 3°*, 5405 (iii).

Bill (No. 145, from the Senate) To ratify and confirm certain Agreements between the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission and the Grand Trunk Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., 5947, 6769; 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 146, from the Senate) Respecting the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate) For the relief of Isabella Helen Horncastle.—(Mr. Clark, Red Deer).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate) To incorporate International Guarantee Company.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 149) Respecting Water in the Railway Belt and Peace River Block of Land.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 5257 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5968, 6175; 3° m., 6188, 6338, 6401 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 5258 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5690; 3°*, 5960 (iv).

Bill (No. 151) To extend the Boundaries of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5268; 1°* of B., 5270 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6160, 3°, 6188, 6338 (iv).

Bill (No. 152) To extend the Boundaries of the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5270; 1°* of B., 5271 (iii); 2°, 6155; in Com., 6155; 3°*, 6188 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) For the relief of George MacKay Sutherland.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) To incorporate The Guarantee Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate), To incorporate the British American Trust Company.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., 5946; 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Judges Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
In Com. on Res., 5407, 5958; 1°* of B., 5415 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6000; 3° m., 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate the Grand Lodge of the Loyal Order of Moose in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6126; 3°*, 6127 (iv).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) Respecting the Mexico Northwestern Transportation Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexico Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 2°*, 5550 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 160, from the Senate) Respecting Alabama Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 2°*, 5550 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6127; 3°*, 6127 (iv).

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) For the relief of William Alexander Hunt Jenkins.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Harriet Duffy.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 5549 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of John Angus Kennedy.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 165) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5549; 2° and in Com., 5862; 3°m., 5892, 5960 (iv).

Bill (No. 166) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5552; 2° and in Com., 5892; 3°*, 5893 (iv).

Bill (No. 167) Respecting the Incorporation of Live Stock Record Associations.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°, 5553; 2°, 6021; in Com., 6023; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 168) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5553; 2° and in Com., 5893; 3°*, 5894 (iv).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
1°, 5555; 2° and in Com., 5846; 3°*, 5859 (iv).

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Quebec Savings Bank Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
1°, 5556; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5859 (iv).

Bill (No. 171) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
1°, 5556; 2° and in Com., 6061; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Lalor).
1°*, 5680; 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6127; 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 173, from the Senate) For the relief of Henry Greek Wills.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 5680; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) For the relief of Keitha Seeley.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of David George Davidson.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) To incorporate Capital Trust Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. Tobin).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 178) To provide an additional Annual Grant to the Province of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 5558; in Com. on Res., 5859; 1°* of B., 5862; 2° and in Com., 6114, 6128; 3°*, 6154 (iv).

Bill (No. 179) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 5680; in Com. on Res., 5921; 1°* of B., 5921; 2° and in Com., 6083; 3°*, 6114 (iv).

Bill (No. 180) To amend the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910.—(Mr. Monk).
Res. prop., 5559; in Com. on Res., 6047; 1°* of B., 5939; 2° and in Com., 6201; 3°*, 6203 (iv).

Bill (No. 181) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 5939; 2°, 6181; in Com., 6182; 3°*, 6182 (iv).

Bill (No. 182) Respecting the Government House property, Toronto.—(Mr. Doherty).
In Com. on Res., 5957; 1° of B., 5957; 2° and in Com., 6181; 3°*, 6181 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 183) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the Lines of the Railways and Bridges therein mentioned.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5681; in Com. on Res., 5894, 5911, 6060; 1°* of B., 6061; 2° and in Com., 6211, 6304, 6395; 3°m., 6395 (iv).

Bill (No. 184) Respecting the Imperial Loan and Investment Company of Canada —(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°*, 6061; 2°*, 6128; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 185) To authorize the sale to the Province of Manitoba of certain Ordnance Lands, in the city of Winnipeg. —(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
In Com. on Res., 5690, 6064; 1°* of B., 6080; 2° and in Com., 6203; 3°*, 6203 (iv).

Bill (No. 186) To authorize the granting of Subsidies to the Government of the Province of Ontario in aid of the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5681; in Com. on Res., 6080; 1°* of B., 6082; 2° and in Com., 6401; 3°*, 6449 (iv).

Bill (No. 187) To authorize the granting of a Subsidy to the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company, in aid of the construction of the Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5690; in Com. on Res., 6081; 1°* of B., 6082; 2°m., 6331; in Com., 6338; 3°, 6495 (iv).

Bill (No. 188) To aid the construction of certain Bridges on the Railway of the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company, and to confirm an agreement between the Company and the Governments of Canada and New Brunswick. —(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5691; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2°, and in Com., 6373; 3°, 6496 (iv).

Bill (No. 189) To aid the construction of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5841; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2° and in Com., 6372; 3°*, 6373 (iv).

Bill (No. 190) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown during the Fenian Raids.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
Res. prop., 5558; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2° and in Com., 6252, 6454; 3°*, 6460 (iv).

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate) To provide for the Incorporation of Railway Companies.—(Mr. Maclean, Halifax).
1°, 6492 (iv).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Lake McGregor Railway Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°, 6495; 2°, 6576; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 193) To grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively 31st of March, 1912, and 31st March, 1913.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 6807; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6808 (iv).

Bill (No. 194) To amend an Act of the present Session intituled An Act respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°, 6577; 2° and in Com. 6578; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting the Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°, 2°, 6578; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Henderson) 3946 (ii).

Biological Board of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'

Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).

Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5258 (iii).

Bisley Rules: *See* 'N. R. A.'

Blind River Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 5928 (iv).

Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).

Board of Management, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii), 5800 (iv).

Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3055 (ii).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices into Canada for 1908-9-10: M. for Ret. (Mr. Carvell) 1267 (i).

Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 975 (i).

Boundary Waters Treaty, Apptmt.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 2589 (ii).

—— Negotiations *re* Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 3833 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'

Bounties on Steel and Iron, Administration of Act: in Com. of Sup., 687 (i), 5934 (iv).

Bounties on Steel Rods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).
See 'Steel.'

Bounties to Veterans: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'

Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1814 (i).

Bourgoin, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5259 (iii); 6188 (iv).

Bourque, Geoffrey, Accident on I. C. Ry., Inquiry *re* M. for Reps.* (Mr. Boulay) 2459 (ii).

Bourque, Geoffrey: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
——— Claims *re* Damages on I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2243 (ii).
Boyle, D. R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S.: Dismissal, &c. Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4976 (iii).
Branch Lines, I C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 622 (i).
——— Subsidies to &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5618 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
Bras D'Or Lakes Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iv).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 6337 (iv).
Breakwaters, N. S.: Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Kyte) 4460 (iii).
Brian, Mr., Dismissals for Political Partisanship: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Bridge Strengthening I. C. R.: in Com of Sup., 4137 (iii).
British Admiralty, Memo *re* Conference between Can. and Australia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 559 (i).
British American Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
British Colonial Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
B. C. and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
B. C. Boundary Agreement *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 971 (i).
B. C. Fishing Licenses, Transfers, &c.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3945 (ii).
B. C. Fishing Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6277 (iv).
B. C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
B. C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2754 (ii).
B. C. Lumber Combine, Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2297 (ii).
B. C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 573 (i).
B. C. Public Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
B. C. Railway Belt Lands, O. C. *re* Transfer: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1200 (i).
British Empire Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 5948 (iv).
'British News,' &c., Purchase by Dept. of Int.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6660 (iv).
See 'Immigration.'
Britiish Preference, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 553 (i).
British Western Loan Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
B. W. India Trade Arrangements, Negotiations *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Murphy) 977 (i).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCraney) 5263 (iii).
See 'St. Aldwyn.'
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3151 (ii).
Brown, Wm., Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit, *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
——— Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4779 (iii).
Brown, Mr., M.P., Smuggling: *See* 'Customs Smuggling.'
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 4781 (iii).
Buck, A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Budget, The (annual statement) 4985:
Debate: (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5011; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5041; (Mr. Verville) 5056; (Mr. Broder) 5083; (Mr. M. Clark) 5085; (Mr. Lalor) 5070; (Mr. Oliver) 5093; (Mr. Marshall) 5102; (Mr. Burnham) 5101; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5109; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5118 (iii); (Mr. Nesbitt) 5134; (Mr. Bellemare) 5146; (Mr. R. Lanctot) 5147; (Mr. Paquet) 5151; (Mr. M. Martin) 5154 (iii).
Budget: *See* 'Financial Review.'
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1358 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Burke's Head Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 2045 (ii).
Burrard Inlet and Tunnel Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6318 (iv).
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com.: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1409 (i).
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Cabinet, Constitution of: Remarks in Debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 56 (i).
Cabinet Dissensions: Remarks in Debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).

Cabinet Ministers from Quebec, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Monk: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i)

See 'Ministers,' 'Que. Minister.'

Cable Rates Exchange: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).

Cable Rates to G. B. on M. for Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3237 (ii).

——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3237 (ii).

——— Res. on Order Paper, Withdrawal of: Remarks (Mr. Borden) 3448; M. (Mr. Armstrong) 3448 (ii).

——— Parcel Post, &c.: M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4082; Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4097; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 70) 4120 (iii).

——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Borden) 931 (i).

See 'Australian,' 'Telegraph.'

Cadet Corps, Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6323 (iv).

Calgary Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).

Campaign Literature, Franking: *See* 'Political.'

Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P.O. at St. Louis du Mile End: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1414 (i).

——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

Campbellton Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).

Camps for Militia Training: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).

See 'Militia.'

Camrose Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Douglas) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

Canada and Australia Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4714 (iii).

Canada-Australia Trade: M. for Papers* (Mr. Ames) 582 (i).

See 'Trade Relations.'

Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Canada and G.B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).

——— Renewal of Contract: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).

See 'Post Office,' 'Fast Atlantic.'

Canada, Mexico and S. America Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iv).

Canada and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

Canada and South Africa Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).

Canada-France Steamship Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 5262 (iii).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Lemieux) 4742 (iii).

See 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6305 (iv).

Canadian Agencies in Europe, Names of Appointees: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5261 (iii), 5557 (iv).

Can. Birkbeck Investment and Savings Co.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'

Canadian Coal used to heat Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).

Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1582 (i).

Canadian Missionaries in China, Refusal of British Gunboat for Protection, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1198 (i).

——— Relief *re* Dangers: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 229 (i).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 268 (i).

——— Stmnt. from Home Govt.: Read (Mr. Roche) 6559 (iv).

Canadian Navy, Repudiation by Nationalists: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 714 (i).

——— Speeches *re* Election Campaign, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 552 (i).

——— Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i).

See 'Naval.'

Can. Northern Alta. Ry., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 144.'

Can. Northern Alta. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'

Can. Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'

Can. Northern Ont. and Carillon and Grenville Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'

Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'

Can. Northern Ont. Ry., Subsidy, Guarantee, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4781 (iii).

Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 187.'

Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 6081 (iii).

Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'

Can. Northern and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Maintenance of Road in L'Ile Bourdon: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5261 (iii).

Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees *re* Montreal Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 4247 (iii).

Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 2587 (ii).

Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation: M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Copies, 1396 (i).
See London.'
C.P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
C.P. Ry. (Toulon) Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).
C.P. Ry., Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5262 (iii).
Can. Public Health Assn.; *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage) Amt.: M. for Com. on Prop. Res. (Mr. Edwards) 1817 (i).
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt. Bill (Mr. Edwards) on M. to Introduce: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 229; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 267 (i).

CANALS:
American Freight passing through Welland Canal: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Canal Staff, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Kyte, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canal Tolls, Abolition of, O. Cs.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage for 1911: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3051 (ii).
Carillon Canal, Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2293 (ii).
Chicago Canal, Rep., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, Lower Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Galops Canal, Upper Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Lachine Canal Lock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
——— Rockfield Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5790 (iv).
Murray Canal, Levelling High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong) 1319 (i).
——— Meeting at Newmarket: Par. in Press (Mr. Emmerson) 3057 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Bank St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
——— New Dredging Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
St. Peters Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Locks: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claim of Denis Martin for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2292 (ii).
——— Charges *re* Damien Lalonde: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Soulanges Canal, Cueillerrier, Jos., Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iv).
——— Employees, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4250 (iii).
——— Guard Pier: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
——— Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3537 (ii).
——— Methot, Denis, Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).
——— Patronage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3536 (ii).
——— Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
Trent Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5799 (iv).
——— Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (iv).
——— Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Welland Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6607 (iv).
——— Quantity of American Freight passing through: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5786 (iv).
——— Water Power, Diversion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 6747 (iv).
Canso Post Office, Dismissal of R. Sutherland: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).
——— Pet. *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 581; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 581 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 974 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet *re* Change of Name: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Cape Breton Public Works: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 2052 (ii).
Cape Breton Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Capital Trust Corporation, Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Caraquet and North Shore Branch Line, I.C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Turgeon) 4192 (iii).
Caretakers for Militia, Wages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6320 (iv).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2293 (ii).
Carillon and Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1810 (i).

Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A.W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
Carriere and Laine Property, Lévis, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lesperance) 731 (i).
Carrier, Mr., Postmaster at St. François Xavier de Brompton, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Car Shortage in Grain Shipments: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 802 (i).
Car Shortage *re* Transportation of Hay Crop: Remarks (Mr. Proulx) 2753 (ii).
Car Shortage in the West: Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) 1709 (i).
——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 1709 (i).
——— Govtl. Action *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Buchanan) 1714 (i).
See 'Grain Congestion,' &c.
Cattle and Stock Pedigree Records: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Cattle diseased, Compensation *re* Damages: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 557 (i).
Cattle killed by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Béland) 4984 (iii).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1020 (i).
Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3342 (ii).
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to *re* St. Lawrence River: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 728 (i).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value for 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 3534 (ii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4244 (iii).
Census Employees, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3335 (ii).
——— Delay in Payments: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1971 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2668 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 935 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 933 (i), 2244 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1199 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1020 (i), 3835 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 4460 (iii).
Census Population of Canada and Quebec Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 3336 (ii).
Census in Regina, Complaints *re* Correctness: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1440, 1574 (i).
——— M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Knowles) 563 (i).
Census Enumerators and Returning Officers, Delays in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2156 (ii).
Census Returns, Number of Males, Females, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 561 (i).
Census of Saskatchewan, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5261 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4983 (iii).
Census Report: Presented (Mr. Burrell) 4037 (iii).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup. 619 (i), 6462 (iv).
Central Ry. Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Champlain Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6485 (iv).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 554 (i).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).
Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).
Charges of Management, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 619, 1033 (i),
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 1862 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1584 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Charlos Cove Breakwater, in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1208 (i).
Charwomen, Pay, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i).
Chateauguay County Inundated Lands, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Brown) 6660 (iv).
Chatham, I.C.R. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
Chatham, N.B., Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 4190 (iii).
Chats Falls Timber Slides, Date of Deed with D. O'Connor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4549 (iii).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1414 (i).
See 'Hull.'
Cheese Weighing at Montreal: *See* 'Dairying.'
Chester Canal Cutting: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 2049 (ii).

Chester Canal Cutting, Discontinuance of Work: Ques. (Mr. A. K. McLean) 716 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 806 (i).
Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4039, 4780 (iii).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Lavalee) 4260 (iii).
——— Rep. *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Chicoutimi Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 11 (i).
Chinese Entering B.C., Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4778 (iii).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 555 (i).
Chinese Tax in B.C.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 285 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Christmas Holidays Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 702 (i).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4459 (iii).
Cigarettes, Quantity manufactured and imported in each Prov. for 1905, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act, Private Secretaries, Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 60'
Civil Service Act (C.S. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104 and 106.'
Civil Service Act (customs, P.O. depts.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 113, 116, 124.'
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Civil Service Apptmts. between Dissolution of Parlt. and Sept. 21st: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Edwards) 562 (i).
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 3334 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, Addition to: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Civil Service Commission, Additional Apptmt: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
——— Increase in Number: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 728 (i).
Civil Service Commission of Investigation Apptmts., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 283 (ii).
Civil Service Competitive Examination, Extension *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Civil Service Increases since 1900: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Aikins) 561 (i).
Civil Service Investigation *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1581 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Civil Service List: Inquiry for (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 6187 (iv).
Civil Service Reform, and Outside Service: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 727 (i).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re*: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 934 (i).
Clifford, Private: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Clock Towers on Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Clothing for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Clouthier, Jos., Dismissal, Postmaster at St. Alphonse Dudswell, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4549 (iii).
Coal Combine in B.C., Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4240 (iii).
Coal Contracts for I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
See 'Can. Coal.'
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1203 (i).
Coal Shortage in the West for Household Consumption, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Warnock) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta Settlement: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B.C., Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Warnock) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 571 (i).
——— Strikes in the West, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 567 (i).
——— Remission of Duties: Remarks (Mr. McCraney) 178, 230; Stmnt. (Mr. Rogers) 230 (i).
Coasting Trade, Foreign Shipping, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2861 (ii).
——— O.C., Extending Time: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1814 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. of Member for Edmonton *re* Prices in East and West: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Cockshutt) 807 (i).
Codd, Staff Sergeant, Retiring Gratuity: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iv).
Coffin, Henry, Apptmt. to H. of C., Dismissal of M. Picotte: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 2459 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 2289 (ii).
Coin Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3148 (ii).
Cold Storage for Bait *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Cold Storage Establishments in Canada, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Verville) 3343 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Verville) 5561 (iv).

Cole Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Combines Investigation Act, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
Commercial Agent in France as Successor to Mr. A. Poindron: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).
Commissioners *re* Investigations, Number of Appointees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5680, 6336 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
——— Lists: Presented (Mr. Borden) 703 (i).
——— M. to present Rep. (Mr. Borden) 794 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Borden) to add Names, 1019 (i), 2217 (ii).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 529 (i).
Companies Incorporation, Ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 529 (i).
Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).
Conservation Commission, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1069 (i), 6579 (iv).
——— Water Powers Report: Presented (Mr. Burrell) 407 (i).
Continental Can Co., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Conway, Patrick J., Lightkeeper at White Island, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587, 3342 (ii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
Copyright Bill, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557, 1208 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 935 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Lower Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2667 (ii).
Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).
Courcy, Mr. P., Apptmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska: Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) 5821 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 5952 (iv).
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
See 'St. John.'
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2242 (ii).
Cow Bay Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Cox, Mr. A. B., Dismissals, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 3535 (ii).
Creosoted Timber *re* Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1582 (i).
Cribbin's Point Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2046 (ii).
Criminal Code (log stealing) Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Crown Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Crystal Beach Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. E. Buck: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Cuillier, Ass't. Electrician, Soulanges Canal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4457 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iv).
Customs, Outside Service, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Customs Collector, P. J. Venoit, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).
Customs Contracts given without Tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).
Customs Deptl. Report: Presented (Mr. J. D. Reid) 971 (i).
Customs Dues *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).
Customs Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Outside Ports Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1073 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case by M.P., Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. (Mr. Baker) 2072 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brown) 2216 (ii).
Customs Tariff, Changes *re* Jute Cloth Dressed Lumber, &c., Rulings, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Turriff) 2459 (ii).
Customs Tariff: *See* 'Tariff Commission B. 88.'
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Weichel) 721 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Grievances *re* Weighing at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5711 (iv).
Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).
Dartmouth Branch Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
Dartmouth to Denus Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
Daoust, Done, Postmaster at Alfred, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 3945 (ii).

Dauphin Custom House: Remarks (Mr. Cruise) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Davidson, David George, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Davis, John, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2841 (ii).
——— Correction (Mr. Ethier) *re* Man. Bill Voting on 3°, 4983 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
——— Reporters' Examination Papers, 6338 (iv).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Decoste, Peter, Dismissal from Dredge Cape Breton: Ques. (Mr. W. Chisholm) 548 (i).
——— Defective Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 803 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1268 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).
Delisle, L. Trefflé, of Trois Pistoles, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4781 (iii).
Denny, James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3150 (ii).
See 'Justice.'
Deschenes, Louis, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Deschamps, Mr. R., Apptmt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6277 (iv).
Deschamps, Raoul, Apptmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2667 (ii).
Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6784 (iv).
Devils Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (i).
Diamond Light and Heating Co., Investigation *re*: on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Public Accounts Com., 5832 (iv).
See 'Pub. Accounts Com.'
Digby Clock Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 2460 (ii).
Dismissals of Govt. Employees, Investigation *re*: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
DISMISSALS—
Anse a Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2072 (ii).
DISMISSALS—*Con.*
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Montreal, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5950 (iv).
——— M. for Cor* (Mr. Seguin) 5957 (iii).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1361 (i).
Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv)
Bath Postmistress, Dismissal: in Com of Sup., 6282 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3337 (ii).
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3151 (ii).
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3050 (ii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2062 (ii).
Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3055 (ii).
Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 975 (i).
Bourgoin, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).
Boyle, D. R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S.: Dismissal, &c., Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4976 (iii).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 6337 (iv).
Brian, Mr., Dismissals for Political Partisanship: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Brown, Wm., Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit, *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 4781 (iii).
Buck, A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P. O. at St. Louis du Mile End: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1414 (i).
——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
Canals Staffs, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Kyte, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canso Postmaster, Pet. *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Canso Postmaster, Dismissal of R. Sutherland: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).
See 'Sutherland.'

Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 581; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 581 (i).

Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3342 (ii).

Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).

Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1208 (i).

Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1414 (i).

Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4039, 4780 (iii).

Chubb, George, Customs Officer, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4459 (iii).

Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4549 (iii).

——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).

Commissioners, Number employed by Govt., Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5680, 6336 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2063 (ii).

Civil Service Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1581 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Dismissals, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5950 (iv).

——— Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as Assistants: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5954 (iv).
See 'Public Service,' 'Morine,' &c.

Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).

Conway, Patrick, Lightkeeper at White Head Island: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587, 3342 (ii).

Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).

Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2667 (ii).

Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).

Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2242 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Cox, Mr., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr Sinclair) 6784 (iv).

Cresine, Geo., Quartermaster on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1582 (i).

Crystal Beach Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. E. Buck: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv)

Cuillier, Ass't Electrician, Soulanges Canal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4457 (iii).

Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 2454 (ii).

Davis, John, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).

Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).

Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal from Dredge 'Cape Breton': Ques. (Mr. W. Chisholm) 548 (i).

——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 803 (i).

——— M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1268 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).

Delisle, L. Treffle, Trois Pistoles, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4781 (iii).

Deschenes, Louis, Wharfinger at River Ouelle, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6784 (iv).

Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).

Digby Clock Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).

Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 2460 (ii).

Dismissals, &c., Apptmt. of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3247 (ii).

——— Irrelevancy of Debate (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3253 (ii).

——— Objection to Ruling (Mr. Macdonald) 3254 (ii).

Dismissal of Conservative Postmaster *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2295 (ii).

Dismissals Generally, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5803 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2018 (ii), 4187 (iii).

Dismissals from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1955 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Dismissals in Hull, Official Inquiry *re*: Ques. 550 (i); Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 4140 (iii).

Dismissals *re* Inland Rev. Dept., Policy of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iv).

Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in 'Le Devoir' read: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2452 (ii).

Dismissals in Ottawa, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1275 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 3834 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).

Dismissals for Political Partisanship: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).

——— Ques. of Order (Messrs. A. K. Maclean and Hon. S. Hughes) 1183 (i).

Dismissals of Public Officials: M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, &c., 878, 944 (i).

Dismissal from Public Works, Par. in Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 3058 (ii).

Dismissals from Public Offices from 1896 to 1911: M. (Mr. Goodeve) for Ret.* 1280 (i).

Dismissals in Rimouski County: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) 1276 (i).

Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).

Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 552 (i).

Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame des Lourdes, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 1863 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Pacaud) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).

Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).

Ducharme, Mr. G. N., Apptmt. of as Commissioner: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).

——— Resignation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4979 (iii).

Dumelong, E., Postmaster at L'Assomption, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 580, 720 (i).

Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4039 (iii).

Dupont, Rene, Dismissal as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).

Dupre, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).

East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Elevator Men in Govt. Employ: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).

——— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).

Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).

Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2579 (ii).

Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2459 (ii).

Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3053 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).

Fisheries Inspectors, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).

Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).

Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1589 (i).

Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. at Petrolia: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 4259 (iii).

Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 726 (i).

Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).

——— Inspector at Stellarton, I.C.R., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3935 (ii).

Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).

Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2860 (ii).

Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2242 (ii).

Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4976 (iii).

Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3051 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).

Gillies, Capt., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).

Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici: M. for Pets.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2587 (ii).

Glenelg, N.S., Postmaster, Complaints *re* Pets., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 1817 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. in Govt., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3752 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).

Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Dismissal, Resignations, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1818 (i).

Govt. Employees, Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Kyte) 2587 (ii).

Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re*, Investigation by H. P. Duchemin: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).

Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. White) 6183 (iii).

Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).

Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).

Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal of: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

Hagerty, Mr. S. W., Dismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4976 (iii).

Hale, Thos., Dismissal as Correspondent, 'Labour Gazette,' Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4459 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4263 (iii).

Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser, Montreal, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3343 (ii).

Ham Nord Postmaster, Investigation, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).

Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

——— Letter *re* Dismissal: Read (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).

Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 2588 (ii).

Hatfield, Mr., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).

Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Officers, Mulgrave, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1815 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2460 (ii).

Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5957 (iii).

Hebert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Hefferman, Mr. E. S., Dismissal from Customs at Spring Hill, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).

Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3342 (ii).

Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed: Ques. (Mr. L. Thomson) 1588 (i).

Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4259 (iii).

I.C.R. Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lesperance) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).

——— Employees in Pictou, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 2246 (ii).

Investigations into Dismissals: *See* 'Commission,' &c.

Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 3339 (ii).

Jones, Chas. O., Dismissal, Evidence, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).

Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 6782 (iv).

Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 2579 (ii).

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1411 (i).

Lacombe, Mr. J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P.O., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 974 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

Lalonde, Mr. Alfred, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Cardin) 6783 (iv).

Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 4549 (iii).

Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3339 (ii).

Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1864 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

Legault, Mr. Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5950 (iv).

Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5949 (iv).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Lemieux, Hon. Mr., late P.M.G., Par. in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2664 (ii).

—— Ques. Ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).

Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4458 (iii).

Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iii).

Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).

Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).

Lizotte, Luc., Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3338 (ii).

Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 6337 (iv).

Lotbiniere County Postmasters, Dismissal, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 972 (i).

McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 3343 (ii).

McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).

McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2243 (ii).

McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3756 (ii).

McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587 (ii).

McIsaac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 5956 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).

McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 4980 (iii).

McLean, W. D., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).

McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 2017 (ii).

McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 4460 (iii).

H

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).

McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

McPherson, John H., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4259 (iii).

Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P.O.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).

Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

Matte, Arthur J., Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Delisle) 5957 (iii).

Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P.O. at St. Germain: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1864 (i).

Montcalm Postmaster, Pets. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 575 (i).

Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).

Montreal Customs House, Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Retention of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2062 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1708 (i); 2057 (ii).

—— Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1812 (i).

Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1818 (i).

Morine, A. B., Letter received by Prime Minister: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6185 (iv).

—— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6185 (iii).

—— Correction *re* Ruling on Question (Mr. Speaker) 6335 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6335 (iv).

Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).

Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).

Mount Oscar, Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4780 (iii).

Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Power) 1583 (i).

Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-collector at Richibucto, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 554 (i).

O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 717 (i).

Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).

Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2243 (ii).

Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).

Postmasters dismissed: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).

Post Office Dismissals, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

Post Office Dismissals since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re*, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 1395, 1589 (i).

——— List read (Mr. Lemieux) 6636 (iv).

Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6781 (iv).

Postmasters in Lotbiniere County, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Fortier) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 548 (i).

Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2071 (ii).

Pouliott, Louis, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).

Powassan Postmaster, Change *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Arthurs) 2459 (ii).

Power, Lawrence F., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3751 (ii); 4781 (iii).

Printing Bureau, Dismissals and Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).

Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 2453 (ii).

Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine: on M. for Sup., (Mr. Carvell) 6528 (iv).

See 'Morine.'

Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2584 (ii).

Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Pardee) 4262 (iii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 6184 (iii).

Renfrew, N., Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Richards, Mr. S., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).

Rivers, Lachapelle and Dubois, Messrs., Dismissal &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii).

Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).

Robitaille, Mr. J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).

Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley P. O., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 722 (i).

——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).

Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c.: M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 1395 (i).

St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2068 (ii).

St. Agathe des Monts, Dismissal of Postmistress: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan. 1912: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2666 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 2861 (ii)

St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request for Dismissal: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2588 (ii).

St. Angele de Laval Postmaster, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii), 4039 (iii).

St. Germain Postmaster, Changes *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1579 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

St Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).

St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L. St. Pierre, Investigation *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6286 (iv).

St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*
—— Remarks (Mr. Bureau) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 575 (i).
Sayabec Postmistress, Pet. *re* Dismissal, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2585 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2666 (ii).
Sheltus, Anson, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).
Shurtloff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Smith, Angus, Pilot of D.G.S. 'Earl Grey,' Suspension of: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1590 (i).
Smith, Lyman C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. on Customs Bill, 4575 (iii).
Stellarton Postmaster, Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal: M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor.* 1589 (i).
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. Reid) 5054 (iii).
Sudbury Post Office, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Sutherland, Mr., Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i), 2018; Cor. read 2022 (ii).
See 'Canso.'
Therrien, F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).
—— (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3339 (ii).
Thompson, Dr., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6784 (iv).
Three Rivers, Inland Revenue, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Herbert: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1209 (i).
Tory, Mr. H. L., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 6783 (iv).
Venoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1817 (i).
Waterways Treaty, Dismissal of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
Webber, James, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Webster, Dr. C. A., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Law) 6186 (iv).
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2855 (ii).
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2857 (ii).
White, James, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Yule, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4779 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5950 (iv).
Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 102, 109, 110, 112, 120, 122, 131, 142, 147, 162, 163, 164, 173, 174 and 175.
Documents handed in to 'Hansard' not read: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6718 (iv).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sinclair) 1391 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Dom. Gresham Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. N. 29.'
Dom. Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Co.: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 29.'
Dom. Exhibition Grant to Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 552 (i).
Dom. Lands in N.W. Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, Complaints *re* British Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5843 (iv).
—— Limitation as to Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1820 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Dom. Trust Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 46 and 80.'
Doncaster Indian Reserve Road Repairs: Conc., 6806 (iv).

Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Double Tracking, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5637 (iv).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavallee) 2460 (ii).
—— Position on N. T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 2245 (ii).
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame des Lourdes, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 1863 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pacaud) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Downey, W. H., Returning Officer, Kings and Albert, Non-Payment of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2057 (ii).
Dredges and Boiler Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5953 (iv).
Drill Halls in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1815 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 180.'
See 'Collingwood.'
Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).
Ducharme, Mr., Apptmt. to Civil Service Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2830 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).
—— Resignation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4979 (iii).
Duffy, Edith Harriet, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2858 (ii).
Dumelong, Mr. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption, P. O.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 580, 720 (i).
Dumontier, Joseph, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector at Quebec, Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarks) 3340 (ii).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4039 (iii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2066 (ii).
Dupont, René, Dismissal as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).
Dupré, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
—— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 724 (i).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto,' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees: M. for Ret..* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1816 (i).
Eastern Block Addition: in Com. of Sup., 1339 (i).
Eastern Townships, Field for Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. McCrea) 6557 (iv).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Eddy, Ezra Butler Bessey, Change of Name: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).
Edmonton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Low) 725 (i).
Election Accounts, Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 4460 (iii).
Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 4, 8, 17.'
Election Deposits: *See* 'B. Nos. 8 and 17.'
Electric Light Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
—— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Elevators, Control of by Govt.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 137 (i).
—— Ref. to in debate on Address, 154, 287 (i).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2853 (ii).
See 'Grain B. 32.'
Empire Trade Commission, Apptmt. of Representative: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5951 (iv).
Erie, London and Tillsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 12.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6220 (iv).
Estende to Baddeck Line I.C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 576 (i).
Estimates, The (1911-12) Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).
—— Suppl., Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 971 (i), 4974 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Estimates Discussion in Concurrence: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6805 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion of Outside Works: Remarks *re* Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2443 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Estimates, Suppl.: Inquiry for (Mr. A. J. Maclean) 1575 (i).
Estimates Omitted: *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 1589 (i).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 559 (i).

Exchequer Court Act. (asst. judge) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Exchequer Court Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1035, 1039 (i).
Excise Customs Duties: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iv).
Excise Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Excise Preventive Officers: in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iv).
Excise Salaries to Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Excise Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).
——— Branch Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farm Bulletins, Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).
Explosive Apparatus Testing Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
External Affairs Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Eyesight, Insurance of: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
See 'Faulkner.'
False Creek Flats, Date of Application of Lease from Marpole and Macdonald: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5953 (iv).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 6186 (iv).
Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2579 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Indemnifying Shareholders, Speech of Hon. Mr. Crothers *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 3147 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Inquiry by Chief Justice Meredith: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) 6710 (iv).
Farmers' Bank Investigation, Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3332 (ii).
——— O. C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: M. for Copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2853 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 713 (i).
Farmers' Bank Reimbursements: (Ques.) (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Farmers' Bank, St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Speech of Hon. Mr. Crothers: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 3332 (ii).
Farming Implements, Cost of: *See* 'Cockshutt.'
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals: (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 6496 (iv).
Fast Atlantic SS. Service, Conference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5695 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 5261 (iii).
See 'Falconer.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Bounties to: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3334 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2459 (ii).
Fidelity Trust Co., Incorporation, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3757 (ii).
Fife, Duke of, Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Borden) 2154 (ii).
FINANCE.
Aud. Gen.'s Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 970 (i).
Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Banking Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1820 (i).
Bounties on Steel and Iron, Administration of Act: in Com. of Sup., 687 (i), 5934 (iv).
——— Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4249 (iii).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Kyte) 2588 (ii).
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 573 (i).
Budget, The, 4985 (iii).
Charges of Management, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 619 (i).
Coin Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4778 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., Limitations *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 1820, 1841 (i).
——— Complaints *re* British Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5843 (iv).
Estimates, The (1911-12): Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).
——— Suppl. (1912): Presented, 4974 (iii).
——— 1912-13: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 971 (i), 6154 (iv).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Investigation, O.C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: M. for Copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
——— Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2853 (ii)
——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3332 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morphy) 6710 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 713 (i), 3147, 3332 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Reimbursements: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Farmers' Bank, and Bank of St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551 (i).
Finance, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
Financial Review (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 6707 (iv).
Gold Coinage, by Mint: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1213 (i).
Govt. Loans, Amounts, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4777 (iii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4258 (iii).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5954 (iv).
P.E.I. Better Terms: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
Public Accounts Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 11 (i).
Royal Mint: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).
Fisheries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
FISHERIES.
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3053 (ii).
B.C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
B.C. Fishing Licenses, Transfers, &c.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3945 (ii).
B.C. Fisheries Question: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 290 (i).
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 874 (i).
Cold Storage for Bait *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sinclair) 1391 (i).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fishery Act, Prosecutions in Pictou County: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1589 (i).
Fisheries Contracts with Stewards on Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Fisheries Department, Reorganisation of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 936 (i).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3053 (ii).
——— Dismissals: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).
Fisheries Inspectors, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces: Ques. (Mr. H. Clark) 3339 (ii).
Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1589 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Turgeon) 5259 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 5386 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, Capt. Newcombe's Rep.: M. for Copy (Mr. Clements) 2467 (ii).
Fishery Treaty with U.S., Withdrawal *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
Fish Reduction Works at Arichat, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2289 (ii).
Fish Scrap as Fertilizer: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
Fish Trap Licenses issued to Capt. J. H. Thorburn: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Law) 2861 (ii).
Gasoline Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).
Hague Tribunal, Fishery Regulations *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3830 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2860 (ii).
I.C.R. Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 6748 (iv).
See 'Fish, Fresh.'
International Congress *re* Fisheries, Delegates: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
International Fisheries Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6646; conc., 6778 (iv).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 549 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 3055 (ii).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Lobster Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
Lobster Traps, Customs Changes in Tariff: on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
Marine Hospitals for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 6787 (iv).
Medical Attendance, Free, for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Murray, Dr., Poaching for Salmon on East River, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5255 (iii).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4460 (iii).
—— Explanation (Mr. Borden) 4550 (iii).
—— Compensation *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 4776 (iii).
—— Remuneration to Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
—— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
Salmon Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5957 (iv).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts: M. for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 2461 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Twine for Lobster Nets: Remark (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 5587 (iv).
—— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3536 (ii).
—— Customs Duties: on M. for Sup. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1070 (i).
Flags, Flying of: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Flax Seed, Stmnt. of, Excessive Freight Rates: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 661 (i).
Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. at Petrolia: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 4259 (iii).
Flour Bags, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 726 (i).
Fort McMurray and Athabasca Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 5747 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 5262 (iii).
Franking Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political.'
Fraser, Mr. John, Inspector at Stellarton, I.C.R., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3935 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4188 (iii).
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 549 (i).
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3150 (ii).
—— Cor. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3534 (ii).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
Freight Rates, Discrimination in the West: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).
—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Turriff) 3048 (ii).
See 'Railways.'
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (Mr. Paquet) 619 (i).
French River, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Devlin) *re* Provision in Estimates, 6729 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Murphy) Conc., 6776 (iv).
French Translation of Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
French Translator, Apptmt. of Mr. C. E. Duckett: M. (Mr. Borden) 1969 (ii).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Galops Canal, Upper Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Gananoque Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2860 (ii).
—— Resignation as Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Demers) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
Garthby, Lake Aylmer, Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (ii).
Gasoline Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c.: (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).

Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
——— Inquiry, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Gaspé Shore Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).
Gaspé Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3305 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2242 (ii).
Gatineau and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4976 (iii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 3060 (ii).
See 'French River.'
——— Rep. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Speech of P.M.G. at Renfrew: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 1970 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Route and French River: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6785 (iv).
Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3051 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).
Gillies, Capt., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).
Gillis Point Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici: M. for Pets.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2587 (ii).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 804 (i).
Glenelg, N.S., Postmaster, Complaints *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 1817 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. in Govt., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).
Gold Coinage, by Mint.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1213 (i).
See 'Coin.'
Good Roads, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Good Roads, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 284 (i).
Goods purchased by Public Works Dept. since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1578 (i).
See 'Pub. Works—Purchases.'
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Goose Creek Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2372 (ii).
Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).
Goulet, Mr., Apptmt. as Station Inspector, N. T.Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3935 (ii).
Govt. Appointments of Relatives of Members: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295-7 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* Boarding Employees: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5953 (iv).
See 'Marine.'
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Employees, Dismissal, Resignations, &c: M. for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1818 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Govt. Employees, Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Kyte) 2587 (ii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Govt. Loans, Amounts, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4777 (iii).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable,' 'Freight Rates,' 'Parcel Post,' 'Railways,' &c.
Govt. Printing Patronage to Quebec Papers: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1357 (i).
Govt. Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1204 (i).
Govt. Railways Management, Abolition of Govt. Ry. Managing Board: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5262 (iii).
Govt. Steamers, Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
——— Repairs, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
See 'Marine.'
Govt. Works Tolls Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Gov. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 1035, 1041 (i).
Governor General of Canada, Letters Patent: M. for Copy* (Mr. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).

Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) Res. prop., 793, 869, in Com. on Res., 870; 1°* of B., 874 (i); 2°, 2161; in Com., 2179, 2186, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2560, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3491, 3630, 3757 (ii), 4042, 4153, 4787; 3°m., 4788, agreed to, 4835 (iii).
See 'B. 96.'

In committee:
Agents car reports, 2573 (ii).
Binning, 3452,, 3460 (ii).
Car distribution, 3461, 3491 (ii); 4788 (iii).
Car orders and distribution, 3183, 3190 (ii).
Car rights, 2565 (ii).
Certificates, 3180 (ii).
Certificates with grain, 2400 (ii).
Commission's offices, 2182; salaries, 2181 (ii), 4154 (iii).
——— Regulations, 2187 (ii).
——— Transportation, 2187 (ii).
Country elevators, rules, &c., 2562 (ii).
Country elevators and warehouses, 2568, 3181 (ii).
See 'Warehouse.'
Fees, 2304, 2323, 2326, 2573, 3156 (ii).
Flat warehouses, 2568 (ii).
Fort William elevators, 2317, 2383 (ii).
Grades, 2536, 2767 (ii).
Grading, 2535 (ii).
Grain in bond, 2401, 3453 (ii).
Grain delivery on receipts, 4046 (iii).
Grain rejected, 2554, 2767, 3176, 3456 (ii).
Grain of same grade to be kept together, 2383 (ii).
Grain Survey Board, 2535 (ii).
Grain Offices in Winnipeg, 2536, 3159, 3453 (ii).
Hospital elevators, 2547, 2548, 3177, 3757 (ii), 4042 (iii).
Inspection, 3157 (ii).
Inspectors security, 2202 (ii).
Inspection at Terminal elevators, 2561 (ii).
Interpretation, 2548 (ii).
Licenses, 2561, 3182, 3457, 3761, 3798 (ii).
Loading platforms, 2570, 3188, 3461 (ii).
'Manitoba Hard,' 2538, 2771, 3162 (ii), 4155 (iii).
Manufacturing license, 2561 (ii).
Mixing, 2313, 3458, 3799 (ii).
Oaths, 2201, 2302 (ii).
Overage, 2399, 3452 (ii).
Reinspection, 2382, 2755 (ii).
Sample markets, 2306, 2383, 3630, 3799 (ii), 4077 (iii).
Samples, rejection of, 2545 (ii).
Screenings, 2554 (ii).
See 'Grain rejected.'
Seed grain, 2564 (ii).
Seed elevators, 3761 (ii).

In committee—*Con.*
Security by licenses, 3798 (ii).
Standards, establishment of, 2203, 2302, 2305, 2397, 3157, 3161 (ii).
Terminal elevators, acquisition of, 3526 (ii).
——— privileges, buying and selling, 3762, 3773 (ii), 4042, 4058 (iii).
——— Storage at, 2560 (ii).
Time for loading cars, 2572, 3183 (ii).
U.S. grain, grading of, 2547 (ii).
Weigh masters, apptmnt., 2323 (ii).
Weights, 2323, 2770 (ii).
Warehouse receipts, 3183, 3458 (ii).
Warehouse receipts and fees, 2183, 2186 (ii). 3°m., 4788 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Cash) 6 m. h., 4808 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Cruise) *re* car distribution, 4788 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Knowles) *re* elevator owners buying and selling grain, 4804 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. McCraney) *re* mixing, 4803 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Oliver) *re* expenses of administration, 4806 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Thomson) *re* sample markets, 4794 (iii).
Grain Bill, Notice for Disccussion (Mr. W. F. Knowles) 1574 (i).
——— Tel. from Grain Growers Association: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4744 (iii).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, &c., Ref. to Washington Despatches: Stmnt. (Mr. Foster) 2577 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the North West: Remarks (Mr. McCraney) on M. for Sup., 5760 (iv).
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6186, 6556 (iv).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Foster) 5954 (iv).
Grain Congestion in N.W.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Oliver) 6203 (v).
Grain Shipments from Canadian Ports, Quantity, Grades, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 536 (i).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 539 (i).
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6792 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3975, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 84) 4035 (ii).
Grain Storage at Minneapolis: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Oliver) 6493 (iv).
Grain Transportation in the West, Par. in Toronto Globe: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5928 (iv).
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6307 (iv).
G. T. R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike: *See* 'B. No. 130.'

G. T. Ry., Strikes and Board of Conciliation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. MacNutt) 3756 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2580 (ii).
G. T. R., Running Rights over T. & N. O. R., *See* 'B. No. 145.'
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s (charter extension) Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
G. T. P. Ry., Privy Council Judgment: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
G. T. P. Ry. (Brandon) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6324 (iv).
—— Bridge at Assiniboine, Subsidy: in Com. on Res., Amt. (Mr. Borden) 6060 (iii).
—— Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
—— Remuneration to Govt. Director: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
—— Workshops at Quebec, Agreement *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 3050 (ii).
Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re* Investigation by H. P. Duchemin: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).
Great Northern Mining & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. White) 6183 (iii).
Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Guarantee Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).
Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal of: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N. T. Ry. Investigation Commission, British Subject, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4038 (iii).
—— Improper form of Question: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
—— Naturalization of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4978 (iii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 1445 (i), 5621 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 676 (i).
—— Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 571 (i).
Hagerty, Mr. S. W., Dismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4976 (iii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hale, Mr. Thos., Discharge as Labour Correspondent: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4263 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4459 (iii).
Halifax, &c., Newfoundland & G. B., Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Halifax Dock Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (iv).
Halifax Terminal Facilities: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii).
See 'G.B. and Can. Mail Service,' 'Fast Atlantic.'
Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser, Montreal, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3343 (ii).
Hamilton Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Ham Nord Postmaster, Investigation Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Ham., Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital, Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 875 (i).
Hampton Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).
Hampton Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 675 (i).
—— Construction *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 572 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, 269 (i).
See 'Debates.'
Harbour Commissioners Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
—— Letter *re* Dismissal: Read (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
—— Improvements, &c., Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
—— Man., Repairs, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
—— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i), 2366 (ii).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Harmony to Elmira Branch Ry., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).
Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 2588 (ii).
See 'Whitehead.'
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4171 (iii).
—— Ry.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 1843 (i).
See 'Albert,' &c.

Hatfield, A. M., Charges *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Law) 5263 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).
Hattie, Wm. A., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2460 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1815 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept.: M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. Cs., 605 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5957 (iii).
Headquarters Staff, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5536 (iii).
Health Ass'n.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Health Department, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 1585 (i).
Hebert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Dismissal from Customs at Spring Hill, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).
Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3342 (ii).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Station: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 975 (i).
Highlands Bridge Construction: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 1197 (i), 5790 (iv).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Highways and Road Construction: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Pugsley) 142 (i).
Highways, Assistance to: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Highways Improvements, Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
Highways in N.S., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Highway Crossings eliminated on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5595 (iv).
Hillsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Historic Tableaus in Ottawa Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed: Ques. (Mr. L. Thomson) 1588 (i).
Horncastle, Isabella Helen, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Horse Racing: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6790 (iv).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction of for Glanders: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5693, 5939 (iv).
Horsfall, Herbert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3537 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Additional Accommodation for Members: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 3343 (ii).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4979 (iii).
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4248 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 4775 (iii).
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1810 (i).
Chicoutimi Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 11 (i).
Christmas Adjournment for Holidays: M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 702 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Emplymt. as Sessional Messenger, Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 2289 (ii).
—— M. Picotte: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 2459 (ii).
See 'Picotte.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
—— Lists: Presented (Mr. Borden) 703 (i).
—— M. to present Rep. (Mr. Borden) 794 (i).
Distribution Office, Salaries: M. to conc. in Senate Report, &c.: (Mr. Borden) 6660 (iv).
Downey, W. H., Returning Officer, Kings and Albert, Non-Payment of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2057 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
—— Wednesday Sittings, M. (Mr. Borden) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).
House of Commons Desks, Changes *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
House of Commons Employees, Salary Increases: M. (Mr. Borden) to conc. in report of Mr. Speaker, 6660 (iv).
—— Improvements *re* Acoustics: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1335 (i).
—— Messengers, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Ethier) 562 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 6807 (iv).
—— Stenographers: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
—— Remarks *re* (Mr. Pugsley) 1846 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
——— Ventilation: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Names. presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
Joliette County Returning Officer, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 4979 (iii).
Lanctot Investigation, Counsel Fees *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Legislation, Joint Com.: M. (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
Library Committee: M. (Mr. Borden) 795 (i).
Library, House of Commons, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1950 (ii).
——— Report presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
McDougall, J. M., Counsel Fees *re* Lanctot Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 4776 (iii).
Members Travelling Allowances during Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1848 (i).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Parliament, Opening of Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2065 (ii). *See* 'Coffin.'
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1585 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time: M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
——— Rep. of Examiner *re* Pets., Divergency of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 643 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6780 (iv).
Quebec West Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Questions, Improperly drafted: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Renfrew South, Electoral Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 926 (i).
Restaurant Com.: M. for Com. (Mr. Borden) 710 (i).
Restaurant, Payments to Waiters: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2861 (ii).
——— Minimum Wages paid in Cites: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 3049 (ii).
Rooms allotted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 670 (i).
Saturday Sittings: Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 5830 (iv).
Sessional Employees dismissed, Number &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Speaker, Election of: M. (Mr. Borden) 2, 5 (i).
——— Deputy: M. (Mr. Borden) 519, 523 (i).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1808 (i).
Statutes of Previous Sessions, Delay *re* Distribution: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Telephones, Long Distance, &c., in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int.: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Voters' Lists in Man., Distribution *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3056 (ii).
Yamaska Electoral Agent: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1584 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction: in Com. of Sup., 622, 677 (i), 5762, 6605 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction, Cor. *re*: M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1213 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 732 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 132 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 6776 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ports, Nav., &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Aikins) 3756 (ii).
——— Surveys, *re* Navigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Aikins) 3943 (ii).
Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Improvement Commission: Ques. (Mr. Kidd) 2293 (ii).
Hull Dismissals: *See* 'Dismissals.'
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4261 (iii). *See* 'Chauvin.'
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2860 (ii).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Power for Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3289 (ii).
Ice-breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Genevieve Wharfs, Completion of repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557 (i).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4259 (iii).
IMMIGRATION—
Agents in Belgium, Number &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Agents, Dismissals, Number and Names: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 877 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Agencies, G. B. and Can., Salaries, &c.: in Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Agencies, G. B. and Can., Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3305, 3911 (ii).
Agents, Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus: Ques. (Mr. Sutherland) 875 (i).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
'British News,' &c., Purchase by Dept. of Int.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6660 (iv).
Chinese entering B. C., Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4778 (iii).
Chinese Tax in B. C.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 285 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B. C., Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 555 (i).
Eastern Townships, Field for Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. McCrea) 6557 (iv).
Farm Labourers, Placing of, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sutherland) 5263 (iii).
——— Agents *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sutherland) 874 (i).
——— Complaints *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sutherland) 4781 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sutherland) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Farm Labourers in Quebec, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1359 (i).
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (Mr. Paquet) 619 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. *re* Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. Cs. 605 (i).
——— Report of Mr. Hawkes: Inquiry for (Mr. Oliver) 6551 (iv).
Hospitals, Number and Location: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1210 (i).
Immigration, Amount expended, Number of Immigrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1211 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1213 (i).
Immigrant Inspection before Sailing for Canada: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 618 (i).
Immigration Office in London, Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2451 (ii).
Immigration in Ont., Promise to Premier *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
Immigration Regulations *re* entering Canada: in Com. of Sup., 3911 (ii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1211 (i).
Immigration from U.S., *re* Wm. Pearson Co.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 3152 (ii).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 3154 (ii).
——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3154 (ii).
Japanese, Oriental, Immigration, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 875 (i).
Labour Conditions in B. C., Emplymt. of Orientals: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 177 (i).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2242 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. R., Immigration Agent at Detroit: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Literature, French Publications: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
Mar. Provs. Immigration Policy: Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2072 (ii).
Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1213 (i).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Negro Immigration: Remarks on Immigration Question (Mr. Thoburn) 608 (i).
Oriental Immigration, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4779 (iii).
Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1205, 1588, 1814 (i).
Sikhs in B.C., Decision *re* bringing in their wives: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2457 (ii).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 1209 (i).
Imperial Loan and Investment Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2420 (ii).
Indemnity to Members: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
INDIANS:
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1587 (i).
Doncaster Indian Reserve Road Repairs: in Conc., 6806 (iv).
Indians, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1039 (i).
Police Point Reserve Transfer: M. for Papers* (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3055 (ii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 1498 (i), 6615 (iv).
Industrial Training and Education Royal Commission: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Salaries: in Conc., 6770 (iv).
—— Private Secretary: in Com. of Sup., 6490 (iv).
—— Promotions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490 Conc., 6771 (iv).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1040, 1061 (i).
Inland Revenue Reports: Presented (Mr. Nantel) 565 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Insect and Pest Destruction Act, Enforcement of: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Inspectors *re* Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
INTERCOLONIAL RY.:
Air Brakes: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).
Archibald, Mr. P. B., Emplymt. by Ry Dept.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
Benoit, Mr. Joseph, Dismissal from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).
Board of Management: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).
—— Abolition of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 5571 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims *re* Damages on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2243 (ii).
—— M. for Reps.* (Mr. Boulay) 2459 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
Branch Lines, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 622 (i), 4135 (iii).
Branch Lines: Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 985 (i).
—— Accommodation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Davidson) in Com. of Sup., 4218 (iii).
Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 565 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Acquisition: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
—— Subsidies to, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5618 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Brotherhood Unions, Agreements, &c.: M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 793 (i).
Campbellton Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).
Caraquet and North Shore Branch Line, I.C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Turgeon) 4192 (iii).
Chatham Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
Coal Supply, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2457 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
Condon, D. Murray, Passenger Agent: Transfer of, Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 3337 (ii).
Construction and Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).
Dartmouth Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
Dartmouth to Denus Branch Line, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 5637 (iv).
Estende to Baddeck Branch Line, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 576 (i).
—— M. for Papers (Mr. McKenzie) 2494 (ii).
Extension Branches: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i).
Facilities on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5809; conc., 6774 (iv).
Fences, Number of Rods, Campbellton Division: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 6748 (iv).
Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 6748 (iv).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Guysborough Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 676 (i).
—— Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 571 (i).
Halifax Dock Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (iv).
Hampton Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Hampton Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 675 (i).
Highway Crossings eliminated: in Com. of Sup., 5595 (iv).
Hillsborough Branch, Rails loaned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4978 (iii).
I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Arbitration, Delays in Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3939 (ii).
I.C.R., Control by Ry. Commission, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4979 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Locomotives manufactured at Moncton: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iv).
—— &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3055 (ii).
'Market Tickets' to Employees: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Matapedia to Gaspé Basin Line, I.C. Ry. Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I.C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Moncton Ry. Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating, Stmnt. *re*: Ans. (Mr. Monk) 6744 (iv).
Moncton Shops, Contract for Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5611, 5762 (iv).
—— Operation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iv).
—— Transfer to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
Morice, Theophile, Dismissal from: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4262 (iii).
Mulgrave Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
North Sydney Diversion Line: in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
Ocean Limited, Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2241 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on conc., 6774 (iv).
Passes to Employees, Newspaper Reporters, &c., Instruction from Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 2328 (ii).
Pay Day, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3340 (ii).
—— Instructions *re* Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1583 (i).
Pictou Employees, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 2246 (ii).
Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed Officials: M. (Mr. Emmerson) to Com. of Sup., 5930 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2450 (ii).
Pullman Conductors, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1413 (i).
Ry. Ties, Contract *re* at Sayabec: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).
—— Contract with Dame Boulay: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Carvell) 5957 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Refrigerator Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5603 (iv).
Rivière du Loup, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
—— Shops Removal to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 570 (i).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5609, 5653, 6461 (iv).
Roy, Wm., Rep. of H. Boulay *re* Charges on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 934 (i).
—— M. for Papers (Mr. Boulay) 1391 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2586 (ii).
St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse killed: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Ste. Rosalie Branch Line, Accommodation, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4134 (iii).
Snow Blockade, Delay to Trains: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1409 (i).
Steamship Connections with I.C.R., Subsidies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5597 (iv).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2289 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 542 (i).
—— Supt., Application from Member of H. C.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4040 (iii).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (iv).
Ticket Collectors, Appmt of.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 6786 (iv).
Truro Station: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
—— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1412 (i).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
—— Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Wallace Harbour Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Working Expenses, Construction, &c., Statement (read): in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Crown Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Interior Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).
Internal Economy Commission Names: presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
International Congress *re* Fisheries, Delegates: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
International Fisheries Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6646; conc., 6778 (iv).
International Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'

International Institute of Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).
International Waterways: *See* 'Boundary.'
Interprovincial Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Inverness Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Investigation *re* Govt. Dismissals: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
See 'Dismissals.'
Investigation *re* Dismissals, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5950 (iv).
Isaac, Isobell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 3339 (ii).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy: in Com., 6309 (iv).
Japanese, Oriental, Immigration, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 875 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Jenkins, Wm. A. Hunt, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Joint Stock Companies Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2857 (ii).
Joliette County Returning Officer, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 4979 (iii).
Jones, Chas. O., Dismissal, Evidence, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).
—— Remarks, 5161 (iii).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Additional in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. German) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Judges in Yukon: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Judges of Superior Court, Montreal, Superannuation, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ethier) 2459 (ii).
JUSTICE:
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com.: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1409 (i).
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3150 (ii).
—— Extra Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2858 (ii).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4261 (iii).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Additional in Ont.: Remarks (Mr German) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Judges of Superior Court, Montreal, Superannuation, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ethier) 2459 (ii).
Justice, Deptl. Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).
—— Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Justice, Min. of, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3150 (ii).
Montreal Circuit Court Judge, Additional: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i), 2855 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3907 (ii).
—— Additional Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6597 (iv).
Northwest Territories, Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4121 (iii).
Penitentiaries in Canada Report: Presented (Mr. Doherty) 970 (i).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 3331 (ii).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1816 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1577 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5162 (iii).
Solicitor General, Payment of Salary to Min. of Justice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).
Tourigny, Mr. Justice, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3147 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Keewatin, Pet. *re* Educational Clause: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 3149 (ii), 4240 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Keewatin, R. C. Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Law) 3340 (ii).
Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).
Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
Kennedy, John Rogers, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Kennedy, Mr., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Kennie, Capt., Edmund, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 6782 (iv).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 549 (i).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kidsons' Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3054 (ii).

King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
Kingston, R. M. C. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 2579 (ii).
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
—— Investigation *re* Liquidation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
Laberge, Mr., Compensation to Family *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Labour Conditions in B. C., Emplymt. of Orientals: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 177 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
—— Private Secretary: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
'Labour Gazette' Correspondents, Apptmt. in Richelieu County: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2292 (ii).
—— Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1411 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Verville) on M. for Sup., 1441 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1468 (i).
—— Names of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1865 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Printing and Distribution &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1468 (i).
Labour Strike Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5949 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2294 (ii).
Lachine Canal, Lock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
—— Rockfield Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5790 (iv).
Lachine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i), 1952 (ii).
Lacombe, Mr. J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P. O., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 974 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 3535 (ii).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2242 (ii).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lake Temiskaming Dam, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pugsley) 2459 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 3055 (ii).
Lalonde, Alfred, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4779 (iii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Cardin) 6783 (iv).
Lalonde, Mr. Damien, Rep. *re* Assault: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).
Lanctot Investigation, Counsel Fees *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
See 'House of Commons..
Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs., prior to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 725 (i).
Land Scrip, &c., to Veterans: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 4549 (iii).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5055 (iii).
La Societe National Gymnastique, Grant to: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii), 5951, 6781 (iv).
—— Continuation of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2579 (ii).
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. R., Immigration Agent at Detroit: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Lauzon, Desire, Emplymt. by Govt., References as to Character: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3538 (ii).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I. C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3339 (ii).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1341, 1531 (i).
—— Memorials, *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2460 (ii).
Leaitch, Alvena Bell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1864 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
'Le Devoir,' Quotations from: Ques. of Order (Mr. Blondin) 371; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 372 (i).

Legault, Mr. Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5950 (iv).
Legislation, Joint Com.: M. (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5949 (iv).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Ex. P.M.G., Par in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2664 (ii).
——— Ques. Ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).
Lemieux, Mr., Relatives appointed to Govt. Service: List read (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4458 (iii).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iii).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3150 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 729 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 728 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Levis Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Levis Dry Dock: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Beland) 6492 (iv).
Levis Graving Dock, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
Library Committee: M. (Mr. Borden) 795 (i).
Library, House of Commons, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1950 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Report Presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5228 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Charges *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Linwood and Grosvenor Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Little Anse Harbour Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).
Live Stock, Inspection *re* Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Live Stock Record Assns.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Living, Cost of, Special Rep.: Presented (Mr. Crothers) 6332 (iv).
Lizotte, Luc., Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Lobster Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
Lobster Traps, Twine, Customs Changes in Tariff: on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
——— on M. for Sup. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1070 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3338 (ii).
Locomotives manufactured at Moncton I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iv).
——— Renewing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).
Logs, Stealing of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 6337 (iv).
London, Eng., Dom. Building: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
See 'Can. Offices.'
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 269 (i).
Lords Day Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B. Tests *re* Foundation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Lotbiniere County Postmasters, Dismissal, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 972 (i).
Louiseville Public Building: Conc., 6794 (iv).
Lowe, Robt. S., Emplymt. by Public Works Dept., Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Loyal Order of Moose: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Lumber Duties, Inspection *re*, Report in Winnipeg 'Free Press': Ques. (Mr. Turriff) 2446 (ii).
——— Interpretaion and Enforcement: M. for Papers (Mr. Knowles) 582 (i).

Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 1723 (i); Neg. (Y. 62; N. 107) 1806 (i).
Lumber, Stealing of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 3343 (ii).
McAllister, Mr., Moving Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6596 (iv).
McAuley, Angus, Claims for Damages *re* Fire Investigation: M. for Rep.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).
McDougall, J. M., Counsel Fees *re* Lanctot Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
See 'Lanctot.'
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2243 (ii).
McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3756 (ii).
McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587 (ii).
McIssac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 5956 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 4980 (iii).
McLean, W. D., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 2017 (ii).
McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 4460 (iii).
McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4259 (iii).
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 713 (i).
Madeleine de Verchères Monument, Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 2824 (ii).
Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P.O.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages in I. C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3055 (ii).
Magdalen Island Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Magdalen Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).
Magdalen Islands Marconi News Service, Copy of Instructions: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'News' *re*: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 4159 (iii).
——— Remarks, 3833 (ii).
——— Salary of Correspondent: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4262 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Hazen) 4041 (iii).
Magdalen Island Telegraph and Telephone: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Mahone Bay and Tancook Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4777 (iii).
Mail Carriers, Como to Oka, Compensation to Family: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Mail Clerks, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5693 (iv).
Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Mail Service between G.B. and Canada, Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 1843 (i).
See 'Can. and G.B.,' 'Fast Atlantic,' 'Post Office,' &c.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i), 4714 (iii), 5934 (iv).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Maisonneuve Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1347 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Discussion *re* Man. School Question: Ques. (Mr. Nesbitt) 534 (i).
——— Conference *re* Separate Schools: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 715 (i).
——— Cor., &c., *re* Settlement with Provs. of Man. and Ont.: M. for Papers (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 774, 789 (i).
——— Eastern and Western Line: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 971 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) Res. prop., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835, 3886; 1°* of B., 3898 (ii); 2° m., 4263, 4353; Amt. (Sir W. Laurier) 6 m. h., 4375, Neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4395; 2°, rsmd., 4397, 4461; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4495; in Com., 4496, 4584, 4656, 4701, 4836; 3° m., 4838; Amt. (Mr. Mondou) Separate Schools, 4839, Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4925; Amt. (Mr. Béland) 4934, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4973; 3° agreed to, 4974 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Eastern Extension: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Form of Ques., 3936; Ans. (Mr. Borden) 3936-7 (ii).
—— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 3755 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor. with Ont. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Meighen) 2459 (ii).
—— Extension of, Par. in 'Montreal Star': Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 489 (i).
—— Financial Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 558 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Oliver) 3448, 3834 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Turriff) 1820 (i).
—— Swamp Lands, Acreage, &c.: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3751 (ii).
—— Terms *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 716 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
See 'Grain B. 32.'
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4258 (iii).
Manitoba Questions: Remarks *re* Answers (Mr. Nesbitt) 581 (i).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Man. Separate School Bill: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 226, 231 (i).
Maple Sugar, Cancellation of O. C. *re* Standards: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 716 (i).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrède, Application *re* Govt. Position: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2069 (ii).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Messages to all Dominions: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2585 (ii).
See 'Magdalen.'
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
MARINE:
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 489 (i).
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Pilots: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
'Arctic' Steamship, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5398 (iii).
Atlantic Coast Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).
Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5258 (iii).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1203 (i).
Coasting Trade, O.C., Extending Time: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1814 (i).
—— Foreign Shipping, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2861 (ii).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1816 (i).
Fisheries Contracts with Stewards on Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
—— Deptl. Inquiry, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5262 (iii).
Govt. Steamers, Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
—— Repairs, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Ice-breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Insurance of Canadian Marine, Govt. Co-operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1582 (i).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3054 (ii).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2294 (ii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5228 (iii).
Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers, Pensions to: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
Live Stock Inspection *re* Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1041 (i), 6651 (iv).
Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
—— Ships for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 6787 (iv).
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).

Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 2459 (ii).
See 'Navy.'
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Patrol Vessels in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5949 (iv).
Radiotelegraphic Service, Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (ii).
Registration of Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Repentigny Lighthouse Keepers, Charges *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 6784 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel, Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 5680 (iv).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 974 (i).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Tidal Service, Surveying Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5400 (iii).
Vickers-Maxim Co.'s Contract *re* Construction of Montreal Dry Dock: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2450 (ii).
Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Wrecks Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Maritime Law International Conference, Invitation to Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2586 (ii).
Mar. Provs. Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Mar. Provs. Immigration Policy: Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2072 (ii).
Maritime Telephone Co. and P. E. I. Connection: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
'Market Tickets' to I. C. R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2855 (ii).
—— Ref. to Privy Council, Provl. Representation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt., Ref. to Supreme Court, 3332 (ii).
—— Correction in Speech (Mr. Pelletier) 3532 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) *re* Order for 2°, 582 (i).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. *re* Legalization: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 575 (i).
Marriage Law, Cor. with Federal Govt. *re* Legislation: M. for copies* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3341 (ii).
—— Cor. with Prime Minister *re* Legislation: M. for copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2861 (ii).
—— Par. in Toronto 'Star': Ques. (Mr. Burnham): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3942 (ii).
—— Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 528 (i).
—— Ref. to Supreme Court: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3332 (ii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 573 (i).
See 'Ne Temere.'
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 4776 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Matapedia to Gaspe Basin Line, I. C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I. C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Matheson, Jas. W., Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5263 (iii).
Matte, Arthur J., Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Delisle) 5957 (iii).
Medical Attendance, Free for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Medical Director General, Apptmt., &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2667 (ii).
Melford Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
—— Notice to suspend work: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 549 (i).
Members Indemnity: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Members Travelling Allowances during Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1848 (i).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5954 (iv).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
Mess. from His Royal Highness, Estimates 1911-12: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 525, 971 (i), 4974 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Methodist Church: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Methot, D., Apptmt. on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).

Mexican Interurban Electric Ry. Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Mexico Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P. O. at St. Germain: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).
Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1864 (i).
Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Militia Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
MILITIA:
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3536 (ii).
Allowances in Com. of Sup., 5447 (iii).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).
Armouries and Public Buildings, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
Automobiles purchased for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
Bands, and Association Grants, *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii); 6653 (iv).
Battlefields Commission: M. (Mr. White) to strike out vote, 5299 (iii).
Cadet Corps, Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Camps for Militia Training: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Caretakers for Militia, Wages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 580 (i).
Clothing for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Customs Dues *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).
Drill Halls in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1815 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3334 (ii).
See main heading.
Headquarters Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5536 (iii).
Kingston, R.M.C. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re* Canon Dauth, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 552 (i).
Militia Council Rep. (presented) 2668 (ii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Militia, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
Military Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4040 (iii).
See 'Automobiles.'
Montreal Military School, Site *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
National Battlefields Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3730 (ii).
Ordnances: in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Properties: in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).
Regiments of Foreign born Citizens, Organization of: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 534 (i).
Rifle Associations and Bands: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii); 6653 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
——— Acquisition of Additional Land: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Schools of Instruction for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
S.A. Bounty Scrip, Delay in Distribution, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 3153 (ii).
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1066 (i).
——— Ore Deposits, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490, 6602 (iv).
——— Reports, French Translation: in Com. of Sup., 6490 (iv).
Mining Rights Administration, O.C. Resolution: Remarks (Mr. Rogers) 6792 (iv).
Ministers from Quebec, Statements at St. Eustache Election Campaign: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 553 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Molson, Kenneth, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Moncton Ry. Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
——— Shops, I.C.R., Contract for Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.'
——— Tenders *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Emmerson) 5762 (iv).

Moncton Shop, I.C.R., Operation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iv).
——— Shops, Transfer to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
Monday Sittings, Precedence of Govt. Business: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
Montcalm Postmaster, Pets. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 575 (i).
Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Montreal Athletic Association at Nancy, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1722 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1350 (i).
Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Additional: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2855 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3907 (ii).
Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Additional Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6597 (iv).
See 'Justice.'
Montreal Customs Appraiser Building: in Com. of Sup., 1351 (i).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii); 6652 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. Nos. 97 and 150.'
Montreal Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49 and 191.'
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmt. of Accountants *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6661 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Delegations *re* from Corn Exchange, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3943 (ii).
——— Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1708, 1960 (i), 2057 (ii), 6551 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1812 (i).
——— Retention of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2062 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1357 (i).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. of, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3944 (ii).
Montreal Judiciary, *re* Increase of Judges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i).
See 'Justice.'
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 572 (i).
Montreal Military School, Site *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Montreal Postal Station F.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
Montreal Post Office Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 24 and 194.'
Montreal Transcl. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
See 'Can. Northern.'
Moose to Drulingville Loop Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2820 (ii).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Knowles) 3972 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 2040, 2206 (ii).
Moosejaw Post Office, Names and Locations: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 976 (i).
Moosejaw District, Proposed Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 3342 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 4237 (iii).
Moosejaw P.O. Inspector, Pets. *re* Apptmt.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office Inspector: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 4981 (iii).
——— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4982 (iii).
Moosejaw Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
——— Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited: M. for Copy* (Mr. Knowles) 562 (i).
Moose, Loyal Order of: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Monuments, Erection of, Sites, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2823 (ii).
Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1818 (i).
Morice, Théophile, Dismissal from I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4262 (iii).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
——— Letter to Prime Minister *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6185 (iii).
——— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6185 (iv).
——— Correction *re* Ruling on Question (Mr. Speaker) 6335 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6335 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Morin, Mr. Theo., Reinstatement of: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal, &c.: Ques (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).
Mounted Police, Annuities to Families of Messrs. Fitzgerald, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 5176 (iii).
——— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 5175 (iii).

Mounted Police, Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6485 (iv).
See 'N. W. Mounted Police.'
Mount Oscar Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4780 (iii).
Mulgrave Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P. O. Dept., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Power) 1583 (i).
Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-Collector at Richibucto, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Murray Canal, Levelling High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Murray, Dr., Poaching for Salmon on East River, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Musicians Holiday on Sunday: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6321 (iv).
Napierville Post Office Site, Agreement, Instructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lanctot) 3153; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3153 (ii).
——— Payment to Mr. Bourgeois: Remarks Mr. Lanctot) on M. for Sup., 2373 (ii).
Napierville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i).
——— Purchase of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lanctot) 5263 (iii).
National Art Gallery, Ownership of Painting: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 6337 (iv).
——— Paintings, &c., purchased since 1891: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 6184 (iii).
——— Presentation of Oil Painting by H. R. H. Princess Louise: Announcement (Mr. Monk) 5056 (iii).
See 'Art Gallery.'
National Battlefields Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
National Ports: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3730 (ii).
Natl. Transcl. Ry., Implementing Privy Council Judgment: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Natl. Transcl. Ry. Time Extension: *See* "B. No. 21.'
N. T. Ry. Bill 95, Factums *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2589 (ii).
Natl. Transcl. Ry. Commissioners, Reduction of Number: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY:
Claims for Damages in Dorchester County, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 6184 (iv).
Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. R. W. Leonard: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
——— Duties assigned to New Chairman: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
——— Notification of Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1196 (i).
——— Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1199 (i).
Commission, Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2244 (ii).
Commission, Payments to Taschereau, Cannon & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2245 (ii).
Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iv).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavallee) 2460 (ii).
——— Position on N. T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lavalee) 2245 (ii).
Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 6732 (iv).
——— Stmnt. re: Ans. (Mr. Cochrane) 6733 (iv).
Goulet, Mr., Apptmt. as Station Inspector, Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3935 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N. T. Ry. Board, British Subject, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4038 (iii).
——— Naturalization of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4978 (iii).
———Improper form of Question: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2157 (ii).
——— Apptmt., Salaries of Messrs. Gutelius and Lynch Staunton: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4242 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2060 (ii).
Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 932 (i).
——— Completion &c., Operation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Montreal Branch Lines, Cor., O. Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) 582 (i).
——— Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).
——— Pet. *re* Subsidy to: Ques. (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) 573 (i).
Montreal Branch Subsidy: in Com., 5896, 6215 (iv).
N. T. Ry. (implementing) Bill 95, Factums *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2589 (ii)

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).

Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4977 (iii).

St. Damien Station, Change in Plans: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3532 (ii).

Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building: M. for Cor. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 755 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6786 (iv).

Naturalization Legislation, Uniformity in: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 765 (i).

Naturalization: *See* 'Imperial.'

Natural Resources: *See* 'Provl. Control.'

Naval Bill Repeal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 4242 (iii).

——— Discussion *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lamarche) 4239 (iii).

Naval Cadets, Employmt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 6786 (iv).

Naval Defence of the Pacific Coast, Res. from B. C. Legislature, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 559 (i), 4458 (iii).

Naval Defences: Remark on debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 42 (i).

Naval Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).

Naval Discipline Act, Application to Canada: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1203 (i).

Naval Policy, Interview with Hon. G. H. Perley in London: Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 1576 (i).

Naval Policy of Govt.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 58; (Mr. Monk) 234 (i); (Mr. Lemieux) 250; (Mr. Mondou) 270; (Mr. Northrup) 357; (Mr. Sinclair) 331; (Mr. Stevens) 291.

——— Promise *re* Referendum: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i).

——— Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 551 (i).

——— Repeal of: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 3942; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3943 (ii).

Naval Service, Cor. between Can. and G. B.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 562 (i).

Naval Service in Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 970 (i).

——— Maintenance, Purchase of Ships, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5303 (iii).

——— Minister's Visit to England *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 938 (i).

——— O. C. *re* Instructions, Circulars issued &c.: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2065 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* Shipbuilding, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 558 (i).

Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 2459 (i).

See 'Can. Navy.'

——— Ref. of Min. of Marine *re* Completion: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 1206 (i).

See 'Niobe.'

Navigable Waters, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 107.'

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'

New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).

Negro Immigration: Remarks on Immigration Question (Mr. Thoburn) 608 (i).

Ne Temere Decree, Powers of Parlt.: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Pugsley) 797 (i).

Ne Temere Decree, Questions asked by the late Govt. Concurrence by present Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 719 (i).

——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 720 (i).

——— Stmnt. by Member for Peterborough: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 731 (i).

Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'B. No. 3,' 'Marriage,' &c.

Neuville and C.N.Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2067 (ii).

Newcombe, Mr., Expenses &c.: *See* 'Justice—Dep. Min.'

New Harbour Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong) 1319 (i).

——— Meeting at Newmarket: Par. in Press (Mr. Emmerson) 3057 (ii).

Newspaper Articles, Reading *re* Questions: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3059 (ii).

Newspapers, Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1589 (i).

New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).

Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 724 (i).

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contract *re* Provisioning: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2859 (ii).

——— Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2859 (ii).

——— Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).

See 'Naval.'

North Arm Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'

North Atlantic Trading Co.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Verville) 279 (i).

North Battleford Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
North Battleford to Isle la Crosse Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
Northern, N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6229 (iv).
Northern Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Northern Territorial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6234 (iv).
North Sydney, I.C.R., Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
North Sydney Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
N.W. Mounted Police, Increase *re* Pay: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4743 (iii).
——— Police Report: Presented (Mr. Borden) 971 (i).
See 'Mounted Police.'
Northwest Territories, Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
Northumberland County Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6186 (iv).
Notes, Printing of Govt.: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 554 (i).
Nursery Stock, Purchase of for Experimental Farm, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3333 (ii).
Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1.'
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 717 (i).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
'Ocean Limited,' Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2241 (ii).
——— on conc., 6774 (iv).
Old Age Pensions: on M. (Mr. Burnham) 1362, 1822 (i).
Old Age Pensions: M. for Special Com., (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
O'Leary to West Point, Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Richards) 721 (i).
Olympic Games, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Ont. Boundaries Extension: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Ontario Boundaries, Extension: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
See 'Boundaries.'
Ont., Grant to *re* T. & N. O. Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co. Grinding Machines: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 2060 (ii).
Ont. and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry., Construction: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490, 6602 (iv).
Oriental Immigration, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4779 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
——— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3293
——— Electric Power, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
——— Plumbing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1324 (i); 3290 (ii).
——— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Ottawa City Estimates: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4121 (iii).
Ottawa Dismissals, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
Ottawa Examining Warehouse, Site, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1949 (i).
Ottawa Exhibition Grant, 6479 (iv).
Ottawa Federal District, Referendum *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1356 (i).
Ottawa Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3239 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission and Architects Association *re*: M. for Papers (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 977 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Minutes of Meetings, Amounts expended: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 1588 (i).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
Ottawa and Lake McGregor Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 139 and 192.'
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Ottawa Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
Ottawa, Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 876 (i).

Ottawa, Site for new Deptl. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3242 (ii).
—— Snow Cleaning, Rideau Hall, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Ottawa River Bridges: Conc., 6806 (iv).
Ottawa and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Oyster Culture: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup.. 5255 (iii).
Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Pacific Trans. Can. and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c., Reps. of U.S. Papers: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 2446 (ii).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 569 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1396 (i).
Parcel Post Extension of System: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2329 (ii).
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4776 (iii).
Parcel Post and Rural Mail System, on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) 4082 (iii).
See 'Rural,' 'Post Office.'
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Paris Agency, Compensation to Mrs. Fabre: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).
Paris Exposition, Payments for Space: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Paquet) 582 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 973 (i).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Parliament, Duration of Present and Redistribution Bill: Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 557, 715 (i).
See 'Taylor, Hon. Geo.'
Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
Parliamentary Restaurant, Payments to Waiters: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2861 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Patent Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Patent Relief: *See* 'B. Nos. 16, 53, 55, 70, 84 and 119.'
Patrol Vessels in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Patronage Committee, Montreal, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1866 (i).
See 'Montreal Harbour Commission.'
Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2243 (ii).
Peace Memorial Monument in Queen's Park, Toronto, Action of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 2590 (ii).
Peace River Block, Water Rights: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Peace River Tel. Line, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Peat Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6491 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Pecuniary Claims: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 4776 (iii).
—— Remuneration to Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
—— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4460 (iii).
Pelagic Sealing, Ratification of Agreement: Explanation (Mr. Borden) 4550 (iii).
Pelee Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Doherty) 970 (i).
Penitentiary Employees, Bonus: in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).
—— Salary Increases: in Com. of Sup., 6596 (iv).
—— Salaries, Increases *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1205 (i).
Pensions to Lighthouse Keepers: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Agriculture Com., 2155 (ii).
Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
Petit de Grat Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2050 (ii).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1358 (i).
Petroleum, Crude and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 730 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2065 (ii).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Pictou and Cheticamp Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4736 (iii).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract *re* Supplies to Crews: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2580 (ii).

Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5949 (iv).
Pink Rock Wharf, N.B., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4257 (iii).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Poaching in N.S.: *See* 'Murray.'
Point Aux Anglais, Drainage Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 4778 (iii).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Police Point Reserve Transfer: M. for Papers* (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1585 (i).
Political Literature *re* Race and Religious Prejudices, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 6516 (iv).
See 'Campaign.'
Pollution of Navigable Waters: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Pollution of Red River: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Population of Canada and Quebec Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 731 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Ice Breaking and Dredging: Personal Explanation (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 3331 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 5796 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Works: M. for Rep.* (Mr. Charlton) 3755 (ii).
Port Hawkesbury Public Building: Remarks 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
Port Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
——— Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).
——— Reports, &c.:. M. for Copies* (Mr Kyte) 2460 (ii).
Porto Rico and Mar. Provs. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Postmasters and Assistant Postmasters, Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
Post Office Dept., Grades of Clerks: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
POST OFFICE.
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Henderson) 3946 (ii).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Blind River Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 5948 (iv).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCraney) 5263 (iii).
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4779 (iii).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c.: M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4082; Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4097; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 70) 4120 (iii).
Canada and G. B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).
——— Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 1843 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet. *re* Change of Name: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 1862 (i).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3148 (ii).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2066 (ii).
Gananoque Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 804 (i).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Stations: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 975 (i).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Séguin) 5949 (iv).
Magdalen Island News Service, Marconi Connections: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3833 (ii).
——— Copy of Instructions: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'News' *re*: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 4159 (iii).
——— Salary of Correspondent: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4262 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Hazen) 4041 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4777 (iii).
Mail Carriers, Como to Oka, Compensation to Family: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Mail Contracts, M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5693 (iv).
Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office, Names and Locations: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 976 (i).
——— Inspector, Pet. *re* Apptmt.: M for Cor.* (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).
Neuville and C. N. Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques: (Mr. Delisle) 2067 (ii).
Newspapers, Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1589 (i).
New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 724 (i).
Northumberland County Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6186 (iv).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 569 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 935, 1396 (i).
Parcel Post, Extension of System: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2329 (ii).
Parcel Post and Rural Mail System, on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) 4082 (iii). *See* 'Postal Regulations.'
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4776 (iii).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract *re* Supplies to Crews: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2580 (ii).
Porto Rico and Mar. Provs. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Postage of Newspapers, Opinion of P.M.G. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2291 (ii).
Postal Convention between Canada and France: Request for Papers (Mr. Lemieux) 935 (i).
Postal Regulations, Commission *re* Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2251 (ii).
——— Remarks on M. to take in Mondays (Mr. Armstrong) 2376 (ii).
Postmasters and Town Councillors Regulations *re* Acceptance: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2587 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postmasters dismissed since Oct. 1911: List read (Mr. Lemieux) 6636 (iv).
Postmasters dismissed: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6781 (iv).
Postmasters in Lotbiniere County, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Fortier) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 548 (i).
Post Offices, Change of Names: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 3751 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Block, Condition *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i), 2010 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) 2015 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1066 (i).
——— Outside Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
——— Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).
Post Office Dept., Stmnt. *re* Dismissals since Oct. 1911: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).
Post Office Dismissals, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re* &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 1395 (i).
Railway Mail Clerks, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 5561 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2294 (ii).
River John Mail Carriers, Name, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1579 (i).
River John Mail Service, Cancellation of M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2061 (ii).
——— Number of Boxes in Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6782 (iv).
——— Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4978 (iii).
——— Routes: Inquiry for (Mr. Lemieux) 5561 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1580 (i).
Rural Postmasters, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 3060 (ii).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, Cor. &c.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5922 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5260 (iii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contract, Expiry of: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5951 (iv).
St. Isidore de Prescott, Postmastership, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3055 (ii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 2294 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue, &c. P. O.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 724 (i).
St. Paul L'Ermite, &c., Mail Carrier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2583 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite, Repentigny Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3341 (ii).
Ste Therese and Laurentides Post Offices, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3335 (ii).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2068 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Seamen St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Beland) 2459 (ii).
Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office: Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1242 (i).
——— Further Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1280 (i).
Sorel and St. Victoria Mail Service, Date of Tenders &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4248 (iii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Spry Bay P. O., Request *re* Remo all of: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 582 (i).
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Pelletier) 934 (i).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4459 (iii).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).
——— Date of Wm. Robert's Contract: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4778 (iii).
Verret, Mr. H. B., Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Williamsville Post Office, Removal: Personal Explanation (Mr. Edwards) 6271 (iv).
Potatoes, Weight of Bag: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2071 (ii).
Pouliott, Louis, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
Powassan Postmaster, Change *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Arthurs) 2459 (ii).
Powers, Laurence G., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii), 4781 (iii).
Preferential Tariff to G. B., Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 553 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Pugsley) M. to withdraw, 1390 (i).
Preferential Trade within the Empire: Remarks in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 55 (i).
Premier Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 534 (i).
Prince Edward and Hastings Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
P. E. I., Additional Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
P. E. I. Better Terms: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Construction &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1206 (i).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Emmerson) 2072 (ii).
——— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1580 (i).
——— Tel. sent to A. A. McLean: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1577 (i).
——— Tels. Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pardee) 2458 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Macdonald) for Return, 4232 (iii).
P.E.I. Estimates: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Claims for Compensation, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).
——— Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).
See 'Railways.'
P.E.I. Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii); Conc., 6794 (iv).
See 'Mar. Telephone Co.'
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 3830 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry System: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5207 (iii).

Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2859 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
——— Changes *re* Duties: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2243 (ii).
——— Plant: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 546 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).
——— Salary Increases: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2066 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2243 (ii).
Printing Com., 1st Rep.: Presented, M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 3330 (ii).
——— 3rd Rep.: M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 6578 (iv).
Prisons and Reformatories: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Private Bills, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Currie) 6578 (iv).
——— Extension of Time: M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
——— Rep. of Examiner *re* Pets, Divergency of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 643 (i).
——— Suspension of Rules: M. (Mr. Ames) 5902 (iv).
See 'Senate Amts.'
Private Secretaries, Status of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Private Secretaries, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5808 (iv).
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re*: in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Privy Council Implementing Judgment *re* G.T.P. Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Privy Council Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6780 (iv).
——— Mess. from Senate, 6824 (iv).
Provident Trust Co., Incorporation, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Legre. of Saskatchewan, *re* Negotiations for Transfer of Natural Resources: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2577 (ii).
See 'Man. Extension Boundaries.'
Provincial Control of Western Natural Resources, Promise *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Provincial Railways and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 562 (i).
Provl. Subsidies: *See* 'B. Nos. 77, 115, 151, 152, 178 and 186.'
See 'Man. and N.S.' 'P.E.I.'
Provincial Subsidies *re* Agriculture: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 2453 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, 3rd Rep.: M. to conc. (Mr. Middlebro) 6333 (iv).
——— 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc., 5832 (iv).
——— 4th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Middlebro) 6492 (iv).
——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Middlebro) 6732 (iv).
——— 6th Rep.: M. (Mr. Ames) to conc., 6062 (iii).
See 'Diamond Light.'
Public Accounts Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 11 (i).
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2068 (ii).
Public Expenditures, Scandals, &c., by late Govt.: Remarks in debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 231 (i).
Public Health Assn.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct, Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2063 (ii).
Public Ownership of Public Utilities: on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 645 (i).
See 'Cable,' 'Freight Rates,' 'Parcel Post,' 'Railways,' &c.
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as Assistants: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5954 (iv).
Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Carvell) 6528 (iv).
See 'Dismissals,' &c.
PUBLIC WORKS:
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2449 (ii).
Anse au Canard Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
——— Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Arichat, Retaining Wall: in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Athabasca Landing to Grand Prairie Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Athabasca River Landing: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 561 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Baddeck Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6658 (iv).
Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Beaumont Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).
Berthier en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Barrette) 1409 (i).
Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).
B.C. Public Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1358 (i).
Calgary Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Canadian Coal used to heat Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
Cape Breton Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1020 (i).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 554 (i).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1584 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
Chatham, N.B., Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).
Chester Canal, N.S., Discontinuance of Work: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 716 (i).
Cole Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Cow Bay Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Creosoted Timber *re* Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).
Edmonton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Low) 725 (i).
Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 5261 (iii).
Fort McMurray and Athabasca Tel Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 549 (i).
Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3534 (ii).
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3150 (ii).
French River, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
Garthby, Lake Aylmer, Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Gaspé Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3305 (ii).
Gillis Point Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Goose Creek Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2372 (ii).
Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* Boarding Employees: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5953 (iv).
Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
——— Man., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i), 2366 (ii).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Hillsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Improvement Commission: Ques. (Mr. Kidd) 2293 (ii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Geneviève Wharfs, Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557 (i).
Inverness Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Law) 3340 (ii).
Lachine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1346, 1952 (i).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5055 (iii).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii), 5951, 6781 (iv).
——— Continuation of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2579 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1341, 1531 (i).
——— Memorials, *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2460 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 729 (i).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 728 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).
Levis Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Levis Graving Dock, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B., Tests *re* Foundation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Louiseville Public Buildings: Conc., 6794 (iv).
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Magdalen Island Telegraph and Telephone: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Maisonneuve Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1347 (i).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Mar. Provs. Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Melford Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
——— Notice to suspend work: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 549 (i).
Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1350 (i).
Montreal Customs Appraiser Building: in Com. of Sup., 1351 (i).
Montreal Post Office Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Montreal Postal Station F.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
Moose to Drulingville Loop Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2820 (ii).
Moosejaw Public Building, Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited: M. for Copy* (Mr. Knowles) 562 (i).
Napierville Post Office Site, Payment to Mr. Bourgeois: Remarks (Mr. Lanctot) on M. for Sup., 2373 (ii).
Napierville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i).
——— Purchase of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lanctot) 5263 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
National Ports: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
North Battleford Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
North Battleford to Isle la Crosse Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
Ottawa City Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
——— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3293 (ii).
——— Eastern Block Addition: in Com. of Sup., 1339 (i).
——— Electric Power, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
——— Examining Warehouse, Site, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1949 (i).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
——— Leases, Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1324 (i), 3290 (ii).
——— Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
——— Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
——— Plumbing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
——— Post Office Deptl. Block, Condition *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2010; Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) 2015 (ii).
——— Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re*: in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
——— Site for new Deptl. Building: in Com. of Sup., 3242 (ii).
——— Sussex St. Property: in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).
——— Sussex Street Property, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1359 (i).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2294 (ii).
——— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
Ottawa City Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3239 (ii).
Ottawa City, Rideau Hall, Furniture, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3279, 3285 (ii). (ii).
——— Improvements, Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 547 (i).
——— Improvements, Amount expented from 1896 to 1911: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 876 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire,' (Mr. Pugsley) 799 (i).
——— Snow Cleaning, &c.: in Com of Sup., 3279 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Ottawa City, Rideau Hall, Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 726 (i).

Ottawa River Bridges: Conc., 6806 (iv).

Peace River Tel. Line, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).

Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).

Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1358 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, N.B., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4257 (iii).

Plaza at Ottawa, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 876 (i).

Point Aux Anglais, Drainage Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 4778 (iii).

Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging: Personal Explanation (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 3331 (ii).

Port Dover Harbour Works: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3755 (ii).

Port Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

——— Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).

——— Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).

P. E. I. Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).

Prince Rupert Dry Dock Subsidy, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).

Provincial Railways and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 562 (i).

Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2068 (ii).

Public Works, Appropriations of Last Year: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2436 (ii).

Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 805 (i).

Public Works, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald 559 (i).

Public Works Contracts, Amounts given without tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).

——— Montreal and Quebec, Without tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).

Public Works, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1064 (i).

——— Private Sec's Allowance: Conc. 6779 (iv).

Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2584 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Public Works Engineering Branch, Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1058-9 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).

Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in different Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 2064 (ii).

Public Works, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).

Public Works Omitted from Estimates: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2794 (ii).

Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 530, 531 (i).

Public Works Votes of Last Year, Continuation &c.: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).

Purchase of Goods by Public Works Dept. since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1204, 1578 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2459 (ii).

Quebec, Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).

——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).

——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1851 (i).

Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2836 (ii).

Regina Armoury and Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).

——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 580 (i).

Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Rivieres des Prairies Nav. Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).

——— Drainage, Amount voted: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 714 (i).

St. Andrew Wharf, Discontinuance of Works, *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 724 (i).

Ste Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Buildings: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).

St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2837 (iii).

St. Croix Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Fortier) 5557 (iv).

St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 560 (i).

St. Johns and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551, 571 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. John, N.B., Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
St. John Dry Dock, Contract, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3296 (ii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 566 (i).
——— Tugs employed, Amount paid per day: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 548 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
St. John Wharf, Appropriation *re* Site: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of of Sup., 1853 (i).
St. Laurent Public Building, Conc., 6804 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4256 (iii).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2068 (ii).
——— Contract of Alex. Duchesneau: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4263 (iii).
Sackville, N.B., Harbour Improvements, Conc., 6805 (iv).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1952 (i).
——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 555 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).
Shediac Public Buildings: Conc., 6793 (iv).
Sherbrooke Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).
Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1205 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Whafs, Contractors *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallée) 2859 (ii).
——— Claim of Mr. Larivière for Timber supplied: Ques. (Mr. Lavallée) 3535 (ii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Sudbury Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
Telegraphs, Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
——— Quebec, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam., Water Storage Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2827 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Temiskaming Dam, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4262 (iii).
——— Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pugsley) 2459 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).
Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1963 (i).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2445 (ii).
Weedon Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Wheatley Creek Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Wood Mountain Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
York Bridge over Grand River, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Yukon Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Quarantine Station Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
See 'Lawlor.'
Quebec Arsenal, Payment to Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Quebec Boundary Extension: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
See 'Ungava.'
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) *re* English Criticism, on M. for Sup., 5415 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
——— Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders, &c.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1401 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 4260 (iii).
——— Construction: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6784 (iv).

Quebec Dry Dock, Site, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Béland) 4263 (iii).
——— Subsidy, Reps. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6493 (iv).
Quebec and Gaspé Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
——— Removal of Members, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 560 (i).
——— Reorganization *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 580 (i).
——— Resignation from Board of Members: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
——— Solicitor, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1814 (i).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2836 (ii).
Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Apptmt. by Min. of Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 545 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
Quebec Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1851 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Quebec West Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Queen's Hotel Co., Limited, Litigation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Queen's Theological College: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Queen's University at Kingston: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
——— Ref. to Minister of Justice *re* Provl. Jurisdiction: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 3730 (ii).
Questions Improperly drafted: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Questions not Answered: M. (Mr. Borden) 6732 (iv).
Questions *re* Mr. Lemieux ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).
Questions and Notices of Motions, Rules *re* Standing: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 1015 (i).
Quinze River and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Race Track Meets: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Radiotelegraphic Service—Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 86.'
Ry. Belt and Peace River Block of Land: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Ry. Bridges in N.B., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Ry. Cos., Incorporation of: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Ry. Mail Clerks, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. Nos. 105 and 106.'
Railway Sections and Section Men, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 183.'
Ry. Tariffs: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
RAILWAYS:
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 1575 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 4247 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 2587 (ii).
Can. Northern Ont. Ry., Subsidy, Guarantee, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4781 (iii).
Can. Northern and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Maintenance of Road in L'Ile Bourdon: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5261 (iii).
C.P.Ry., Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5262 (iii).
Car Shortage in the West: Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) 1709 (i).
——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 1709 (i).
——— Govtl. Action *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Buchanan) 1714 (i).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 4190 (iii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re*: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 934 (i).
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 1589 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., Discrimination in the West: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).
——— Transportation, Generally: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645, 1902 (i).
G.T.Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2580 (ii).
——— Board of Conciliation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. MacNutt) 3756 (ii).
G.T.P. Remuneration to Govt. Director: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 1445 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5621 (iv).
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 572 (i).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4171 (iii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction: in Com. of Sup., 622, 677 (i); 5762, 6605 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Ry., Contract: M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 732 (i).

——— Cor. *re*: M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1213 (i).

——— Ports, Nav., &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Aikins) 3756 (ii).

——— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 132 (i).

——— Surveys *re* Navigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Aikins) 3943 (ii).

Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs. prior to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 725 (i).

New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).

Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry., Construction: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims for Compensation, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).

P.E.I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1206 (i).

——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Emmerson) 2072 (ii).

——— Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1580 (i).

——— Tel. sent to A. A. McLean: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1577 (i).

——— Tels., Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pardee) 2458 (ii).

——— Inquiry (Mr. Macdonald) for Return, 4232 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony to Elmira Branch Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).

——— Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).

——— O'Leary to West Point, Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Richards) 721 (i).

——— Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 3830 (ii).

Rys. and Canals, Annual Stmnt.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 4122 (iii).

Railway Bridges, N.B., Aid: Prop. Res. (Mr. Borden) 5691 (iv).

Ry. Commissioners, Board of: in Com. of Sup., 5800 (iv).

Railway Committee, Apptmt. of Sub-Committee *re* G.T. Ry. Bill, Liberals Omitted: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iv).

Railway Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) on M. for Sup., 6543 (iv).

Railways Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1064 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Railway Facilities in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

——— Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5800-1 (iv).

Railway Mail Clerks, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 5561 (iv).

Railway Question: Notice of Discussion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1494 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'

Railway Rates and Freight Charges: (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).

——— Staff Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).

Railway Subsidies: Prop. Res., 5681 (iv).

Railway Ties, Contract with Dame Boulay: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Carvell) 5957 (iii).

Ry. Ties, Contract *re* at Sayabec: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).

St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 4233, 4461 (iii).

——— Contracts *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).

St. John Valley Ry., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 577 (i).

——— Contract to Grand Falls: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 4977 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Michaud) 2460 (ii).

St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3049 (ii).

Salisbury and Harvey Ry., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Pugsley) 562 (i).

——— Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

Students, Railway Fares, Reduction to: Remarks (Mr. Currie) 6277 (iv).

Subsidies to Railways in Man. and N.W., &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. McCraney) 562 (i).

Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6228 (iv).

Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Lines: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).

Sunnybrae Branch Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

Transportation Question: *See* 'Freight Rates.'

Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. Nos. 55 and 84.'

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'

Rainy River Radial Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6312 (iv).

Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Pardee) 4262 (iii).

Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 6184 (iii).

Reciprocity in Trade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).

Reciprocity Treaty with U.S., Cor. with British Ambassador: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1817 (i).

——— Cor. between Can. Govt. and U.S.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1817 (i).

——— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 51; (Mr. Emmerson) 426; (Mr. Foster) 76; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 36; (Mr. Lemieux) 244; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 466; (Mr. Monk) 231; (Mr. Oliver) 449; (Mr. Pugsley) 142; (Mr. Sinclair) 323; (Mr. Verville) 277; (Mr. W. T. White) 447 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S., from 1890 to 1891: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5263 (iii).

Red River, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 64.'

Red River Pollution: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 5166 (iii).

Refrigerator Cars on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5603 (iv).

Regiments of Foreign born Citizens, Organization of: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 534 (i).

Regina Armoury and Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).

——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 580 (i).

Regina Census: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 1574 (i).

See 'Census.'

Registration of Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).

Renfrew, N., Contracts Awarded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2857 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Public Service: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3334 (ii).

——— Contracts awarded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ: M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2218 (ii).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1576, 1707 (i), 1971, 2058, 2377 (ii).

——— Speech of Min. of Customs: Remarks *re* Georgian Bay Canal (Mr. Devlin) 1573 (i).

——— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 926 (i).

Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Repentigny Lightkeepers, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 6784 (iv).

See 'Dismissals.'

Restaurant Com.: M. for Com. (Mr. Borden) 710 (i).

See 'House of Commons.'

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Kyte) 5939 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4744 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2056 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 6494 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 4836 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 5560 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 2377 (ii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'

Revised Statutes, French Version: *See* 'B. No. 65.'

Richards, Mr. Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).

Rideau Canal, Bank St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).

Rideau Canal, New Dredging Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).

Rideau Hall, Expenditure *re*: Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire' (Mr. Pugsley) 799 (i).

——— Furniture, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3279, 3285 (ii).

——— Improvements, Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 547 (i).

——— Improvements, Amount expended from 1896 to 1911: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 876 (i).

——— Lighting and Heating, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

——— Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 726 (i).

See 'Pub. Works.'

Rifle Associations and Bands: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).

Rigaud Postmaster, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2294 (ii).

Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 3331, 3449 (ii).

Rivière du Loup, I.C.R. Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).

——— Workshops, Removal to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 570 (i).

Rivières des Prairies, Nav. Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 621 (i), 2441 (ii).

——— Drainage, Amount voted: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 714 (i).

River John Mail Carriers, Name, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1579 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).

Rivers, Lachapelle and Dubois, Messrs., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii).

Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).

Robinson, Mr. Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer for N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4241 (iii).

Robitaille, Mr. J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).

Rockfield Bridge, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1197 (i), 5790 (iv).

Rockliffe Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).

——— Acquisition of Additional Land: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).

Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley P.O., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 722 (i).

——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).

Rolling Stock, IC.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5609, 5653, 6461 (iv).

Rooms allotted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 670, 1951 (i).

Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).

Ross Rifle: *See* 'N.R.A.'

Royal Assent: *See* 'Bills.'

Royal Mint: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).

Royal Society of Canada Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).

Roy, Wm., Rep. of H. Boulay *re* Charges on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 934 (i).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Boulay) 1391 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Prop. Res. (Mr. Pelletier) 5680 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'

Rural Mail Delivery Extension: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2061 (ii).

——— Number of Boxes in Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6782 (iv).

——— Routes: Inquiry for (Mr. Lemieux) 5561 (iv).

——— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1580 (i).

——— Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4978 (iii).

See 'Post Office.'

Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2247; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) Res. out of Order, 2250; Remarks (Mr. Speaker) *re* M. to restore to Order Paper, 2287 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Blain) to stand, 2460 (ii).

Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c.: M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 1395 (i).

St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2068 (ii).

Ste. Agathe des Monts, Dismissal of Postmistress: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).

St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5922 (iv).

St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan. 1912: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2666 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 2861 (ii).

St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request for Dismissal: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2588 (ii).

St. Andrew Wharf, Discontinuance of Works *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 724 (i).

St. Angele de Laval, County of Nicolet, Postmaster, Charges *res* Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (iii), 4039 (iii).

Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contraits, Expiry of: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5951 (iv).

Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail; (Mr. Boyer) 5260 (iii).

Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Buildings: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).

St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6308 (iv).

St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'

St. Croix Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Fortier) 5557 (iv).

St. Germain Postmaster, Charges *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Papointe) 1579 (i).

St. Germain Postmaster, Mr. C. Michaud: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

St. Isidore de Prescott, Postmastership, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3055 (ii).

St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Lafortune) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).

St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 560 (i).

St. John and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551, 571 (i).

St. John Ambulance Association, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6583 (iv).

St John and Courtenay Bay Contract: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii), 6187 (iv).

St. John and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).

St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
St. John Dry Dock, Contract, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3296 (ii).
St. John and Halifax Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i), 4739 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Dredging Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5694 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 623, 669 (i).
——— Contracts *re*: Remarks- (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
——— Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 566 (i).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 548 (i).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. John Ry. Crossing at Haymarket Square: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 402 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 4233, 4461 (iii).
——— Contract *re*:Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 577 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
——— Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Michaud) 2460 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges, Subsidy: in Com. on Bill, 6211 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3049 (ii).
——— Contract to Grand Falls: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 4977 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Carvell) 3946 (ii).
St. John Wharf, Appropriation *re* Site: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i), 4740 (iii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).
St. Laurent Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).
St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse Killed on I.C.Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
——— Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 5680 (iv).
St. Lawrence River Power, Res., from Montreal Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2456 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Average Depth of Water between Montreal and Quebec, Cap a la Roche at Low Tide: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4256 (iii).
St. Lorette Lake, Man., Pier, Completion of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 2813 (ii).
St. Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 2294 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue of P.O.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 724 (i).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L.. St. Pierre, Investigation *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
St. Paul L'Ermite, Mail Carrier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2583 (ii).
——— Repentigny Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3341 (ii). *See* 'Dismissals.'
St. Peters Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6286 (iv).
Sainte Roche Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
Ste. Rosalie Branch Lines, I.C.R., Accommodation, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4134 (iii).
Ste. Therese and Laurentide Post Offices, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3335 (ii).
Ste. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bureau) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2068 (ii).
——— Contract of Alex. Duchesneau: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4263 (iii).
Sainte Victor de Sorel Mail Contract: Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 6586 (iv).
Sabbath Observance, *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Sackville, N. B., Harbour Improvements, Conc., 6805 (iv).
Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Pugsley) 562 (i).

Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Pugsley) 938 (i).

See 'Railways.'

Salmon Fisheries, B. C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).

Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1952 (i).

—— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 555 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Pardee) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii).

Sarnia Winter Harbour: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., (Mr, Pardee) 3946 (ii).

Saskatchewan, Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 89.'

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'

Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'

Saskatchewan Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Saturday Sittings: Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 5830 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal Locks: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).

Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 575 (i).

Sayabec Station Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2068 (ii).

—— Pet. *re* Dismissal, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2585 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).

Schools of Instruction for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).

Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).

Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2666 (ii).

Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Beland) 2459 (ii).

See 'Post Office.'

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Seager Wheeler, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 542 (i).

Seamen, St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).

Sec. of State, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).

—— Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).

Security Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'

Seed Control Act: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Board of Trade of Wilcox: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2299 (i).

Seeley Keitha, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Sen. and H. of C. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'

Senate Amendments, Railway Bills: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6493, 6577 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 6544 (iv).

Senate, Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).

Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 541 (i).

—— Pet. *re* French Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 2755 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 1576 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5161 (iii).

Separate Schools in Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4247 (iii).

—— Establishment of in Man.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4263 (iii).

See 'Man. Boundaries.'

Sessional Employees, Number dismissed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).

See 'Dismissals,' 'House of Commons.'

Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. in Immigration Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1205 (i); 1814 (i).

Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Shediac Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).

Shediac Public Buildings: Conc., 6793 (iv).

Sheldon v. Rex.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3756 (ii).

Sheltus, Anson, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).

Sherbrooke Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).

Shurtleff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).

Sikhs in B. C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2457 (ii).

Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).

Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office: Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1242, 1280 (i).

Smith, Angus, Pilot of D.G.S. 'Earl Grey,' Suspension of: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1590 (i).

Smith, Lyman, C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. on Customs Bill, 4575 (iii).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1816 (i).
Solicitor General, Payment of Salary to Min. of Justice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1577 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5162 (iii).
Sorel Deep Water Wharfs, Contractors *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 2859 (ii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 974 (i).
Sorel and Ste. Victoria Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4248 (iii).
See 'Post Office.'
Sorel Wharf, Claim of Mr. Lariviere for Timber supplied: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3535 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1205 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).
—— Claim of Denis Martin for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2292 (ii).
—— Employees, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4250 (iii).
—— Guard Pier: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
—— Patronage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3536 (ii).
—— Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay in Distribution, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2061, 3153 (ii).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
South Ont. Pac. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Speaker, Election of: M. (Mr. Borden) 2, 5 (i).
—— Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1808 (i).
Speaker, Deputy: M. (Mr. Borden) 519; Reply, 523 (i).
Speech from Throne, 8 (i).
Spirella Co. of Can., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Spittal, C. D., at Bisley: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Spry Bay P.O., Request *re* Removal of: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 582 (i).
Statistical Officers: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Statue erected on Federal Land in Quebec City by Provl. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2667 (ii).
Statutes of Previous Sessions, Delay *re* Distribution: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Steamship Connections with I.C.R., Subsidies &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5597 (iv).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts: M. for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 2461 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5957 (iv).
—— Protection against: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Kyte) 2588 (ii).
Steel and Iron Bounties *re* Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4249 (iii).
See 'Bounties.'
Stellarton Postmaster, Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal: M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor.* 1589 (i).
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Stenographic Assistance for Members: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1846 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
Sterling Life Ass. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Stewart, Ethel May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. Reid) 5054 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. H. V. White) 561 (i).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Strikes and Strike Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Sudbury Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
—— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry., Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6228 (iv).
Sunnybrae to Guysborough Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 542 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2289 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 18 and 193.'

Supply: M. for Com. (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).

SUPPLY—

Committee:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 6461 (iv).
Census and Statistics, 619 (i), 6462 (iv).
Destructive Pest Act, 6479 (iv).
Distribution of Bulletins, 6465 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 6479 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 6465, 6477, 6484 (iv).
Health of Animals, 6469 (iv).
International Institute, 6478 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, 6469 (iv).
Seed Control Act, 6469 (iv).
Tobacco Growing, 6478 (iv).
Toronto Exhibition, Grant, 6480 (iv).
Year Book, 6465 (iv).

Charges of Management:

Dom. Notes, Printing, 1033 (i).
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 1034 (i).
Public Debt, 619 (i).

Civil Government:

Agriculture, 1041 (i), 6485 (iv).
Archives, 6460 (iv).
Auditor General's Office, 1040, 1031 (i).
Civil Service Commission, 6615 (iv).
Conservation Commission, 1069 (i).
Customs, 1040 (i).
Depts., Generally, 1067 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 1035 (i).
Indian Affairs, 1039 (i).
Inland Revenue, 1040, 1061 (i), 6490 (iv).
Interior, 1038 (i).
Justice, 1035, 1039 (i), 6584 (iv).
Labour, 6615 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries, 1041 (i), 6651 (iv).
Militia, 1037 (i).
Mines, 1066 (i).
Naval Service, 1062 (i).
Post Office, 1066 (i), 6278 (iv).
Privy Council, 1035 (i), 6460 (iv).
Public Printing and Stationery, 1038 (i).
Public Works, 1064 (i).
Railway and Canals, 1064 (i), 5808 (iv).
Secretary of State, 1038 (i).

Customs:

General Vote, 1195 (i).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 1073 (i).

Excise:

Provisional Allowances, 5827 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 5812 (iv).
Stamps, 5826 (iv).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 5826 (iv).

Weights and Measures:
Salaries, &c., 5828 (iv).

Fisheries:

Cold Storage for Bait, 6653 (iv).
General Vote, 680 (i).
International Fisheries Commission, 6646 (iv).
Protection Service, 5386 (iii).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 5242 (iii).

Immigration:

Agents' Salaries, &c.. 3305 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., 3911 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of:
Judges Allowances, 6597, 6601 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6561 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 6560 (iv).
Moving Allowances, 6596 (iv).
N.W.T., 6560 (iv).
Penitentiaries, 6561, 6583 (iv).

Bonuses, 6600 (iv).
U.S., Pecuniary Claims Convention, 6579 (iv).

Labour Dept.:
Accident Inspectors, 1525 (i).
Combines Investigation Act, 1500 (i).
Conciliation and Labour Act, Expenses, 1468 (i).
Contingencies, 6615 (iv)
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1498 (i), 6615 (iv).
Technical Education Commission, 1527 (i).

Legislation:
Members' Stenographers, 6461 (iv).
Senate, 6460 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 5236 (iii).
International Navigation Congress, 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamer, 5237 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 5236 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 5232 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subsidies:
General Vote,, 640, 677-680 (i), 4714-4742, 5934-5938 (iv).

Marine Hospitals, 5238 (iii).

Militia:
Allowances, 5447 (iii).
Annual Drill, 5452, 5484 (iii).
Clothing and Necessaries, 5521 (iii).
Customs Dues, 5522 (iii).
Grants to Assns., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Headquarters and District Staff, 5536 (iii).
Military Camps, 5521 (iii).
Military Properties, 5539 (iii).
Ordnance, &c., 5541 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Quebec Arsenal, 6654 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 5546 (iii).
Schools of Instruction, 5546 (iii).

Mines Dept.:
Metallurgical Problems, Investigation, 6491 (iv).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, 6490, 6602 (iv).
Printing of Reports, 6490 (iv).
Salaries, &c., *re* Explosives Investigation, 6603 (iv).

Miscellaneous:
Champlain, Monument, 6485 (iv).
Conservation Commission, 6579 (iv).
Gymnastic Meet, Nancy, 5811 (iv).
Legal Expenses, Lanctot Charges, 6486 (iv).
Mint, Royal, 6584 (iv).
Olympic Games, Grant, 6486 (iv).
Paris Agency, 6614 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution, 6613 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—*Con.*

Pelagic Sealing Congress, 5810 (iv).
Printing Bureau, 6611 (iv).
Retiring Allowances, Sgt. Codd, 5811 (iv).
St. John Ambulance Assn., 6583 (iv).
Tuberculosis Assn., Grant, 6579 (iv).
Wiley, Mrs., Claim, 6489 (iv).

Mounted Police:

General Vote, 5175 (iii).
Gratuities, 6485 (iv).

Naval Service:

Construction and Maintenance, 5303 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service, 5386 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 5398 (iii).
Radiotelegraphic Service, 5399 (iii).

Ocean and River Service:

Cattle Inspection, 5229 (iii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 5231 (iii).
Registration of Shipping, 5229 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 5228 (iii).
Schools of Navigation, 5229 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 5229 (iii).
Wrecking Plant, 5231 (iii).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 6280 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 6615 (iv).

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:

Eastern Block, Addition, 1339 (i).
Halifax, Quarantine Buildings, 1341 (i).
London, Eng., Can. Office, 6655 (iv).
Ottawa, New Buildings, 1321 (i).

Harbours and Rivers:

French River Improvements, 6657 (iv).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:

British Columbia, 2215 (ii).
Generally, 623 (i).
New Brunswick, 1527, 1530 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1343 (i), 2039-2056 (ii).
Ontario, 1855, 1949-1966 (i).
Quebec, 1346-1356, 1849-1854 (i).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 3239-3279, 3285-3294 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2204-2213 (ii).

Dredging:

Mar. Provs., 2816 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers:

Generally, 623 (i), 3235 (ii).
Manitoba, 2813 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, 2440 (ii).
New Brunswick, 2363-2372 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 639 (i).
Ontario, 640 (i), 2445 (ii).
Quebec, 2441, 2785, 2836 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2814 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*

Miscellaneous:

Monuments to Distinguished Canadians, 2823 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 2825 (ii).
Upper Ottawa, Storage Dams, 2827 (ii).

Roads and Bridges:

Grand River Bridge, York, Ont., 2817 (ii).

Slides and Booms, &c.:

Levis Graving Dock, 3295 (ii).

Telegraph Lines:

Cape Breton, 2817 (ii).
Generally, 3303 (ii).
Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 3302 (ii).
Quebec, 2817 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2819-2822 (ii).
Yukon, 3303 (ii).

Railways and Canals:

Canals:

Cornwall, 5797 (iv).
Lachine, 5790, 6611 (iv).
Rideau, 5791, 5798 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, 5791 (iv).
Soulanges, 5791, 5798 (iv).
Staff and Repairs, 5801 (iv).
Statistical Officers, 5801 (iv).
Trent, 5792, 5799 (iv).
Welland, 5786, 5796, 6607 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Compassionate Allowances, 5678 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Director, 5801 (iv).
Litigation, 5800 (iv).
Railway Commission, 5800 (iv).

Railways:

Hudson's Bay Railway, 622, 677 (i), 5762, 6605 (iv).
Intercolonial Railway, 622, 670 (i), 4124-4137, 4162-4236 (iii), 5595-5658, 5809, 6461, 6604 (iv).
National Transcontinental Railway, 5765 (iv).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 5659-5677 (iv).

Steamboat Inspection:

General Vote, 5238 (iii).

Trade and Commerce:

Bounties, Expenses *re*, 5934 (iv).
Old Age Pension Fund, 688 (i).

Concurrence:

Doncaster Indian Reserve, Road, 6806 (iv).
French River Improvements, 6776 (iv).
Inland Revenue, Salaries, 6770 (iv).
Intercolonial Railway, 6774 (iv).
International Fishery Commission, 6778 (iv).
Louiseville, Public Building, 6794 (iv).
Mines Dept., Salaries, 6771 (iv).
Ottawa River Bridges, Clearing, 6806 (iv).
Public Works Dept., Private Secretary, 6779 (iv).
Sackville Wharf, 6805 (iv).
Shediac, Public Building, 6793 (iv).

Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).

Sussex St. Property, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).

——— Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) *re* abandonment, 2007 (ii).

——— Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1359 (i).

See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'

Sutherland, George Mackay, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 153.'

Sutherland, Mr. Roderick, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 1274 (i),, 2018 (ii).

——— Cor. Read, 2022 (ii).

See 'Dismissals.'

Sutherland Rifle Sight: *See* 'N.R.A.'

Svaigher, A., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 6186 (iv).

Swift Current Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).

Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Pelletier) 934 (i).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (iv).

Sydney and Wycocomagh Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4740 (iii).

Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C.; Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 1209 (i).

Tableaux in H. of C., 1336 (i).

Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of: *See* 'B. No. 88.'

Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).

——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 938 (i).

——— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. M. Martin) 466 (i).

Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i).

See 'Parliament.'

Technical Education Commission, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).

See 'Industrial,' &c.

Telegraph Lines, Quebec, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).

Telegraph Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).

Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2007 (ii).

See 'Cable.'

Telephones, Long Distance, &c. in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).

Telephone Wires, Permission of Govt. to place on Tel. Poles: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).

Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delays *re* Payment to Dep. Ret. Officer: Remarks 1707 (i).

Temiskaming Lake Dam Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4262 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 5928, 6661 (iv).

See 'Lake Temiskaming.'

Temiskaming Dam, Water Storage Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2827 (ii).

T. & N.O.Ry. and G.T.R., Running Rights: *See* 'B. No. 145.'

T. & N.O.Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iii).

T. & N.O.Ry., Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Therrien, F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).

Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3339 (ii).

Thibodeau, George, Resignation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

Thompson, Dr., Dismissal from Mounted Police: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6784 (iv).

Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).

Three Rivers Inland Revenue, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Hebert: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1209 (i).

Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).

Tidal Service, Surveying Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5400 (iii).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).

Timber Slides, Dues: *See* 'B. No. 103.'

Tobacco Growing, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).

Tobacco Growers of Yamaska, Govt. Aid to: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).

Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1963 (i).

Toronto Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6480 (iv).

Toronto, Govt. House, Sale of to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 182.'

Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2445 (ii).

Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).

Tory, Mr. H. L., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).

Tourigny, Mr. Justice, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3147 (ii).

Tower Clock, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. M. Clark) 1575 (i).

Tower Clock, Explanation (Mr. Monk) 1708 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4459 (iii).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Can. Agencies,' 'Commercial.'
Trade and Commerce Deptl. Report: Presented (Mr. Foster) 971 (i), 2591 (ii), 6780 (iv).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and W. Indies: (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).
See 'British West Indies,' 'West Indies.'
Trade Relations with Japan, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 559 (i).
Trade Relations: *See* 'Franco-Canadian.'
Trent Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5799 (iv).
—— Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (iv).
See 'Canals.'
Trent Canal Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Truro Station: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
Trust and Loan Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Tuberculosis Association, Grant to: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Govt. Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3533 (ii).
Twine Materials Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3536 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Typewriter Supplies, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
'Tyrian' Telegraph Service Boat: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3059 (ii).
Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2060 (ii).
See 'Que. Boundaries.'
Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).
Union Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Union Jack Flag, Use of: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Union Labour Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
United Gold Fields of B. C., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 6783 (iv).
—— Investigation, Application to Min. of Jus.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3148 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 572 (i).
—— Proceedings *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2455 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249, 4778 (iii).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (ii).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).
Vanantwerp, C. B., Emplymt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Boivin) in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Vancouver Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5898, 6218, 6325 (iv).
Vegetables, Weight of Bag: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. W. H. White) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 933 (i).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 6783 (iv).
Venoit, J., Suspension: *See* 'Benoit.'
Verret, Mr. H. B., Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).
Veterans, Bounties to: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).
See 'Bounties.'
Vickers-Maxim Co.'s Contract *re* Construction of Montreal Dry Dock: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2450 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2294 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1577 (i).
Voters Lists in Man., Distribution *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3056 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int.: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Waiters, Holiday on Sunday: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Waiters in Restaurants, Minimum Wages paid in Cities: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 3049 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Wallace Harbour Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).

Water in Ry. Belt, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners: M. for O. C.'s, &c.: (Mr. Pugsley) 981 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c., and Appointments: M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
——— Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
See 'Boundary Waters.'
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3055 (ii).
Ways and Means—Financial Statement (Mr. White) 4985 (iii).
——— M. for Com. (Mr. White) 702 (i).
See 'Budget.'
Webber, James, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Webster, Dr. C. A., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Law) 6186 (iv).
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Wednesday Sittings, Govt. Business: M. (Mr. Borden) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).
Weedon Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Tobin) 6492 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
Welland Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6607 (iv).
——— Quantity of American Freight passing through: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5786 (iv).
——— Water Power, Diversion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 6747 (iv).
Wells, Edna, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 102.'
Western Dom. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
West. Ont. Pac. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
West Indies, Australia and Canada Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).
West Indies and British Guiana Trade Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 1820 (i).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Murphy) 977 (i).
West Indies Mail Service, Establishment by Dom.: Remarks (Mr. McCurdy) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Wheat Grades: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 663 (i).
See 'Grain Bill.'
Wheatley Creek Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Wheeler, Seager: *See* 'Seager.'
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2857 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Whitehead, N.S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2855 (ii).
See 'Harris.'
White, James, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs., Claims *re* Yukon Property: in Com. of Sup., 6489 (iv).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Williamsville Post Office, Removal: Personal Explanation (Mr. Edwards) 6271 (iv).
Wills, Henry Greek, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Winnipeg Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Wood Mountain Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. as Excise Officer: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Wrecks Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Wrecks Subsidies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 550 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Yamaska Electoral Agent: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1584 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 3273 (ii).
Yarmouth Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 3269 (ii).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).
York Bridge over Grand River, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Yukon Act (Judges) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Yukon Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Yule,, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4779 (iii), 5950 (iv).